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Abstract

This thesis seeks to acknowledge and address the concerns that Maori people voice about research into their lives. The present study shows that Maori people are concerned that the power and control over research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability are addressed by the imposition of the researcher's agenda, concerns and interests on the research process. Such dominance of a Western orientated discourse is being challenged by a pro-active, Kaupapa Maori research approach. This approach is part of the revitalisation of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Kaupapa Maori research is collectivistic, and is orientated toward benefiting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas. Kaupapa Maori Research is based on a growing consensus that research involving Maori knowledge and people needs to be conducted in culturally appropriate ways, ways that fit Maori cultural preferences, practices and aspirations in order to develop and acknowledge existing culturally appropriate approaches in the method, practice and organisation of research. This thesis examines how a group of researchers have addressed the importance of devolving power and control in the research exercise in order to promote self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga) of Maori people. In the thesis I have talked with researchers who have accepted the challenge of positioning themselves within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori. As a result, this thesis examines how such positionings challenge what constitutes a process of theory generation within the context of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

This thesis further seeks to examine a way of knowing that reflects what meanings I can construct from my positioning within an experiential Kaupapa Maori research matrix. My position within this matrix resulted from critical reflections on my participation in a research project that focussed on my mother's family, my participation in a research group with an agreed-to agenda, my participation within the projects considered in the narratives in this thesis, my talking with other research participants in the form termed "interviews as chat" and from our constructing joint narratives about their/our attempts to address Maori concerns about research in their practice.

The broad methodological framework used in the thesis is narrative inquiry for such an approach allows the research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in that chosen by the researcher. In other words, the story teller maintains the power to define what constitutes
the story and the truth and the meaning it has for them. Further, this thesis seeks to investigate my own position as a researcher within a co-joint reflection on shared experiences and co-joint construction of meanings about these experiences, a position where the stories of the other research participants merged with my own to create new stories. Such \textit{collaborative stories} go beyond an approach that simply focusses on the cooperative sharing of experiences and focusses on connectedness, engagement, and involvement with the other research participants within the cultural world view/discursive practice within which they function. This thesis seeks to identify what constitutes this engagement and what implications this has for promoting self determination/agency/voice in the research participants by examining concepts of \textit{participatory consciousness} and \textit{connectedness} within Maori discursive practice.

\textit{Whakawhanaungatanga} (establishing relationships in a Maori context), is used metaphorically to give voice to a culturally positioned means of collaboratively constructing research stories in a \textit{'culturally conscious and connected manner'}. The thesis explains that there are three major overlapping implications of whakawhanaungatanga as a research strategy. The first is that establishing and maintaining relationships is a fundamental, often extensive and ongoing part of the research process. This involves the establishment of \textit{'whanau of interest'} through a process of \textit{'spiral discourse'}. The second is that researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in the research process; that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually and not just as a 'researcher' concerned with methodology. Such positionings are demonstrated in the language/metaphor used by the researchers in the stories described in this thesis. The third is that establishing relationships in a Maori context addresses the power and control issues fundamental to research, because it involves participatory research practices, in this context, termed \textit{'Participant Driven research'}. 
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Chapter 1: Maori people's concerns about research

In recent times conducting research on Maori groups has become a particularly sensitive area. This is true not just for non-Maori researchers but also for Maori researchers. Criticism by Maori people of researchers and of research extends beyond the inter-personal relationship established between an interviewer and interviewee and into questions related to the reasons for the research being devised, the interests which drive or will benefit from the research, the design of the project, the selection of researchers, the analysis of data and the outcome of the research (Linda Smith, 1991, p. 2).

Introduction

Despite the promises of the Treaty of Waitangi, the history of Maori and Pakeha relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand since the signing of the Treaty has not been one of partnership, of two peoples developing a nation, but one of political, social and economic domination by the Pakeha majority, and marginalisation of the Maori people through armed struggle, biased legislation, and educational initiatives and policies that promoted Pakeha knowledge codes at the expense of Maori (Ward, 1974; Simon, 1990; Walker, 1990; Bishop, 1991a).

Despite the development of the myth of our being 'one people' with equal opportunities (Hohepa, 1978; Walker, 1990), results of this domination are evident today in the lack of equitable participation by Maori in all positive and beneficial aspects of life in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and by their over-representation in the negative aspects, the 'crisis indices' (Simon 1990; Pomare 1988; Davies and Nicholl, 1993). In education, for example, the central government's sequential policies of assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism (Irwin, 1989; Jones, et al, 1990) and strategies such as Taha Maori (Smith, 1990; Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993), while all concerned for the welfare of Maori people, have failed to sustain Maori cultural and language aspirations, and have effectively stressed the need for Maori people to subjugate their destiny to the needs of the majority culture, who through political domination effectively prescribed the agenda for the nation state (Ward, 1974; Bishop, 1991a). In short, the development of Aotearoa/New Zealand since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, despite constant armed and passive resistance by Maori people, has been one where the Pakeha majority has benefitted enormously and where Maori have been politically marginalised, culturally and racially attacked, and economically impoverished.
Research has contributed to, and continues to, contribute to the persistent attacks on Maori cultural integrity, and as a result has promoted Maori political and economic marginalisation and the subsequent impoverishment of Maori people in Aotearoa/New Zealand today. Despite Maori people being one of the most researched people in the world, in the domain of knowledge definition there is a great deal of evidence that much research into Maori people's lives and experiences, conducted by educational and other researchers, has been parasitic, that is of benefit to the researchers more than to those who have been the objects of study. It has been the researchers, rather than the people being researched, who have determined the research agendas, controlled the research processes and reported the research outcomes in terms defined to suit their world views. Consequently this has perpetuated the marginalisation and impoverishment of Maori people. In short, this process of research has maintained the power to define what constitutes research, and the criteria for evaluation and presentation of research findings, in the hands of those people doing the observing, gathering and processing of data and the construction of meaning from/about the research experiences.

In article two of the Treaty of Waitangi, Maori people were guaranteed that they would maintain chiefly control (tino Rangatiratanga that is, self-determination) over taonga katoa (all treasures), particularly the power to define what constitutes a taonga (a treasure) to Maori people, and the power to protect, promote, prefer and prescribe taonga. Despite this guarantee, Pakeha political control over decision making processes in educational research and education in general has proscribed Maori knowledge-gathering and information-processing methods and contexts, that is taonga. Maori definitions, research questions and approaches to fundamental epistemological questions such as 'What is research? Who defines what research is? Who defines the purpose and benefits of research?', along with Macri strategies for knowledge production and definition, have been denied authenticity and legitimacy (Curtis, 1983; Stokes, 1985, 1987; Smith, 1990; Smith, 1991; Bishop and Glynn, 1992a).

Kaupapa (agenda) Pakeha Research

The colonisation of Aotearoa/New Zealand and the subsequent neo-colonial dominance of Pakeha majority interests in research has resulted in the development of what could be labelled Kaupapa Pakeha research. Such research into Maori people's lives continues to address concerns and interests of the researcher's own making and defines the experiences, and the meanings of these experiences for others in terms of its own agenda.

This chapter will illustrate how such research has:

1) simplified and commodified Maori knowledge for 'consumption' by the colonisers
2) undervalued and belittled Maori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonisers

3) developed a social pathology approach by focussing on a supposed inability of Maori culture to cope with human problems, implying that Maori culture was inferior to that of the coloniser in human terms

Such research has denied the authenticity of Maori experiences and voices and replaced them with an 'authoritative' voice of the 'expert' and perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that denies power sharing, and which precludes the development of an ideology that legitimates diversity of cultural epistemologies and cosmologies within Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The rest of this chapter examines these contentions in turn, then summarises how Kaupapa Pakeha research has created concerns about research that need to be addressed when undertaking research into Maori people's lives.

1) Research that has commodified Maori knowledge/history

Much Kaupapa Pakeha Research has simplified and commodified Maori knowledge for 'consumption' by people other that those whose culture generated the knowledge and within whose cultural context such knowledge makes sense. Two examples are detailed here. The first addresses the historical development of a syncretic history of Maori migration and the second is the contemporary concern about commodification of Maori intellectual property.

i) A syncretic migration message

Historian Michael King (1994) explains how research by non-Maori in the early part of this present century disadvantaged and belittled Maori knowledge through gross misrepresentations of the complexities of Maori history in order to present a 'simple', 'commodified' history suitable for 'consumption' within the compartmentalised education system developed by and for the majority culture in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In other words, 'colonisation' in the form of scholarly research gathered and synthesised material to serve a Kaupapa Pakeha purpose.

Two eminent anthropologists of the early twentieth century, Percy Smith and Elsdon Best took "fragments of tribal traditions from different places and sought to weave them into a single Western-style chronological history .... Percy Smith fabricated a pre-Maori people called Moriori, with dark skin, fuzzy hair, and a more 'primitive' culture than that of the later Polynesian arrivals" (p. 141). Elsdon Best developed the idea of the 'Great Fleet', a collation of canoes that travelled together to Aotearoa/New Zealand from the mystical homeland of Hawaiki. According to this story, settlement of Aotearoa/New Zealand involved the arrival of the great navigator Kupe in 950 A.D., followed 200 years later by Toi in 1150, and then the 'Great Fleet'
made its landfall in 1350 A.D. This chronology was enshrined in school textbooks for
generations and became a prescribed set of facts to be regurgitated in Social Studies
tests year after year.

However, this syncretic account is crude and inaccurate. It never addresses the
beauty of the myriad of Kupe stories, the poetry of his namings of places (over 60 in the
area of Whanganui a Tara [Wellington] alone) or the implications of this legend for
human interactions and relationships (Walker, 1978; O'Regan, 1982). For Maori people,
the reality of the stories about Kupe is that he only appears in tribal histories of those
areas where he visited, for example the Cook Strait area and in Northland. Other areas
in Aotearoa/New Zealand have stories that recognise other founding settlers, such as
Toi in the Mataatua region and Tuterakifanoa in the South. Imagine the astonishment of
Maori children in the Bay of Plenty, Taranaki or the South Island learning from their
textbook that someone called Kupe discovered their homeland when taught at home
about another ancestor altogether.

The appropriation and reshaping of Maori traditions has ignored that Maori are a
complex, tribal people (Ritchie, 1992), with differing stories, whakapapa and traditions.
These differences reflect the different peoples' histories and research questions. The
needs of the Pakeha education system for a generalised, commodified and simplified
picture resulted from a (still present) distrust and disdain for 'tribalism' and the
consequent complex picture this reveals about pre-European Maori life. Such
simplification results also from Pakeha research processes that focus on the need to
create generalisations from a variety of cases/examples, and research questions such as
'Who are the Maori?', and 'Where do they come from?' Non-Maori discussion of these
questions creates knowledge about Maori people that is radically different from that
which Maori people themselves may wish to define/construct.

Maori have their own research questions and priorities. Such questions as those
suggested by Professor Whatarangi Winiata in the Ngati Raukawa submission to the
Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) which addressed the need for Ngati
Raukawa to identify the cultural resources available for tribal development (submission
number 2568), or the keen interest Maori people have in developing and sharing ways
of tracing their genealogies (submission number 2739). The submissions emphasised
also that most research, as defined by Maori, needed to be of benefit to the collective
whole. Maori research also addresses questions such as 'What are the salient features
of our place? Who are the important people of this place?' The answers to these
questions will be given in a holistic manner, rather than in terms of oceanic migration
alone. Answers will be given in terms of waka (canoes) and maunga (mountains), awa
(waterways) and iwi, hapu and whanau (literally tribal, sub-tribe and extended family
groupings). In other words, the focus will be on whakapapa, that which binds us to each
other, to other living creatures and to the world we all inhabit.
While the migration of Maori people to Aotearoa/New Zealand from Eastern Polynesia during the first millennium has been detailed, and the tracks of the earlier ancestors have been retraced by archaeological rediscoveries of Lapita pottery cultures and still further verified by tracing the patterns of historical linguistics (Bellwood, 1978; Green, 1979; Davidson, 1984), the debate over Polynesian migrations reveals much about the researchers themselves. Elsdon Best developed the theory of the 'Great Fleet' by gathering a series of stories from a variety of locations and creating a generalised, synthesised story. However, by following a similar approach of researching authentic tribal traditions and genealogies, Auckland Museum ethnologist David Simmons (1976) has reappraised these stories of the Great Fleet and shown the diversity, complexity and variety of canoe stories. Walker (1979) comments

Simmons by the rigorous application of the techniques of scholarly research has overthrown some of the work of founding fathers such as Percy S. Smith and Elsdon Best. He did so by reinterpreting the traditions of Maori origins on Maori terms (p. 91)

Simmons could find no evidence for the Fleet within Maori traditions and genealogies, for although most tribal traditions name a founding canoe, they do not link the canoe arrivals together into a fleet. By empirically comparing tribal genealogies, Simmons (1976) illustrated that there is remarkable variation in the number of generations that trace back to the various founding canoes. For example, Mataatua (the 'founding canoe' of the eastern Bay of Plenty area) is reckoned to have arrived 14 generations ago, whereas the founding canoe of the Taranaki people, Aotea, has an estimated arrival of 26 generations ago. Therefore these canoes could not have travelled together to Aotearoa/New Zealand for the difference of 12 generations would be in the order of some 240 years (allowing 20 years per generation).

This consideration raises some very critical questions. If the method of gathering information was similar in both Smith's and Simmons's cases, that is, it was scholarly, objective and orientated at gathering empirical data from the authentic sources, how is it that the results of their studies were so different? Is it that Best misused a valid method, and that Simmons was able to use the method more correctly, or is there perhaps something wrong with the method? Whatever the case, the inaccuracy of Best's synthesis suggests that European investigators found the myriad of migration stories presented a picture of diversity and complexity too hard to contemplate, especially when the prevailing opinion was that Maori were a primitive people, not capable of such complex understandings and knowledge systems. As Brailsford (1981) suggests
how could this primitive people set out from 'Hawaiki' in frail canoes, generations and centuries apart and navigate 2,500 kilometres to New Zealand? It was much simpler to have them all arrive together as one Great Fleet (p. 3)

However, a further question remains. What purpose did this research into the origins of Maori people fulfill? Whose agenda was being met by such research? Simplifying the details of Maori navigation skills, knowledge and education systems not only reinforced European ideas of Maori being a primitive people, but it also enhanced those notions of cultural superiority that colonisation was predicated upon. Such attitudes still prevail in mainstream education settings in New Zealand today. Despite there being a considerable literature arguing against the notion of the 'Great Fleet', there is scant attention paid to an alternative literature (Salmond, 1983; Brailsford, 1981; Walker, 1978). This literature acknowledges the great detail and variety of Maori stories about voyaging and migration and maintains that Maori people have a different agenda for their stories. This agenda addresses holistic approaches to living in the modern world, based on the teachings and traditions of the ancestors, an agenda that is located within a Maori cosmology. By insisting on continuing the debate about migration as being one of the primary debates about Maori prehistory, mainstream educators (using textbooks such as Mills, 1985, and Woodcock, 1988) ignore the culturally preferred questions of Maori people, and persist in locating academic debate within the domain, interests and concerns established by non-Maori people.

ii) Contemporary commodification of Maori intellectual property

In a more contemporary example, Maori academic Graham Smith (1993) and Maori lawyer Moana Jackson (1993) enunciate concerns about a new wave of assimilation of Indigenous and First Nations language, knowledge and culture which has accompanied the insertion of 'new right' economic reforms of education, especially since the implementation of the Education Act of 1989 and the development of the programmes and practices under the title of 'Tomorrows Schools' (following Picot, 1988).

Smith (1993) argues that the economic exploitation of Maori people in Aotearoa/New Zealand is inextricably linked to their cultural oppression. One major way in which this is accomplished is through further "commodification of Maori language, knowledge and culture," where to meet the 'new right' market orientated and driven context "Maori language, knowledge and culture is to be packaged up as marketable goods which can be bought and sold on the open market" (p. 6). To Jackson (1993), this 'Universalist' argument proposes that all knowledge is part of the world's heritage and is therefore open to all people. Smith describes this as an extension of the
open secular model where all knowledge is available to all people at the right price, and where schools act as knowledge 'brokers', promoting their own interests at the expense of Maori interests. Some recent examples include the commodification of Maori identity, with the census, using a practice which is followed by a number of institutions, requiring Maori to rank their tribal affiliations. This is in direct contradiction of Maori bilineal descent preferences. Koha (traditional Maori gifting) has also been subject to redefinition by the Inland Revenue Department, and traditional cultural roles such as Kaumatua (respected elder), Tohunga whakairo (carving expert) and whare waananga (centres of higher learning) have been subject to commodification and redefinition by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (Smith, 1993) and by educational institutions. Smith (1993) concludes of this practice that

by packaging and quantifying Maori cultural items within Pakeha definitions the control over what these items might mean shifts from Maori to Pakeha, and by redefining these cultural items into self-contained components they become susceptible to market forces, in that their 'value' is more dependent upon economic considerations than cultural considerations (p. 9).

Jackson (1993) and Smith (1993) are voicing the concern expressed by many Maori people about the loss of control over Maori intellectual property. This concern is also addressed in the Draft Declaration in Indigenous People's Rights and the Mataatua Declaration (Te Puni Kokiri, 1993a). These concerns focus on the right of indigenous people to define what they treasure as taonga tuku iho, literally those treasures passed down from the ancestors, that is, those things that explain and make sense of their world, which the world gives to nurture and protect them and which give spiritual or artistic expression to their sense of being" (Jackson, 1993, p. 1). Maori people are concerned that continuation of neo-colonial policies in the form of the 'new right' politics current in Aotearoa/New Zealand are mitigating against the retention of Maori control over Maori intellectual property. The loss of control means that accountability becomes defined in terms determined by the dominant culture. Also the focus on universalisms, rather than cultural specificities, enables researchers using such self-defined terms as 'academic freedom' to use Maori knowledge and information to serve purposes beyond that which Maori people would support.

2) Research that belittled Maori knowledge and learning practices

Much Kaupapa Pakeha research has undervalued Maori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonisers. Examples discussed here address the skill of Polynesian navigators, the ownership of oral taonga
and questions pertaining to definition and ownership of knowledge within the education system.

i) Drift theories versus navigation

Non-Maori research and writing has frequently served to diminish the abilities of the Maori people. The contentious issue of Maori arrival in Aotearoa/New Zealand not only provides many examples of research that serves Kaupapa Pakeha interests but also demonstrates how Kaupapa Pakeha research can be used to belittle Maori knowledge. Many Pakeha researchers have been dismissive of the idea that Maori could have actually navigated across the vast Pacific ocean in order to populate Aotearoa/New Zealand. Sharp (1963) was the most vociferous exponent of the drift theory which was popularised by Cumberland (1980) on the TV series *Landmarks* as recently as the late 1970s. This series was packaged by the former Department of Education, and widely circulated among schools in the early 1980s. The 'drift theory' stated that Maori people could not have navigated to Aotearoa/New Zealand, rather they must have arrived here by accident; a fishing expedition swept south from Polynesia by storms and currents or some such event. The 'drift' theory denied that Polynesian peoples had sufficient knowledge and skills about oceanic navigation and education processes that would ensure these skills were passed on appropriately from generation to generation. These ideas are still current in our schools, despite evidence to the contrary in a number of publications (Siers, 1977; Lewis, 1978; Finney, 1979). Also, little account has been taken of the successful recreation voyages through the Pacific of *Hokulea* and "Avaiki Nui", the former a fibreglass recreation, the latter made of traditional materials. The voyages of *Hokulea* from Hawaii to Tahiti and the South Pacific in 1976 and again in the mid-1980s, and of *Avaiki Nui* from Tahiti to Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1985/1986, using only traditional navigation techniques, received scant attention in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The implications of these voyages for the credibility of the 'drift' theory and the cultural ideologies on which this theory rests were scarcely recognised.

ii) Removal of taonga

Some non-Maori researchers have actually removed taonga from Maori people, Curtis, (1990) gives examples of collections of whakapapa, waiata (songs), whakatauaki (proverbs) and pakiwaitara (legends) being expropriated for non-Maori purposes. They have processed these taonga for their own research needs and ignored or violated associated issues of tapu (sacredness). Some collectors neither acknowledged that the true ownership belonged to the people themselves, nor even presented a copy of any completed works back to the people. Often such research has been conducted which has ignored advice as to the appropriate methodology from kaumatua. The clear implication
here is that if the purpose of the research is not challenged then this form of belittlement will be perpetuated.

iii) Who defines learning and knowledge in the education system?

The education system developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand since the commencement of colonisation has long over-valued the literate and under-valued the oral. Indeed, colonisation has been further promoted by the suggestion that Maori people do not have a full literature, rather only 'arts and crafts' and therefore they are a simple culture, not worthy of concern. The oral transmission of knowledge has been devalued as being unreliable since it was claimed that memories were not as reliable as written documents. Such attitudes reveal both a lack of understanding of the principles upon which orally literate societies operate, and the ethnocentrism of the critics.

These attitudes do not acknowledge that the Maori placed a high cultural value on the transmission of facts and beliefs without embellishment or innovation. Indeed, early Pakeha travellers frequently wrote of the prodigious feats of memory they were often witness to (Wade, 1842). Traditional learning processes and purposes differed from modern methods (Pere, 1982). They involved a great deal of time and repetition, and were fostered within the social context of underlying principles of the culture, e.g. mana (power), tapu and mauri (life force), the mana of the person, for example, being enhanced in proportion to the range and depth of knowledge displayed. The education system imposed by settlers attempted to replace a pre-existing and complex system, and subsequently attempted to deny or belittle its existence.

Furthermore, as King (1978), Salmond (1975) and Metge (1984) report, these learning processes continue today in the Maori world, exemplified in the oral art forms of whaikorero (oratory), karanga (ceremonial call) and pakiwaitara. The records of the hearings of the current Waitangi Tribunal are today an accessible source for all New Zealanders to read of the still prodigious feats of memory required of contemporary tohunga (specialists), especially those chosen as repositories of hapu or whanau whakapapa. Whakapapa recitation is a good example of how the mana of the person, the protection of the tapu, and the intermingling of the life force of the person and the information itself poses challenges for potential researchers coming from a culture with a written literature background and/or cultural preference for such an approach. From a Maori position, for example, resorting to documentation of any sort may be suspect, because the mauri of the person and the document may be so intermingled as to be inseparable. Tapu may be involved and tapu removal may be necessary, if appropriate. Indeed, subsequent re-use of documents may be inappropriate because of the nature of the mana of the people involved.

Maori learning processes emphasise the importance of many Maori concepts and their contextual relationships. These include whakapapa and the nature of humans
in relation to creation stories, the birth of Te Ao Marama (the world of light that was revealed when Tane separated his parents, Rangi, the Sky Father, and Papa, the Earth Mother), the search for the kits of knowledge\(^4\) and the subsequent messages contained in these kits for humankind, an awareness of the importance of Mauri-Mana- Tapu-Noa, and the complementarity of these concepts as well as their importance for research (Marsden, 1975; Rangihau, 1975; Metge, 1976, 1984; King, 1978; Walker, 1978; Pere, 1982, 1988; and Irwin, 1984).

Smith (1992b, after Young, 1971), writing about tertiary education and research contexts, suggests that it is necessary to understand the discourse of power to develop some critical questions such as, 'What counts as knowledge? Who determines what counts as knowledge? What counts as credentials? What counts as research?' In other words, what agency, that is what actions can Maori people take within the discourse related to 'academic freedom' in mainstream University contexts. How can such agency be effected if the discursive practice is constructed in exclusively predetermined knowledge and cultural frameworks? Smith suggests that the reality is that the 'choices' most Maori have are limited to either participating in Pakeha dominant institutional frameworks or not participating at all (p. 26).

The outcome of the dominance of non-Maori knowledge codes (Smith 1990) coupled with the economic and political marginalisation of Maori people has meant that there is currently a crisis in Maori education; under-representation of Maori in the 'success' indices and over-occupation of the 'failure' indices. The crisis is well summarised by the Waitangi Tribunal when they conclude that

the education system in New Zealand is operating unsuccesssfully because too many Maori children are not reaching an acceptable level of education. For some reason they do not or cannot take full advantage of it. Their language is not protected and their scholastic achievements fall far short of what they should be. The promises of the Treaty of Waitangi of equality of education as in all other human rights are undeniable. Judged by the system's own standards Maori children are not being successfully taught, and for that reason alone, quite apart from the duty to protect the Maori language, the education system is being operated in breach of the Treaty (In Hirsch, 1990, p. 24)

Research into Maori people's lives and activities has also involved reification, that is, the removal of cultural elements from their 'sense-making' context. This has not only had belittling effects but has also helped to destroy the 'historical memory' for Maori people. Giroux and Friere in Livingstone (1987) submit that
...forgetting instances of human suffering and the dynamics of human struggle not only rendered existing forms of domination 'natural' and 'acceptable' but also made it more difficult for those who were victimised by such oppression to develop an ontological basis for challenging the ideological and political conditions that produced such suffering (p. xv)

Such circumstances have led to Maori people forgetting many of the contemporaneous elements that contributed to making total sense of their lives and their history. Further, myths created as part of the dominant discourse are taken up by Maori as truths, and a deeper psychological problem is created in that Maori begin to believe the myths created about themselves. The accumulation of the large body of knowledge created about Maori, essentially by non-Maori for non-Maori purposes over such a long period of time, indeed for generations, has become very powerful and oppressive. The knowledge created by these research processes permeates the domain of everyday life through school texts, popular literature and mass media which engage in their own particular and peculiar selection processes of story-telling and sensationalism. The remnants of the nineteenth century evolutionary theories of monogenetic and polygenetic sources of racial differentiation (Belich, 1987; Simon, 1990; Bishop, 1991a), together with deficit or cultural deprivation theories common in the twentieth century, have created a legacy of a cumulative discourse of racism which over time has become a self-fulling prophecy for Maori and non-Maori peoples alike.

This process over time is a very powerful. For example, commonly, non-Maori and Maori educators suggest that Maori children "do well with their hands", preferring not to deal with abstract concepts. This is a myth created in the nineteenth century and can be directly sourced in the rationalisation for the limited curriculum created for Maori children in the 'native schools' (Simon, 1990). This myth is exploded when Maori children learn effectively in Maori cultural contexts within the contemporary Maori education system, for example, in Kaupapa Maori education institutions or through immersion in hui (meeting) at marae (meeting place)). In these contexts, teaching is constantly conducted within and through abstract concepts; metaphors, allusions and imagery.

3) Research that has developed a social pathology focus

This section will examine how colonisation developed a social pathology approach to Maori social and political institutions by focussing on a supposed inability of Maori culture to cope with human problems. The clear implication was that Maori culture was inferior to that of the coloniser in human terms. Examples addressed in this section are the denial of the validity of Maori socio-political institutions, the denial of
Maori economic adaptability, and the development of cultural deprivation theories to explain Maori underachievement in the mainstream education system.

i) The denial of the validity of whanau, hapu and iwi

Historically, some non-Maori writers did seem to acknowledge the mana of Maori people, yet often this was done in order to advance other causes. For example, Owens (1981) cites the Earl of Morton, President of the Royal Society, who was concerned to check the possibility of bloodshed by the European visitors to Aotearoa/New Zealand in the early days of settlement. He considered this possibility a crime of the highest nature for they are human creatures, the work of the same omnipotent Author, equally under his care with the most polished European.... No European Nation has a right to occupy any part of their country, or settle among them without their voluntary consent (p. 29).

Owens (1981) also cites Captain James Cook as saying that Maori were "brave open warlike people and void of treachery ... certainly in a state of civilization", executing their arts "with great judgement and unwearied patience" (p. 29). Cook's opinions were to typify the European response to the Maori for many generations, for despite this respect for Maori 'civilisation', Cook was convinced that the Maori needed the improvements that would be offered by his own 'civilisation', one example being that of central government.

Living thus dispers'd in small parties knowing no head but the chief of the family or tribe whose authority may be very little, subjects them to many inconveniences a well regulated society united under one head or any other form of government are not subject to (p. 30)

This theme has repeatedly resulted in the belittlement of tribal structures by subsequent governments right up to the present day, a reflection of the belief that whanau, hapu and iwi are inappropriate socio-political structures within which to address problems of a 'modern' society.

Similarly, there was a common belief that there was immense social dislocation and upheaval caused by European technology and presence, particularly during the initial years of contact and settlement in the 1830s, and this supposed disruption needed to be controlled by a benevolent 'governor'. Much has been made of the supposed anarchy and depopulation of the pre-1840 period and the supposed inability of the Maori to cope with the rapid changes of these times. However, the humanitarian justification for annexation, the idea that Aotearoa/New Zealand was sliding into
uncontrollable warfare, anarchy, and depopulation, was grossly exaggerated. Owens (1981) suggests that "in 1840, the only threat from which New Zealand needed to be rescued was the threat of uncontrolled British migration" (p. 53). Steven (1989) argues that the real reason for annexation was in fact to allow for peaceful settlement, and

a military stratagem, the Treaty of Waitangi, was thus devised in order to provide a costless means of ensuring that the Maori people would not try to obstruct the mass influx of settlers (p. 24)

ii) The denial of Maori economic adaptability

Waikato Maori people assiduously resisted attempts by the European settlers to gain land in the Waikato in the 1850s because they had already taken on those aspects of European technology and agricultural skills that had enabled them to compete with the European settlers. Indeed, trade in the North Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand in the 1850s was dominated by the Maori.

The decades before the wars of sovereignty (Orange, 1987) of the 1860s saw a growing prosperity in the Waikato. Some saw this as evidence of the success of the policy of amalgamation (Governor Grey, cited in Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974). Others now see it as evidence of the integrity and adaptability of Maori cultural institutions and practices (Temm, 1990; Ward, 1974). However, from a Maori perspective, these initiatives were a diverse series of responses by the various peoples of the Waikato to the opportunities offered by the new world order (Bishop, 1991a).

Sir Keith Sinclair (Sinclair, 1990) recently contended that New Zealand in the period leading up to the wars of the 1860s was one of the richest countries in the world (measured by per capita income). Turnbull and McLaren (1964) confirmed that during this period the Waikato (along with the Bay of Plenty, Taranaki and other similar areas) was one of the richest areas in this country. Consequently, during this time, the Waikato was one of the richest areas in the world. It is not hard to imagine the chagrin of the settlers, promised land by prior emigration publicity, seeing the vast stretches of the Waikato so near to Auckland, yet so unobtainable. What must have added the 'salt to the wound' was that the Maori, whom most of them despised, had taken European technology and were turning what had been, to the eyes of the settlers, wasteland, into the sort of productive enterprise that the settlers themselves wanted to develop.

Control over land, access to the new and growing markets in the cities of New Zealand and Australia, coupled with an entrepreneurial spirit and the willingness of the Maori people to adapt to the new circumstances in which they found themselves, created a situation that was intolerable to the settlers. So began one of the more shameful 'research' episodes in our history, which was orientated at 'quieting the natives'
and which eventually culminated in an accumulation of 'evidence' that 'proved' that Waikato Maori people were assembling south of Auckland with the intention of attacking the capital city of the new colony. That this was a thinly disguised 'scare' tactic, of dubious merit, used to provide an excuse to invade the land holdings of their competitors, was attested to by the Royal Commission on Confiscated Lands in 1928 (AJHR, 1928, G-7) into the Waikato invasion. The commission decidedly denounced the lack of evidence that this 'research' had been able to identify. However, such research was to be commonplace in the decades following the wars of the 1860s. Research that 'proved' the ideas that the researchers had commenced with in the first place.

Belich (1987) types the decades prior to the 'wars of sovereignty' as the time when Maori were dominant politically, socially and economically in New Zealand, yet this is a feature of our history that is often ignored. During this time, Europeans were still located in coastal enclaves, interacting with Maori, essentially in the nature of a 'symbiotic relationship' useful to both. The picture of European dominance that has become our school history has served the original ideology rather than the actual reality, not because the diversity is too complicated to understand, but because generalisations about the supposed inadequacies of Maori culture suited the need to support the mythology of New Zealand's race relations that was being developed and perpetuated during this period.

For example, one of New Zealand's myths has been that the wealth created in the 1850s was done so by the South Island pastoralists. Many of New Zealand's history writers (for example, Turnbull and McLaren, 1964) refer to the prosperity of this period coming from the energies of the pastoralists in the South Island. Indeed this is the theme of much of the history taught in New Zealand schools. The wealth produced by the Maori, who were until the 1860s the majority of the population, does not get as much attention. Thus is perpetuated the myth that Europeans were the entrepreneurial capitalists and that Maori were the traditional subsistence villagers. Also supported is the myth that the transformation of society to one type of social structure and therefore cultural response was/is necessary. Couple this with the myth of the 'fatal impact', the myth that Maori could not cope with cultural invasion, and this combination provides the basis and moral justification for the policy of assimilation that dominated education policy for over a century.

Some of the evidence of the prosperity of the Maori people is startling. Lady Martin (1884) recorded her journey through the Waikato in 1858:

Our path lay across a wide plain, and our eyes were gladdened on all sides by sights of peaceful industry. For miles we saw one great wheat field.... Carts were driven to and from the mill by their native owners (p. 116)
Austrian geologist Ferdinand von Hochstetter recorded similar observations. "We reached Rangiowahia ... extensive wheat, maize and potatoe-plantings surround the place" (in Temm, 1990). Temm (1990) also offers the figures collected by New Zealand's first Attorney-General Sir William Swainson in 1857 as evidence of the extent of Maori commerce:

They had upwards of 3000 acres of land in wheat, 3000 acres potatoes, nearly 2000 acres in maize and upwards of 1000 acres planted in kumaras. They owned nearly 100 horses, 200 head of cattle and 5000 pigs, four water mills and 96 ploughs. They were also the owners of 43 small coastal vessels, averaging 20 tons each and upwards of 900 canoes (p. 21)

This was a significant commerce, illustrative that Maori people were capable of commercial enterprise on a large scale, whilst still living in a Maori traditional society based on tribal divisions of whanau, hapu and iwi. The success of Maori adaptations proved the adaptability of Maori society in relation to economic enterprises, and the adaptability and resilience of their system of social organisation. What is significant about this is that Maori social organisation was flexible enough not only to support a traditional subsistence way of life, but also to support a modern capitalist way of life. This challenges the idea that capitalism needs an individualistic type of social organisation, and the settlers' insistence that Maori give up their traditional ways or the ways developed with the Missionaries in order to be able to benefit from the advantages of the modern economy was just not true. The fact is that Maori in the Waikato were responding in a variety of ways to the new opportunities, for example, Waata Kukutai, of Ngati Tipa, supported the missionary Robert Maunsell, Wiremu Tamihana of Ngati Haua, attempted to negotiate a place for his people in the law-making functions of the new colony, and the more conservative Rewi Maniapoto of Ngati Maniapoto wanted the Pakeha to leave. None of these new types of social organisation were of the sort that the settlers said were necessary. The settlers' advice to the Maori to individualise land ownership and to integrate with the settlers was an attempt to marginalise the Maori people and appropriate their assets. When the attempts at persuasion by the settlers failed, they had to resort to war.

The development of the new economy and trading relationships brought with it social changes, and these changes caused friction because of the development of independence from those institutions that had initially made Maori dependent upon the European. A visiting magistrate reported the following developments in the Raglan area:
Every recently arrived traveller, if he comes from any of the European settlements, is closely questioned as to the price of pork, wheat, flour and flax. The old persons may be seen in groups round the evening fire, chatting about the appearance of crops; the women busily employed in making baskets to carry grain and potatoes, or in plaiting leg ropes for driving their pigs to market. ... They have now dispensed with the formerly all-important European character, once to be seen in every village, the Native Trader. He has been for the last three or four years unknown among them, being unable to make a profit by his trading transactions. They have all obtained some knowledge of arithmetic, and delight in exhibiting their skill. Often is a slate presented to the traveller covered with long rows of figures - addition, subtraction, etc, and imposing-looking and correctly worked questions of 'Rule of Three'. They have now wise men among themselves to calculate the cubic contents of a heap of firewood, the area of a plot of land, so as to sow two bushels of wheat to the acre, the live weight of a pig, and the value at 3d. per pound, sinking one fifth as offal. They esteem themselves first-rate horse breakers, and I heard more than one lecturing on the mysteries of the turf to an admiring audience (GBPP 1779, 1854, p. 108-110)

As warfare declined, tribal mana began to be measured by prowess at the new pursuits. All other pursuits seem merged into habits of thrift; and the most engrossing subject that could be broached, is the relative merits of two mill sites, over- or under-shot wheels, and the best means of raising 200 or 300 pounds for the purpose of building a mill which could grind more than one erected by a rival tribe.

Such developments as these were to cause consternation in the hearts of the Settlers whose attitude toward the Maori was demeaning. These developments must have also warned the settlers that the Maori people were adaptive and powerful enough to do without them, so much so, that unless they suppressed the Maori, there would be no place for the settlers.

iii) The 'Deficit Theory'

The adaptability and flexibility of Maori culture was suppressed or ignored during the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries when education for Maori children was developed by the settler-controlled General Assembly. This education served to limit the ability of Maori people to compete with the commercial farming sector, the beneficiaries of which dominated the politics of our country (Simpson, 1984; Simon, 1990). The development of a limited curriculum, the subsequent suppression of Maori language and culture in educational institutions, and limitations on the avenues for higher education for Maori children effectively marginalised the mainly rurally
located Maori population from equal participation in the economic and political mainstream of our society.

Following World War II, Maori people moved to the cities in one of the most rapid urbanisations undergone by any people in the world. During this period, Maori children entered schools that were organised in cognisance of the developing New Zealand traditions of free, secular, and compulsory education. However, these altruistic values also embraced numerous covert values, attitudes and assumptions that further promoted the success for the children of the dominant group. These values (after Metge, 1976) of individual competition, individual achievement and self-discipline, where abstract analysis, compartmentalised thinking and the separation of religion from culture, promoted achievement based on mastery of abstract concepts, in the context of a notion of self-development and individual betterment. Such values stood in sharp contrast to the experiences of many Maori children who had been socialised into family, community and peer groups where group competition and co-operation were valued, where group achievement and peer solidarity were dominant, where the complementarity of abstract and concrete thought, physical and social achievements, and religion and culture was emphasised. Such socialisation emphasised the usefulness of the individual to the group rather than the other way round.

These tensions were exacerbated by the manner in which the values of the dominant group were expressed in schools' organisation, the behaviour of teachers, the choice of subjects, the curriculum within the subjects, the relative emphasis and resourcing allocated to particular areas of interest, and the stated and unstated agenda of priorities and goals (Metge, 1990b). As a result of the schools being organised monoculturally, Maori pupils often found that their cultural knowledge was unaccepted, their intentions and motivations misinterpreted, and their language and names mispronounced. Their resulting confusion was often manifested as frustration, inadequacy and failure, which in turn was confusing to well-meaning but poorly trained teachers. That schools were not organised in ways that suited the majority of Maori pupils was identified in the Hunn report (Hunn, 1950) which identified Maori statistical disadvantage in a number of indices, including education. Researchers began to identify why such situations existed.

Much educational research was inspired by the then currently fashionable approach in the United States which focussed on 'cultural deficiencies'. Research conducted in the early sixties by Lovegrove (1966) was of this type. He undertook a comprehensive study designed to investigate whether or not there were significant differences between Maori and European school children on tests of scholastic achievement and certain selected determiners, ie. intelligence, home background, attitude to school, speed of performance, and listening comprehension. He also sought to determine the relative importance of these variables in determining the scholastic
achievement of Maori and European children. As a result of his study, Lovegrove (1966) claimed to have shown that Maori and European children from almost comparable home backgrounds performed similarly on tests of scholastic achievement. From this he concluded that "it should be remembered that reasons for Maori retardation (in the education system) are more probably attributable to the generally deprived nature of the Maori home conditions than to inherent intellectual inferiority" (p. 31). In other words, the Maori child was able to compete with the European child "providing home conditions have some degree of similarity" (p. 33). As a result, Lovegrove (1966) suggested that there might be cultural 'retardants' creating the disparity. He identified in particular that the aspirations of the Maori rural home were perhaps discrete from the close relationship between the type of upbringing a child receives and his progress at school. However, he further suggested that because intellectual differences (as measured by intelligence tests) existed between the races, that even if the Maori homes were able to provide enough support for the child in the primary years, it would appear that the "environments they (Maori parents) provide are not conducive to the development of the complex intellectual processes assessed by tests of intelligence" (p. 34). For example, Lovegrove identified that the Maori child's home in comparison to the home of a European child is less visually and verbally complex as well as being less consciously organised to provide a variety of experiences which are essential to broaden children's intellectual understanding.

Maori children were therefore 'suffering a pathology' which manifested itself in inadequate language and intellectual development. Such pathologies were the result of a 'deficient cultural background'. The solutions for Maori children's underachievement were to be 'catch-up' programmes, remedial sessions and the like. In other words, an attempt was to be made to accelerate and emphasise the implementation of the previous policy of assimilation (now termed 'integration' by Hunn, 1960).

Attempts to critique the foundations of such ideas were made by other researchers (see Watson, 1967, 1972, cited in Metge, 1990b; Harker and St George, 1980) but the ideas of Maori being a 'deficient' culture became so entrenched in the 'common knowledge' of the dominant culture that these ideas of deficiency continued to be dominant in Education Department publications, school organisation and teachers' attitudes and behaviours for many decades (see Simon, 1984; Metge, 1990b).

However, the idea that it was Maori home conditions that was the prime contributor to academic underachievement was a major step forward in scholastic reasoning about Maori children. Prior to this, it was thought that Maori were intellectually (genetically) inferior, a belief rooted in the 'social Darwinism' and 'polygenesist racism' of the nineteenth century (Belich, 1987; Simon, 1990; Bishop, 1991a). Such a scenario in the 1960s at least gave hope that something could be done for the children, in the way of 'compensatory' programmes. However, this focus on
cultural differences instead of racial inferiority engendered some depressing conclusions about the state of Maori education over a decade later.

Harker (1979) identified that cultural differences and different value systems between the culture of those who developed the educational institution and those of cultural minorities will impact on the educational achievement of minority culture children. He suggested that such realisations will create pressure to either "attempt to restructure the value system of Maori children in order to bring it into line with the requirements for success in the school environment" (p. 49), or to "make adjustment to the school environment (such as curriculum reform) in order to provide greater continuity with the Maori value system" (p. 49), or some combination of these.

Harker concluded that the former solution had been tried without success for over a century, and the second was hopeless because no matter what the changes made to the criteria for success at school, "those groups with high cultural motivation to succeed will adapt and continue to succeed under the new criteria ... hence achievement differences cannot be ameliorated by changes to the educational system" (p. 49).

This may sound depressing, but what is more depressing is when Harker concludes that the problem may not be in the search for an answer to this dilemma of how to cater for ethnic diversity, but rather may be found in questioning the wisdom of insisting on equalising performance for all ethnic groups. Harker's (1979) conclusion is grim.

If New Zealanders are genuine about their society as a multi-cultural one, in which all cultures are accorded equal status, then perhaps we have to learn to live with some measure of achievement differences between ethnic groups (p. 50; emphasis added)

These conclusions clearly indicate what happens when a researcher stands outside of the people about whom he is talking. Few would make such a statement about their own children? Small wonder Maori people question who is speaking, and with what authority.

Summary

There has developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand an epistemology of knowledge generation and definition based on one world view imported into Aotearoa/New Zealand from Europe. A major effect of the dominance of this discourse has been that Maori stories have been reinterpreted to meet the needs of the national schooling curriculum, with the consequent sidelining of Maori explanations and knowledge codes. A further effect is that Maori cultural aspirations have been marginalised and Maori knowledge and pedagogic processes undervalued and belittled in order to promote those
introduced by the colonisers. Further, a neo-colonial discourse has developed within education that seeks to explain in pathological terms the current educational crisis facing Maori people.

These outcomes are an inevitable result of the dominance of European interests and concerns, and control over the structure of the schooling enterprise in Aotearoa/New Zealand which for some generations removed Maori from developing a widely-heard ontological base from which they might challenge the ideology of cultural superiority that initiated the dominance. Such dominance of an ideology of cultural superiority promoted and validated the development of research methodologies which determined that the interests, agendas, and methods would remain firmly in the control of the researchers, to whom the primary benefits of such research would accrue.

The challenge to the dominance of Western orientated discourse has been taken up by numerous revisionist historians (Ward, 1974; Owens, 1981; Orange, 1987; Belich, 1987). Similarly, concern has been voiced over the past century about the 'capture' of the Maori past by others, even to the extent of challenging who has the right to write as an indigene (Fee, 1989). This challenge can be understood when researchers still perceive Maori as a group that is studied 'out there' or 'back then'. Such researchers have focussed on Maori people as they lived in former times, and seem unaware of Maori people as a dynamic contemporary culture within Aotearoa/New Zealand.

However, the most dramatic growth has been in the number of Maori people who along with other indigenous and 'ethnic' peoples (see, for example, Smith, 1992; Stewart and Williams, 1992; Te Henepe, 1993; Williams, White and Stewart, 1993; Ardler et al, 1993; The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Rights in Education, 1993; Stanfield, 1994) have become increasingly concerned about the omission of a Maori 'voice' from the history of our country. No depiction of the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand can be complete when perspectives, experiences and narratives of so many are missing, distorted or subordinated to the dominant discourse. It is important to stress that while Aotearoa/New Zealand is no longer a colony, the discourse of colonialism is still dominant. Post-colonial discourses, while purportedly located as indigenous critiques of centre dominated politics (Adam and Tiffin, 1990), can be subject to 'capture' in order to further legitimate dominant views of what is of interest and of concern to indigenous people. For example, the 'mission' of emancipation orientated research and the contemporary preoccupation of many researchers with revisiting their concept of the 'subject' with notions of 'otherness'. To indigenous peoples such discourses are neo-colonial, not post-colonial. The problems of colonialism continue in Aotearoa/New Zealand embedded in the systemic order and within the deeper psychological processes of the people of Aotearoa/New Zealand today.

As Linda Smith (1992) states:
It has become a problem of the mind and of social consciousness which is still being disordered by the wider influences of former colonial masters, of metropolitan discourse and of the western academic tradition which continues to define what counts as an emancipatory project (p. iii)

Conclusion

The concerns that Maori people express about research into their lives can be summarised as focussing on the locus of power and control over such issues as initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability.

Initiation. The concern about initiation is defined as how the research process begins, and specifically whose concerns, interests and methods of approach determine/define the outcomes. Maori people are concerned about this crucial aspect because Kaupapa Pakeha research has developed methods of initiating research and accessing research participants that are located within the cultural concerns, preferences and practices of the Western world.

Benefits. The question of benefits concerns who will directly gain from the research, and will anyone actually be disadvantaged. Maori people are increasingly becoming concerned about this important political aspect. This is because Kaupapa Pakeha research has established an approach to research where the benefits of the research serve to advance the interests, concerns and methods of the researcher, and locates the benefits of the research at least in part with the researcher, other benefits being of lesser concern.

Representation. Whose research constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality? Kaupapa Pakeha research has misrepresented, that is simplified/conglomerated and commodified Maori knowledge for 'consumption' by the colonisers and denied the authenticity of Maori experiences and voice. Such research has displace Maori lived experiences with the 'authoritative' voice of the 'expert', voiced in terms defined/determined by the 'expert'. Further, many misconstrued Maori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Maori and non-Maori alike.

Legitimacy. This issue concerns what authority we claim for our texts. Kaupapa Pakeha research has undervalued and belittled Maori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonisers and adherents of neo-colonial paradigms. Kaupapa Pakeha research has developed a social pathology research approach that has focused on the 'inability' of Maori culture to cope with human problems, and proposed that Maori culture was inferior to that of the colonisers in human terms. Such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power sharing processes, and the legitimation of diversity of cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.
Accountability. This concern questions who are researchers answerable to? Who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, text constructions and distribution of newly defined knowledge? Kaupapa Pakeha research has claimed that all people have an inalienable right to utilise all knowledge and maintained that research findings be expressed in terms of criteria located within the epistemological framework of Kaupapa Pakeha research, thus creating locales of accountability that are situated within Western cultural frameworks.

All of these issues are also of great concern to post-modern and post-structural scholars. This thesis does not attempt to position the various Western-located paradigms in relation to each other, for that is a major task in itself. This thesis will, however, attempt to bring the voice of some of these positions into debate with each other, but more critically with Maori interests, concerns and positions. These concerns about the locus of power and control over the conduct of research form the framework of this thesis. These concerns form the basis of the interview guide used in this thesis and they are addressed in detail throughout the following chapters.

1 For example researchers who work within positivist paradigms have established criteria for evaluation of research texts in terms of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity.

2 Epistemological in the sense that claims to validity/legitimacy are located within a set of rules that constitutes the particular world view. This thesis aims to challenge the dominance and hegemonic insistence that positivist and post-positivist stances contain the only sets of rules for assessing validity/legitimacy of other people's experiences and meanings. This thesis will attempt to identify an alternative 'set of rules' that will provide an epistemological base for an alternative and culturally valid means of legitimating experiences.

3 I never cease to be amazed at the rapidity with which Maori people seize any opportunity to initiate and participate in research that will address issues and problems that are of concern to them. Similarly I never cease to be amazed at non-Maori colleagues who ask me what I mean by Maori research interests and how do these differ from Pakeha interests and concerns. There is an incredulity in their voices when they question as to whether Maori people actually do have different research questions.

4 This refers to a commonly-told Maori story about how a myth hero, Maui, sought knowledge and received it in a series of kete (kits or baskets) of related knowledge. Linda Smith refers to the exercise of gathering these kits as the first Maori research project.
bell hooks (1990, cited in Fine, 1994) says that she is waiting for them to stop talking about the 'Other'. She demands that social science remove the concerns about otherness because it is still another form of talking for someone else. A similar thought has been addressed in New Zealand by Sarah Williams who is currently undertaking an anthropology of Anthropologists. She observed that numerous New Zealand Anthropologists were "bailing out" of studying Maori culture, yet this has been of traditional interest. I suggested that perhaps there was another question, "Did they jump, or were they pushed?"
Chapter 2: Kaupapa Maori research

The oppressed and the exploited of the earth maintain their defiance; liberty from theft. But the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves (NGUGI, 1986, p. 3.)

Introduction

In Bishop (1992a) it is suggested that a developing New Zealand ontological base (Awatere, 1981; Irwin, 1989; Walker, 1990; Smith, 1990; 1992b; Smith, 1991) has engendered a pro-active, political discourse rooted in a Maori world-view. This approach is termed Kaupapa Maori. Kaupapa Maori emerged from within the wider ethnic revitalisation movement (after Banks 1988) that grew in New Zealand following the rapid Maori urbanisation of the post-World War II period. This movement blossomed in the 1970s and 1980s with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Maori communities (Awatere, 1981; Walker, 1989). More recently, this consciousness has featured the revitalisation of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony^1^ of the dominant discourse. Education has become a major focus and area of hope for adherents of a Kaupapa Maori approach.

Research into Maori people's lives forms a crucial concern of this approach. Kaupapa Maori is challenging the dominance of individualistic, Kaupapa Pakeha research which primarily, at least in its present form, benefits the researcher and their kaupapa. In contrast, Kaupapa Maori research is collectivistic, and is orientated toward benefitting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas. Kaupapa Maori research is based on a growing consensus that research involving Maori knowledge and people needs to be conducted in culturally appropriate ways (e.g. Curtis, 1983; Stokes, 1985, 1987; Smith, 1990; Smith, 1991; Bishop and Glynn, 1992a; Bishop, 1994a), ways that "fit Maori cultural preferences, practices and aspirations" (Smith, 1992a, p. 7) in order to "develop and acknowledge existing culturally appropriate approaches in the method, practice and organisation of research" (Smith, 1992a, p. 9). For example, the research process should also be shared with the Maori community throughout, and eventually the research findings should be shared in a way
that is culturally appropriate (Bishop and Glynn, 1992a). This approach emphasises the importance of devolving "power and control in the research exercise" (Smith, 1992a, p. 7) in order to promote self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga) of Maori people. The approach further challenges researchers to develop "cultural competence" (Stokes, 1987; Bishop and Glynn, 1992a; Banks, 1988) in order that researchers position themselves within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori. As a result, there is a need to "develop theory which evolves out of and connects with our New Zealand context" (Smith, 1992a, p. 9).

This chapter addresses four constituent features of Kaupapa Maori research:

1) What is Kaupapa Maori and how might it realise 'Maori cultural preferences, practices and aspirations' in education and in research?

2) How does Kaupapa Maori address and promote the practice of 'self-determination' through 'power sharing'?

3) How is 'cultural competency' addressed by the 'positioning of the researcher within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori'?

4) What might constitute a process of theory generation from a New Zealand context? How are explanations generated within Kaupapa Maori research?

1) What is Kaupapa Maori research? How is Kaupapa Maori realised in education and in research, and how might it represent Maori cultural preferences, practices and aspirations?

A proactive Kaupapa Maori trend developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand during the latter part of the 1980s and the early part of the 1990s. This kaupapa responded to the dual challenge of imminent language death and consequent cultural demise, together with the failure of a succession of government policy initiatives such as assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism to sustain Maori cultural and language aspirations (Jones et al, 1990). This development occurred among Maori groups such as Te Kohanga Reo, NZ Maori Council, The Maori Congress, Maori Health and Welfare bodies, and Iwi Authorities. For Maori, the specific intention was to achieve "increased autonomy over their own lives and cultural welfare" (Smith, 1992b, p. 12). In education, this call for autonomy was in response to the lack of programmes and processes within existing educational institutions that were designed to "reinforce, support or pro-actively co-opt Maori cultural aspirations in ways which are desired by Maori themselves" (p. 12). Smith (1992b) suggests that the wish for autonomy also challenged the "increasing abdication by the State of its 1840 contractual obligation to protect Maori cultural interests" (p. 10). This abdication is seen in such practices as devolution (for example the Tomorrow's Schools [after Picot, 1988] proposals for devolution of responsibility to schools) without consequent careful consideration of the
protection necessary for minority groups, and without concern for the diminution of equity provisions and principles (Smith, 1992b, p. 14).

The desire for autonomy is the result of ongoing Maori analyses, understandings and concerns about the reality of inequality that Maori people are positioned within as a result of the discourse of race and culture that has shaped New Zealand. Maori people understand how these discursive practices have maintained unequal power and unequal economic distribution within our society. Their demand for autonomy in this context is generally articulated as tino Rangatiratanga (literally chiefly control, metaphorically meaning Maori self-determination). This call is often misunderstood by non-Maori people. It is not a call for separatism, nor is it a call for non-Maori people to stand back and leave Maori alone. It is a call for those involved in Aotearoa/New Zealand to reposition themselves in relation to these emerging aspirations of Maori people for an autonomous voice.

Kaupapa Maori is a discourse that has emerged and is legitimated from within the Maori Community. Smith (1992b) describes Kaupapa Maori as "the philosophy and practice of 'being and acting Maori'" (p. 1). It assumes the taken-for-granted social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Maori people, in that it is a position where "Maori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right" (p. 13). Further, Kaupapa Maori presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within our society. These include rejection of hegemonic belittling, 'Maori can't cope' stances, together with a commitment to the power of conscientisation and politicisation through struggle for wider community and social freedoms (Smith, 1992a).

Kaupapa Maori addresses what French post-structuralist Michel Foucault terms "the productive function of power-knowledge" which is to "regulate populations by describing, defining and delivering the forms of normality and educability" (Foucault, 1980, in Olssen, 1993, p. 5). To Foucault, it has been the modernist mission of the human sciences, with their beliefs in truth, objectivity, linearity and inevitable progress, which have constituted normality of some and marginalisation for others. Marginalisation has been the result of the pursuit of definitions and experiences of unity and generality through the production of 'grand narratives', whether they be of normalisation, interpretative potentialities or oppressions. Kaupapa Maori can be seen as the deconstruction of those hegemonies which have disempowered Maori from controlling and defining (researching) their own knowledge within the context of unequal power relations in New Zealand (Bishop, 1991a).

Irwin (1992b) argues that prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and colonisation of New Zealand there existed a "complex, vibrant Maori education system" which had "Maori development [as] its vision, its educational processes and its measurable outcomes" (p. 9). Protection of this education system was guaranteed under
Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi, just as Article Three guaranteed Maori people, as citizens of New Zealand, the right to equitable educational outcomes. Yet this promise had been negated by subsequent practice. The outcome is the present educational crisis (Jones, et al, 1990; Davies and Nicholl, 1993). The post-Treaty education system which developed in New Zealand, the mission schools (Bishop, 1991a), the Native schools (Simon 1990) and the present mainstream schools (Irwin, 1992b) have been unable to "successfully validate matauranga Maori, leaving it marginalised and in a precarious state" (Irwin, 1992b, p. 10). Further, while mainstream schooling does not serve Maori people well (Davies and Nicholl, 1993), the Maori schooling initiatives of Te Kohanga reo (Maori medium pre-schools), Kura Kaupapa Maori (Maori medium primary schools), Whare Kura (Maori medium secondary schools) and Whare Waananga (Maori tertiary institutions) "which have developed from within Maori communities to intervene in Maori language, cultural, educational, social and economic crises ... are successful in the eyes of the Maori people" (Smith, 1992b, p. 1; italics added).

Despite the attempts of authors like Openshaw, Lee and Lee (1993) to belittle the attempts to identify what constitutes traditional Maori education, Irwin (1992b) insists that the Maori education system was legitimate in the eyes of Maori people before the Treaty of Waitangi. Maori education was implicitly acknowledged in the Treaty of Waitangi, but was deliberately marginalised by the practices of the missionaries (Bishop, 1991a) and, in the present day, by the secular controllers of education (Simon, 1990). Kaupapa Maori education is now legitimated in the eyes of Maori people within Maori-controlled educational contexts (Smith, 1992b).

Similarly, in terms of social science research on education, Maori means of accessing, defining and protecting knowledge existed before European arrival. Such Maori cultural processes were protected by the Treaty of Waitangi, subsequently marginalised, but are today legitimated within Maori cultural discursive practice. Kaupapa Maori research practice is, as Maori educationalist Kathie Irwin (1992b) explains, epistemologically based within Maori cultural specificities, preferences and practices and are as Olssen (1993) suggests "epistemologically productive where ... in constructing a vision of the world and positioning people in relation to its classifications, it takes the shape from its interrelations with an infinitely proliferating series of elements within a particular social field" (p. 4).

**Attacks on legitimacy**

The Kaupapa Maori position regarding legitimation is based on the notion that the world constitutes multiple differences, and that there are different cultural systems that legitimately make sense of and interact meaningfully with the world. Kaupapa Maori research, based in a different world-view from that of the dominant discourse,
makes this political statement while also acknowledging the need to recognise and address the ongoing effects of racism and colonialism in the wider society.

Such a position is constantly under attack within Aotearoa/New Zealand from a wide front; from conservative voices who deny Maori culture any legitimacy to liberal notions of integrating what is best of both worlds in order to create a rosy future for all New Zealanders, to the radical voices who claim that they have the formula for emancipation of Maori as oppressed and marginalised people. These positions have in common the notion that 'insiders' are incapable of an appropriate critical distance from which to understand their experiences, because they are incapable of sufficient 'detachment'. The conservatives desire to establish and maintain control of the criteria for evaluating Maori experience, hence we get a deluge of statistics telling us of the appalling socio-economic condition of Maori people. The liberals, once dominant in education circles, capture Maori cultural elements, often out of context and add these to existing academic curriculum such as Taha Maori programmes in schools. The radicals argue that Maori cultural practices do not conform to their perspectives of how emancipatory projects should develop.

For example, emancipationists working from a gender perspective, often identify what to them are patriarchal practices on marae. Gender-orientated emancipationists critique the common Maori cultural practices that allocate to men the task of whaikorero. However, such identification is challenged by Awatere (1981) and Irwin, (1989). Irwin challenges Pakeha modernist gender analysis by questioning whether they understand the complementarities of roles in a total powhiri (ceremonial welcome) function and also asks what actually constitutes 'speaking' on a marae. Is delivering a karanga not speaking? They conclude that it is Maori people who have the right to determine the answers to these questions, not outsiders. A second common patronising approach is that Maori people are an 'oppressed minority' who 'suffer' from the malady of 'false consciousness' where "people's self-understanding of what they are doing is illusory or deceptive" (Carr and Kemmis, 1986. p. 96). Critical theorists Carr and Kemmis (1986) provide a striking example of this attack on the ability of a culture's participants to make sense of the world, and on a culture's means of solving problems in ways legitimated within and understood by participants of that culture. Carr and Kemmis (1986) claim that the manner in which "others" understand their actions and experiences often hides the true nature of their situation. Certain social mechanisms operate to create distorted views of the social reality, and it is only the emancipationist theorists who actually understand what is happening to other people because they understand these hidden mechanisms. Carr and Kemmis (1986) explain that
... clearly the ways in which people characterise their actions may be at variance with what they are really doing so that their understandings and explanations may be no more than rationalisations that obscure the true nature of their situation and mask reality in some important way ... how certain social mechanisms operate to bind people to irrational and distorted ideas about their social reality. They (that is theoretical accounts) may also try to reveal, at the social-structural level, the ideological character of group life by showing how social processes such as language and the processes of cultural production and reproduction shape our experiences of the social world in specific ways and for specific purposes.

These kinds of explanations not only deny the validity of the individual's own explanation of what he [sic] is doing. They also offer alternative explanations which, were they made intelligible and acceptable to the individuals concerned would prevent them from acting in the ways that they do (p. 96)

In other words, an emancipationist stance provides answers for the problems faced by the 'oppressed' people. However, these explanations arise outside of the people's understandings, and in terms dictated by the researcher. Indeed, far from 'suffering from false consciousness' colonialist's attempts to remove from Maori the opportunity to engage in Maori sense-making processes in education (Walker, 1990; Smith, 1990; Simon, 1990; Bishop 1991a) Justice (Jackson, 1989) Health (Rolleston, 1989; Durie, 1994), Welfare (Ministerial Advisory Committee. 1986) and Research (Smith, 1991; Bishop, 1994a) has been constantly and successfully resisted.

Intellectual arrogance has no place in research predicated upon the notion that Maori culture has its own systems of adequately depicting social reality in terms understandable and judged to be legitimate by its participants through traditionally based cultural practices. Such an approach to representation and legitimation is fundamental to the emerging successfulness of the Kaupapa Maori education initiatives, and constitutes the fundamental base of a Kaupapa Maori research approach.

Further attacks on the validity of Maori culture and knowledge, are continually made by 'New Right' advocates (for example, the Sexton report, 1991) in the process of promoting, in contrast to Maori co-operative collectivism, their own cultural view of the "primacy of the individual, the emphasis on meritocracy and the fundamental need for competition" (Smith 1992b, p. 4). At the same time, 'New Right' advocates maintain that their stance is non-ideological, nor is it based in terms of cultural, but rather in 'normal, modern' practices. That both of these stances are indeed ideological and hegemonic simply further begs the question of who has the authority and legitimacy to engage in constructions of, and definitions of 'reality.' As feminist methodologist Patti
Lather (1991) explains, this is a problem being addressed on an international front where "post-modernisms are responses across the disciplines to the contemporary crisis of representation, (that is) the profound uncertainty about what constitutes an adequate depiction of social 'reality'" (p. 21). Lather (1991) further explains that this whole argument, philosophically speaking, is located in the broad area known as 'post-modern', the essence of which

is that the dualisms which continue to dominate Western thought are inadequate for understanding a world of multiple causes and effects interacting in complex and non-linear ways, all of which are rooted in limitless array of historical and cultural specificities (p. 21)

**Examples of Kaupapa Maori research**

Not many examples of Kaupapa Maori research are yet available, although there are a number of successful projects emerging in this area. Irwin (1992b), in her examination of how first year Maori secondary school teachers are socialised into the teaching profession, identifies Kaupapa Maori as the epistemological base of her research, in that

…the development of all the normal features of research design and the research process, viz, negotiating entry to the field, designing and confirming the research questions, methods of data collection and analysis, designing and confirming the research timetable, developing a writing style which will communicate effectively to the diverse audience for which the final report will be prepared, have been informed by Kaupapa Maori (p. 6.)

Other examples of Kaupapa Maori research include Carkeek, Irwin and Davies, (1992), Johnston (1992), McCudden, Mohi and Glynn (1992), along with the seminal work of Smith (1991) and Smith (1992b) which defined the field. Five further Kaupapa Maori studies form the substantive content of this present thesis.

**2) Promotion of self-determination. How does Kaupapa Maori address and promote the practice of 'self-determination' through 'power sharing'?**

Kaupapa Maori research challenges prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority (Walker, 1990) which pervades our social, economic, political and educational institutions. A Kaupapa Maori approach asserts that two peoples created this nation of Aotearoa/New Zealand when Lieutenant-Governor Hobson, as a representative of the British Crown, and the chiefs of New Zealand, on behalf of their people and their descendants, signed the Treaty at Waitangi on the 6th of February, 1840. The Treaty is
seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision-making processes of this country, and for Maori self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga) of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand (Walker, 1990).

One response to these challenges has been in a major report commissioned by the Ministry of Education (Hirsch, 1990). Former Race Relations Conciliator Walter Hirsch recommended a number of changes within mainstream educational institutions to improve the achievement of Maori students in order to promote social justice and racial harmony. The central theme of these recommendations was empowerment of Maori people, a "shedding of the cloak of dependency" (p. 29).

Hirsch suggested that:

Empowerment of Maori people is really the issue underlying all the others—bilingual education, the quality of teachers, the nature of schools, curriculum and resource development, the assessment of students and parent education (p. 9)

To Hirsch (1990), empowerment means Maori people having more control over decision-making at the school level and at the planning level, and control over designing curriculum and resources and managing research, so that what is being done is not for Maori by Pakeha but by Maori for themselves. In the context of research, empowerment means that Maori people should regain control of investigations into their own lives. For example, Maori educationalist Monty Ohia (1989) suggests that:

It is time for researchers to be pro-active and discover that the democratic system of this country needs to uplift the Maori population from the quagmire of economic deprivation, social degradation and political misrepresentation by handing over the decision making on Maori people to Maori people (p. 10)

However, Hirsch (1990) misunderstands the strength of the growing voice of Maori people when he quotes one leader in Maori education as saying "I don't mind who studies a topic like this providing it leads to changes for the betterment of our people" (p.5), and implies that this is a typical authentic voice. Hirsch and the Ministry may need reminding that there are a significant and growing number of Maori educators who do not agree with this idea, and who would say that Maori research should be done by Maori people only. The prohibition by the National Trust of Kohanga Reo on research by non-Maori people in Kohanga Reo illustrates this strong resistance.

Therefore researchers need to be cognisant of the wishes of these groups and approach their research in full awareness of the reasons behind the growing Maori
resistance to non-Maori imposition. Ohia's (1989) position is that the place for Maori is as the initiators of the research process, and he implies that the position of non-Maori regarding the research enterprise needs re-evaluation from their traditional position as the initiators, controllers and interpreters of research.

The distance between Hirsch's position and Ohia's may rest with the problematic concept of 'empowerment' which somehow supposes that someone is 'giving' or 'enabling' power to be gained. The Kaupapa Maori position of tino Rangatiratanga is unequivocal. It means that power and control must rest within Maori cultural practices. Non-Maori must position themselves in reference to this discourse. Ohia (1989) suggests:

Research which will present the Maori people with the advantages needed to address the inequalities needs to be led by Maori people. This does not stop anyone else from taking part. However it does signal the fact that Maori people are the appropriate people to establish research programmes which are needed to assist Maori people to attain their true status in this country (p. 9)

The position of non-Maori researchers and self-determination

Hence it is necessary to consider the position of non-Maori researchers in relation to the discourse of self-determination. Non-Maori people should be involved in Maori research for two reasons.

The first reason is that there is a cohort of highly-skilled, professionally-trained non-Maori who are becoming bicultural and are willing to work within Maori-controlled contexts. Some outstanding examples include Richard Benton and his language surveys from the 1970s through to the 1990s, Nina Benton and her work in Kohanga Reo, Alex Firestone and his mathematics training for Kura Kaupapa Maori teacher trainees, Jim Ritchie's work with Tainui and Ted Glynn's work in reading tutor training with the Tairora,Tauawhi procedures. These researchers are dedicated to the betterment of Maori people and presented their work as koha for Maori people to pick up as they saw fit.

The second reason why non-Maori should be involved in this area of research is simply that for Pakeha researchers to leave it all to Maori people is to abrogate their responsibilities as Treaty partners. Walker (1990) promoted this stance by stating that the Maori as a minority of 12% of the population of three million, cannot achieve justice or resolve their grievances without Pakeha support. For this reason, Pakeha are as much a part of the process of social transformation in the post-colonial era as radical and activist Maori (p. 234)
The pursuit of social justice is a task that all New Zealanders must be engaged in. The temptation to interpret tino Rangatiratanga as simply leaving solutions to the problems of inequitable educational outcomes to Maori people themselves, now that Maori educational initiatives are gaining ground, is to ignore the reality of the post-colonial reconstruction. To remove a people's resource base over a period of a century and a half, to deny them access to the skills necessary in the modern industrial society in which we all now live, and then to expect them to solve problems which have become systemic is to further past injustices, not to empower the people. Empowerment means decision making from a position of shared strength and wealth, not from a position of either being cast adrift, without provisions, to fend for oneself, or of relinquishing one's language and culture in order to participate in the mainstream.

Clearly the main task for non-Maori and Maori researchers alike is to question the position they assume within the discourse of relative autonomy, of self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga). Researchers need to question methodologies that blame the Maori people for their very marginalisation and to seek methodologies that enable realisation of self-determination and power sharing. In this light an important challenge was issued over fifteen years ago by Walker (1979), who suggested that it is an axiom of Social Science that social phenomena have multiple causes, and if these causes are to be found the whole field needs to be examined, in other words it is time that researchers examined Pakeha society itself (p.91)

3) Cultural competency. How cultural competency is addressed by the positioning of the researcher within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori

In addressing the operationalisation of a Kaupapa Maori approach in terms of cultural preferences and practices of Maori people, Smith (1991), suggests that representation and definition of reality need to be jointly constituted by both the researchers and the researched. She cautions that theoretical discussions about 'emancipatory', post structuralists' or 'praxis orientated' research cannot begin to have meaning unless it can be shown to be real. This requires actual research to be done, methodologies to be tested, and results to be disseminated and to be openly discussed by both the research community and the researched community (p. 54)

Such a project is difficult in a positivist research framework because this framework is predicated on the necessity of 'promoting and maintaining distance' between the researchers and the researched community, in order to maintain objectivity.
However, research conducted within post-positivist frameworks attempts to reduce the distance between the researcher and the researched. Lather (1991), Fonow and Cook (1991) and Troyna (1992) suggest that distance between the researcher and the researched is a crucial indicator of empowerment. The implication in this stance is that the greater the distance between the researcher and the researched, the greater the degree of 'disempowerment' and the less likely it is that the researched people will be able to participate in sense making constructions. This has implications for how researchers might position themselves within research practice in bicultural and Maori contexts.

Bishop and Glynn (1992a) suggested that irrespective of the particular research strategies, and these can vary from tiaki (caring) to whangai (adoptee) to power-sharing (Smith, 1992a), researchers committed to a Maori kaupapa need to see their role as emancipatory (empowering), and therefore to be positioned within a post-positivist frame of reference. Carr and Kemmis (1986) suggested that emancipatory research implies establishing systems of power-sharing within the research process. Power sharing should encompass the choice of the research questions, the research paradigms, the design and methodology of the research, and even of the conduct of the control over the whole project and ownership of data, in order to address the potential for imposition of the researcher's agenda in unequal power situations.

We considered that essential to the process of power sharing within a bicultural context was the need for researchers in this field to work toward "cross-cultural competency" (after Banks, 1988, p. 37). It was suggested that cross-cultural competency in educational research in Aotearoa requires researchers to develop skills and to participate in experiences that will enable them to communicate effectively and to interact positively and comfortably within Maori and Pakeha cultures.

As Stokes (1987) states:

Ideally, the researcher needs to be a bicultural person, able to weigh up sometimes complex cross-cultural situations and perceive very clearly his or her own role, obligations, liabilities and responsibilities (p. 11)

and also:

A researcher who is not only comfortable in both cultures, but who can also stand back and put both sets of cultural values (and the real and potential conflicts) in perspective, will come closest to evaluating Maori research needs (p. 10)
However, while 'cross-cultural competency' may be a necessary condition for empowering research, it may not be sufficient to ensure empowerment of the research participants. 'Belittling' research has been done by researchers who were indeed cross-culturally competent (for example, the early 20th century historians/ethnologists, Elsdon Best and Percy Smith). There is also a danger that cross-cultural competency may involve only the researcher's ability to communicate biculturally at a social level, that is, understanding the values and norms of the other culture. The researcher may not necessarily have competence and experience at the level of power sharing in the decision making processes and therefore will not be able to address the impositional tendency of research conducted within contexts of unequal power relations.

This concern for cultural competency is not just directed at non-Maori. Maori educational researchers also need to work within the discursive practice that addresses researcher imposition and promotes Maori cultural contexts as appropriate contexts for research. In her study of the socialisation of first-year Maori teachers, Irwin (1992b) describes how a Maori researcher from one iwi had to approach Maori people of another iwi. The use of the traditional Maori institution of the hui for initiation of the research project involved extensive negotiation procedures in order to mediate between the tapu of the iwi and the people involved (Salmond, 1975, 1983; Shirres, 1982, 1986; Durning, 1987).

The crucial concern of a Kaupapa Maori discourse is to promote self-determination for Maori people in a manner that addresses the tendencies of research practices to impose the concerns, interests and practices of the researcher on the research participants. The Kaupapa Maori position is that Maori cultural practices ensure that Maori aspirations will be met, simply because Maori cultural practices grow out of these aspirations. Researcher participation within these practices will facilitate agency by the research participants, that is self-determination within a Maori discursive practice. Researchers need to position themselves in relation to this desire for self-determination.

The position of the researcher

Noddings (1986) considers that for empowering relationships to develop, consideration needs to be given of how we position ourselves in relation to the persons with whom we work, collaborate, practice and model behaviour in our relationships with others. That is, the researcher's position can expand or restrict the range of positions that can be taken by other research participants. Conversely, the position taken by a cultural group can expand or limit the range of positions open to a researcher. For example, the position taken by a minority cultural group may render a researcher totally irrelevant. Similarly, the position of the researcher may render the experiences of potential research participants totally irrelevant. They may develop the problem that
Metge and Kinloch (1978) identified as 'talking past each other.' The concept of positioning within discursive practice, replaces the more familiar concept of roles and is used to 'capture the fluid nature of social reality' where

in conversation ... we draw on different discourses, each with their own assumptions, explanatory frameworks and particular relevancies ... and as we do so, the ground shifts, our positions as speaker shifts and the position of hearer might shift as well (Davies, 1990, p. 361)

For instance, we may at one time choose to position ourselves as 'one who is worth listening to' yet to the listener we may be of marginal value. To position ourselves as an evangelical emancipationist in relation to listeners positioned within a Kaupapa Maori philosophy may engender a dismissive response. Similarly, to offer emancipation from a position of power may render the listeners powerless rather than empower them. The way that I address the various discourses available to me will position my hearers along a continuum from those who share my world-view to those who are judged 'lacking' within such a discourse. The central concern here for researchers is that we construct reality as much as we deconstruct the reality of/for others. Awareness of our positioning in this relationship and awareness of our objectives is crucial. In this sense, then, empowerment is not a matter of what we do for others, but more importantly what we do to ourselves. For example, if we construe the reality of others as 'false', then we are choosing to occupy a power position that renders the other powerless to refute our accusation of 'false consciousness.' If we construe the reality of others as 'valid', as 'real', as 'relative', then it is we who change in such a way that we can understand and work with others in ways determined by their cultural context.

Another example is the classic argument between proponents of "social and cultural reproduction" (after Bourdieu, 1977, and Bernstein, 1977) and the 'resistance' theorists (after Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985) which focusses on the role and degree of human agency in and available for promoting systemic change. This argument focusses on the tension between those who promote analyses of social structures, (for it is critiqued that this stance may reduce individuals to passive bearers of roles, norms, discourses and ideologies), and those who promote analyses of purely cultural accounts, (for it is claimed that this may exaggerate the power of individual social actors to construct meanings of their existence). It is further claimed that this latter approach under-emphasises the power relations within the wider society and the limitations that this places upon personal choice. However, the complex nature of power and control issues within society, suggests that rather than engaging in a binary dialectic that focusses on contradictions, struggles and tensions (as in Bishop, 1991a), it may be more useful to concentrate on the interaction of social structure/context/institutions and the
individual's agency (Bishop, 1994b) in relation to the discursive practice created by specific cultural contexts. Otherwise, construction of meaning remains dominated by the concerns of researchers operating within a discourse (in this case a binary dialectical process) of their own construction.

This has implications for what it might mean for researchers to operate so that research participants might be seen as agentic, rather than as manipulated objects who can be controlled through the practices and structures of the researcher’s institutions and through the discursive and textual practices which the researcher makes available to them. At a systemic level, agentic discourse (as in Ward, 1974; Owens, 1981; Howe, 1984; Walker, 1990) deconstructs the hegemony of dismissive discursive practices, practices that render it unthinkable for Maori culture to be problem solving on the same level as Tauwi culture (non-Maori). At an individual level (Davies, 1990) identifies agency as something that one has separate from the collective. However, there is a strong cultural implication in Kaupapa Maori practice that agency comes from collective participation. There are individual positions and responsibilities, but they are not holistic in themselves. They are holistic only as part of the discourses used by the collective when addressing the issues of power and control.

Positioning is crucial to operationalising agentic behaviour by research participants. Agency in this sense means the power to define and protect what is precious to a people and the power to determine one’s own destiny. Davies (1990) rejects the agonistic definition of agency. Davies (1990), using Walkerdine and Lucey's (1989) words, suggests that to assume a person has agency by definition of their being a person, is in "fact a middle-class liberal, humanist sham" (p. 341). She goes on to suggest a definition which identifies how "agency may be discursively constructed as a positioning made available to some but not to others" (p341). Such a definition is rooted in an approach to language which suggests that in learning to use the discursive practices available within the social world, each person gains access to what it means to be a person within the complex range of discourses available to them. Indeed, a "person is a person by virtue of the fact that they use the discursive practices of the collectives of which they are a member ... each person can only speak from the positions made available within those collectives through the recognised discursive practices used by each collective" (Davies, 1990, p. 343). Further, each person brings to any episode of "collaborative constitution of the world ... their accumulated personal history" (Davies, 1990, p. 343). This includes not only how they are positioned now but in what ways they might be positioned in the future. Therefore, their 'accumulated personal history' needs to include an ability to participate in the appropriate discourse.

Operationalisation of these considerations forms a major focus of this thesis. It is a fundamental belief of a Kaupapa Maori approach that access to discursive practices which empower individuals to position themselves as agentic is facilitated by the group
dynamics of Maori cultural practices. Such cultural practices as hui and whaka-whanaungatanga (establishing relationships) facilitate access to the means "by which goals they have chosen can be brought about", access to interactive others who will take as legitimate their positioning themselves as agentic, and the development of themselves "as people who should make choices, act upon them, and accept moral responsibility for those choices" (Davies, 1990, p. 343).

4) Theory generation. What might constitute a process of theory generation from a New Zealand context? How are explanations generated within Kaupapa Maori research?

In 1982 I commenced researching the lost whakapapa (genealogy) of my mother's family (Bishop, 1991a). As the result of the colonisation of New Zealand (see Ward, 1974; Owens, 1981; Belich, 1987; Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990), I had grown up ignorant of my family's Waikato Maori ancestry. Our family's knowledge of its heritage was very sketchy, essentially consisting of a few stories passed on through my mother. It was also very difficult to find out much in the way of family details for there appeared to be a conspiracy of silence. It was very mysterious.  

Initial impressions

The impression those of us raised in the South Island, some 2000 kilometres from the Lower Waikato where my grandfather and his fourteen siblings had been born, was that, given the bicultural ancestry of the family, geographic location would have been significant in selecting marriage partners. In other words, in an area where there were large numbers of Pakeha, it was likely the children would marry Pakeha, whereas in places where more Maori were present, then more marriages to Maori would seem likely. In areas of Maori dominance, it would seem likely that most marriages would be to Maori. The predominance of Pakehadom in the South Island was taken as sufficient explanation of why those members of the family raised in Southland were raised as Pakeha. We expected that most of the family who had remained in the North Island would have remained Maori or to have married into Maori families.

Given these expectations, the reality of the family in the North Island was somewhat of a surprise. Following a series of journeys to the North Island during 1990 and regular follow-up visits in 1992, 1993 and 1994 in search of the family history, it became clear that most of the family members today are also living a Pakeha life-style, although there are many who are living as Maori.  

This search revealed that an inexorable process of Europeanisation had overtaken my family. This process has proven to be so insidious in its progress that now, approximately 150 years after the birth of the first children of my grandfather's siblings, the overwhelming dominance of the Pakeha lifestyle among the numerous sub-
branches of the family testifies to its pervasiveness. Members of the family appear to have been persuaded to make a cultural choice, that is, a firm resolve to choose one cultural life style above another.

It would also appear that to a significant degree the history of the family is a vignette of New Zealand's history. This process of Europeanisation began during the 'crucial decades' for race relations in New Zealand, that period from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 to the wars of Sovereignty in the 1860s when the pattern of race relations in New Zealand was established for the time to follow. In this sense then, this story is relevant to a wider audience.

This family's search for identity has also revealed a diaspora; a locational and a cultural dispersal. It would appear that this was the first phase of the diaspora that was to affect many Maori families. Two further events perpetuated the Maori diaspora; the loss of land in the mid 19th century and the urbanisation of the Maori people in the mid 20th century (Walker, 1990).

**Attempts at explanation/con structing meanings**

In an attempt to understand the reasons for Europeanisation of my mother's family and the subsequent cultural and geographic dispersal of the family, I focussed on the impact of the education my grandfather and his siblings received in Reverend Robert Maunsell's mission schools in the lower Waikato in the 1850s, and on their subsequent life choices (Bishop, 1993a; Bishop, 1993b). I suggested that this education, within the context of the times, created the foundation for the Europeanisation and diaspora of my family.

There was very little remaining evidence as to the veracity of these suppositions for the process of colonisation had in itself contained mechanisms for suppressing the family histories. Despite the interest shown by a great number of family members, our family's heritage was very well hidden. In order to seek explanations for such opacity of history, I turned to critical theory, which as an historical process within Western intellectual thought, is a discourse where essentially the Western mind focusses on its own colonising practices. Critical theory was also considered useful because of its central focus on the notion of emancipation. I felt this notion was useful because it did not just seek explanations in an empirical sense, for I was also interested in explanations that would be of benefit to other members of my family. My main concern was that colonial suppression of our family history had removed from family members the opportunity to participate in Maori cultural experiences and understandings.

participatory remediation of a suppressed family heritage. In this work, the Gramscian concept of hegemony was employed to explain how the persuasiveness of ideas could enable colonisation of the mind to occur, and thus to explain why the majority of the fourteen siblings of my grandfather chose to raise their children in the culture of their father, that is as Pakeha, and not in the culture of their mother, that is as Maori. Further, this concept of hegemony was used to explain why the information about our ancestry was suppressed and knowledge of our Maori heritage was not passed on.

However, on reflection, it is problematic to involve a 'white western male' in explanations of how I understood the colonisation of Maori minds, just as it is problematic not to consider the role of patriarchy/gender politics in the decisions made by our ancestors. Further, on repositioning myself in relation to this process of creating explanations about the choices made by our ancestor within a participant research group, numerous other explanations became evident. These alternative explanations/theories challenged not only my choice and use of 'emancipatory' theory but also my position within the research group.

Such attempts at explanations from within the dominant discourse highlight the very tension of working within an academic environment predicated on one cultural world-view, with its very specific demands and traditions associated with research. Added to this my own upbringing and education, which was firmly within this discourse, and the dominance of Western explanations and methodological frameworks is understandable. This tension is also a major focus of this present thesis, a tension that is addressed, yet perhaps not resolved.

In my enquiry into my mother's family (Bishop, 1991a), I felt it necessary to use Girouxian resistance theory, together with the Frierean notion of 'conscientisation', to explain how uncovering knowledge and the use of this knowledge in counter-hegemonic ways could be used by us descendants for emancipation through our own thoughts and actions. It was clear that our ancestors who lived through the period of turmoil termed 'the crucial decades' would have known very clearly what was happening to them. My concern, however, was that subsequent diaspora and denial of our family heritage had rendered their understandings and meanings unknowable to us because of the structural impediments created by colonialism. Theoretically a critical theory approach would:

seek to offer individuals an awareness of how their aims and purposes may have become distorted or repressed and to specify how these can be eradicated so that the rational pursuit of their real goals can be undertaken (Carr and Kemmis, 1986, p.136)
Critical theory aims to "distil the historical processes which have caused subjective meanings to become systematically distorted" (p. 137). In other words, I assumed that we, as descendants of Maori people, had been denied access to knowledge about our heritage due to unknown 'historical processes' and my research sought from critical theory a methodology that could liberate individuals from the effects of hegemonic processes of suppression of alternative views of the world.

Carr and Kemmis (1986) promote action research as just such a methodology that allows individuals to engage in the "critical reconstruction of suppressed possibilities and desires for emancipation" (p. 137; italics added). Carr and Kemmis (1986) define action research as,

> simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices and the situation in which these practices are carried out (p. 162)

To Carr and Kemmis (1986), action research differs from both positivistic and interpretative research approaches in that it suggests that practitioners are themselves participants who attempt to change some elements of a situation for the betterment of the participants. I felt that action research might address Maori concerns since it tries to move beyond seeking explanations and understandings that often suit the researcher, but that may be of little use to those who are researched. Action research seeks to enable participants to engage in critical reflection in order to promote change.

**Reconsideration of approach**

Therefore, using the language of critical theory and action research as defined and promoted by Carr and Kemmis (1986), the study sought to 'release' my family from the oppression that colonisation had foisted upon them, to 'clear the opacity' of history that they had 'succumbed to' and to question the 'false realities' that they lived within. However, critical reflection on the ideas of Middleton (1985, 1993), Lather (1986, 1991), Smith (1990), Ohia (1989) and Irwin (1992b), among others, revealed that these theoretical and methodological assumptions were perhaps in themselves impositional. On further reflection, I realised that such researcher-initiated explanations tend to deny the development of symmetrical dialogue between participants, a condition considered necessary by Chisholm (1990), Gitlin (1990), Robinson (1986, 1989), Lather (1986, 1991) and Goldthorpe (1992), for the promotion of empowering relationships. These authors consider that the impositional tendencies of researchers using an 'emancipatory' approach to research, while less than those researchers using the more traditional methodologies are nevertheless considerable. To persist with this model, as Delpit
(1988) suggests, is to anticipate the collateral development of an empowering relationship, that is a symmetrical relationship between the researchers and those researched without first establishing a means of facilitating such development. Reconsideration of my family study provides such an example.

Reconsideration of the first meeting with another family genealogist and historian, and talking on numerous occasions over the years with other family members, led me to realise that not only did these people know more about the family than I did, but they had many questions they also wanted answered. When I met with family historian, Kit Davis in 1982 she welcomed me and showed me how she had been collecting family information for some thirty years. Subsequently the leads she gave me led me on to meet many other genealogists, many of whom had been collecting and processing family materials for decades. These people didn't want to just hand over their material to me to take away; they wanted to sit down with me and participate in extending our understanding of the material. They wanted to develop a system where we could work together toward constructing a mutual understanding about what had happened to our family. Therefore, it became important for me to reconsider how I could reduce the imposition of my own interests and concerns as a researcher by seeking an understanding with the family members themselves.

Talking with the family research group over a period of years eventually changed my study from one where I sought data to conform to a theory to one where we began to negotiate the meaning of the data. For example, as we were unable to talk to our ancestors it was necessary to reconstruct their likely motives from a consideration of the options facing them at certain crucial points in their lives. This lead to using reconstructed life histories as a methodological tool since understanding the relevant socio-political contexts within which our ancestors lived became necessary. Other clues to likely attitudes of these tupuna (ancestors) was the behaviour and attitudes held by their children.

Other theoretical and methodological answers were provided by the very process of research itself. The question of who was likely to be interested and have the authority to be part of the participant group was a problem to me initially. The members of this family number in the thousands. How was it possible to interact meaningfully and more importantly, authoritatively, with such a vast array of people? How were issues of validity, accountability, and control to be addressed?

However, the answer was to emerge out of the very process of the research. This type of research exercise is not just sequential, that is a linear progression; it is also cumulative in that 'old ground' is gone over many times and answers often come when least expected. This process is exemplified when one day in May of 1990 while my brother and I were talking with a kaumatua and others in a group at Turangawaewae marae about our search for our whanaunga (relatives). Jim Ritchie, an eminent scholar
and member of Waikato University's Maori Research Unit, offered an explanation for the phenomena of our search for our tupuna. He explained that it was a "typical third generation search" (Ritchie, 1990.) that followed an unpleasant emigration, or the escape from horrific circumstances. He explained that typically, the first generation did not want to talk about the events surrounding their departure. The second generation were so busy consolidating their new situation that they too didn't want to talk about it. It was the third generation who strove to seek out the dispersed family structure, all the time hoping to understand the hidden reasons behind the dispersal of the first generation.

Ritchie's explanation was very valuable for it enabled me to establish potential participants in the research group. By this time, I was engaged in discovering the network of existing family historians and genealogists. I was already beginning to get in touch with them, but I needed this insight to realise that the group/family itself had a mechanism for identifying those members who could be part of the wider research group that I was belatedly becoming part of myself. Also, it became clear why these were the people who could speak authoritatively on behalf of their particular sections of the family. Interestingly, these were invariably members of the third generation.

It was the family historians who suggested some of the major common questions of the study and with whom I worked to understand the information gathered and the many and varied possible answers. Among the common questions the family members wanted answered were 'Who was Irihapeti? Who was John MacKay? Who was Sam Joy? How did they live? Where did they live? How did they bring up their children? Where did the children of Irihapeti settle? Why are they so spread apart? When did this happen? How do the descendants live now—as Maori or as Pakeha? How did this separation occur? Why was this information suppressed? When can we arrange a family reunion?'

These family historians had already 'selected themselves' by their interest in the history and the cultural diaspora of the family, and had submitted themselves to the mechanisms of verification of their 'credentials' by the rest of their branch of the family. This verification is a very fluid process that ranges from informal day to day contacts, to copious letter writing, to participation in numerous hui and korero (talking) sessions, through to the organisation of the family reunions. Suffice it to say that members of the family know very well who is able to speak with authority and of whom it is worth taking notice. In all families there are people who are selected by the family members to be the recorders of whakapapa. It is such an important task that in the past it never used to be left to chance. With colonisation however, it has become less valued and appears, to the casual eye, to have been left to chance. However, there is a very specific and continuous process of checks and verifications by others in the family as to the veracity of the incumbent. This process of self-selection and verification has enabled a vast
network of opinions and attitudes to be canvassed and represented when family matters/research questions are discussed.

The research group in this study was not a finite group where validity was determined by the researcher, for example, by means of establishing a 'sample'. The research group is ever-expanding, and the validity of the selection process, in being decided by the family, takes the control over the validation of data-processing methods out of the hands of the researcher and places it in the hands of the research group themselves. This approach reduces the distance, and the power differential, between the researcher and the researched. Neither have the complete power, since the power resides in the group and in the group processes. To remove the control of identifying the research group from the preferred methods of the researcher to the preferred methods of the research group places the issue of validity of the process of selection and information verification onto both the researcher and the researched.

Verification of information took place as information was shared between branches of the family. Irihapeti, her two husbands and the grandchildren of these two husbands, had lost contact over time. It was bringing together these dispersed families and their stories that provided reassurance and verification to the members of the families. This process of validation by the research group proved more useful and potentially empowering for them than researcher-defined validation processes, because it was more within their control.

Our Kaumatua, Tukawekai Kereama affirmed the use of this methodology by his confirming that the material that I had uncovered from Land Court archives supported family stories that had been in the Joy family for years. This type of cross-referencing between oral and written sources was a frequent feature of the interviews, and provided confirmation and answers to many questions.

However, common understanding was not sought in all cases. For example in some cases gathering five versions of a story and making a composite could have offended each of the five storytellers. The purpose of each story may have differed from family branch to family branch, because each story, if handed on from an ancestor, will carry the mana of that ancestor. It will therefore be tapu, not to be trifled with by being retold by an academic researcher seeking to form generalisations or for some other purpose. However, as the researcher in this case was part of the whanau and was accountable to the whanau, the tapu nature of the stories was protected.

**Theoretical imposition**

Weaving theory and practice is a central concern of 'praxis orientated researchers'. These researchers seek emancipatory knowledge, knowledge that highlights internal contradictions and oppressive practices, "and in doing so direct attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present
configuration of social processes” (Lather, 1991, p. 52). She goes on to suggest that it is difficult to reach symmetrical dialogue in 'praxis orientated research' because conceptual over-determinism or theoretical imposition can lead to 'grand theory' construction. Banks (1988) describes grand theories as all embracing, unified explanations of events and phenomena… One problem with social science grand theories is that researchers usually feel obligated to interpret their findings in ways that will support their theories. The theory must remain intact. Observed phenomena and behaviour must be interpreted in ways consistent with the theoretical framework used by the researcher … they are also limiting because they force researchers to depict extremes in order to make their observations and theoretical frameworks consistent… social scientists often formulate theories or use existing ones and then make their empirical observations … findings are described in ways that will fit the theory. This often results in description of events and institutions that are extreme, and that are characterised by an inattention to details that the grand theory does not explain and by explanations that are incomplete or misleading (p. 149-150)

In other words a cycle is created where the idea determines the collection of data that in turn will promote and validate the original idea. It is ironic that this hegemony of ideas is one of the very problems that emancipatory research is determined to displace. An example may illustrate this.

Giroux (1984), Freire (1985), Giroux and McLaren (1986), and Anderson (1989) are among the 'resistance theorists' who voice concern about the 'revisionists' like Bowles and Gintis (in Banks, 1988, p.149), and cultural and social reproduction theorists like Bordieau (1977), Bordieau and Passeron (1977) and Bernstein (1977). Resistance theorists are critical of the denial of human agency and the over-burdensome reliance on structural limitations to change advocated by the social and cultural reproduction theorists. Giroux and McLaren (1986) and Giroux (1991) have proposed a new 'critical pedagogy' based on the dialectical notion of resistance to persuasive hegemonies, as a means of allowing for human agency. However, this explanation appears to establish another 'grand theory'.

Hence, while Lather (1991), using Ellesworth’s (1989) classroom experiences, critiques the impositional tendencies, utopianism and consequent diminished emancipatory value of Giroux’s (1991) critical pedagogy, both Lather and Giroux subscribe to a methodology that is based on reducing explanations to fundamental principles bounded by the Western tradition. They are concerned to argue in terms of binaries, that is in terms of dialectical, linear progression. However, within a Polynesian
world-view, ideas are not related in oppositional pairs but sometimes in triplets (McCudden, 1990) or sometimes, as interrelated matrices (Rangihau 1975; Pere, 1982, 1988; Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993), whose interrelationships are examined.

It was when attempting to identify how the life choices of my family had been affected by the colonial context within which they lived that I realised the limitation of such a binary analysis. In Lather's (1991) terms, I was attempting to fit the details to a theory rather than constructing meaning through negotiation with my ancestors. Persisting with analysis of the colonial situation in terms of binary oppositions left out as much detail as it included, and it flattened out the possibilities for complexity and diversity of human motivations. It ignored the variety of positions that individuals could create within the discursive practices of the period. Further, the analysis of the situation in the original study (Bishop, 1991a) is different from a subsequent reappraisal and extension of this study (Bishop, 1994b) which allowed my ancestors to talk more for themselves. In the original study, analysis of the colonial situation was reduced to the dialectic of hegemony and counter-hegemonic resistance. However, this analysis ignored the range and scope of allegiances, support systems, conflicts and struggles that developed during this period, and denied my ancestors their own 'voice' in explaining their reasons for making decisions and choices. This binary analysis also denied the explanations and understandings that present-day members of the family have constructed. To further suggest that support and allegiances are but evidence of the success of hegemonic persuasiveness is to ignore the initiative and vision of individuals inspired by different cultural goals than those of the outside researcher. Even if the goals were similar, motives differ, and to state the family's choices were simply the results of hegemony is reductionist in a manner that critical theory is designed to avoid. Perhaps critical theory is limited to such explanations because it recognises only one world-view, the Western.

Rather than imposing an 'outside' theory onto a situation, Lather (1991) suggests that theory building needs to be flexible and "grounded in a body of empirical work ceaselessly confronted with and respectful of the experiences of people in their daily lives (p. 60)." This stance implies that theoretical considerations on their own are inadequate and that the relationship between theory and experience should be grounded within the cultural contexts of the research participants rather than just within that of the researcher.

**Responses to the draft of the book about the family**

When I completed the draft of a book about the family I sent it to the members of the research group. Some of their responses are reported here because they illustrate the variety of 'sense-making experiences' undergone by various members of the research group. They illustrate the ongoing reciprocal, dialogic nature of these experiences and
how my theoretical explanations were inadequate to cater for the variety of perspectives.

I spoke to Paumea McKay for the second time on the 22nd of August, 1993. We were at a family reunion committee meeting at Putaruru. He called me aside during the meeting and the following conversation took place, covering the issues of accountability and ownership of knowledge.

Paumea As a boy I visited with Sam Emery or Joyce in Rotoiti and I have saved the first stanza of a chant that an old man in Rotorua chanted to my Dad when we were travelling through, but its language is a bit delicate for Western ears. (He recited the stanza, and continued) that's the only part of the thing that I can remember, because as you know I wasn't raised with the language and so there was a whole lot of other stuff.

Russell You said that you didn't tell me that beforehand. Why didn't you tell me that?

Paumea Now when you were writing your book, I knew that there had been a whole lot of things that had been said about my Dad. When your book came back, from the front page to the back page, it said to me 'This fellow had finally arrived as far as Maori/Pakeha is concerned'. I know you have been arriving all the time and so you understand what had actually happened to our family, because other people had said 'Oh, Paumea MacKay that's the land grabber'.

Russell At that point you realised that I could actually have the knowledge.

Paumea Yes, I felt safe in giving you the knowledge, I felt safe in giving you, those things that had happened to me personally.

I recorded a further conversation with Paumea McKay later that day when we returned to the topic of the family land. His father Paumea Sr. had been involved in negotiations regarding succession to the family land in the 1930s. His prominent role had left many stories about ulterior motives and skullduggery. Paumea spoke at some length about the chapter in the draft book on the land issue and agreed with the conclusions that I had come to, that the context within which the land was alienated was one where it was inevitable that family members were to be pitted against one another. He recalled that his father had talked to him about this problem, saying,
...unfortunately, though, the way the Pakeha law goes, you will be forced to
sell it whether you like it or not, and you are going to sell it over the blood
of your brothers and cousins.'

When you wrote [refering to the chapter on the land in my draft book]
that last chapter there I said 'Amen! Paumea [senior] had the reputation of
selling our land. One story was about him selling the Mahia area to the
Ormond family for financial return. However, his basic belief was this: 'If
this property belongs to you and I knew about it, I am a bad Christian if I
don't identify that fact to you. If you know it's mine and you know that I
exist and you don't try to tell me there is this valuable thing there, there is
something not quite right'. When you wrote that in the book I thought, 'Here
is someone who has found out these things, the mechanisms that forced
people to do these things'

I was amazed myself. From the day that Irihapeti applied for that land it was
inevitable that it would be alienated because of the law, and when they
couldn't get it through under one law, they would pass another.

Yes, yes, yes, that's right.

We also spoke about the different versions of the family whakapapa. This issue was
very contentious among the family and much time has been spent debating this and the
possible reasons for the suppression and loss of whakapapa.

You see that period of great turmoil during the 1800s, not only were
whakapapas changed but a lot of the stories, that were also changed. At that
time, the stories that were put out were often changed.

We have a problem of kuia/kaumatua standing up at the family reunion hui
saying 'this was the truth'. What do I do in this case do I just repeat that as
being said?

That's right - you simply quote them. I am happy with this approach.

So you think the book is on the right track?

Absolutely, I have read many books ... but this covers the political
machinations that set family members against one another. I like it that you
have called it the diaspora, because I understand that to mean 'the scattering'.

*Russell*  I like it also - some others don't, but to me it is a political scattering - like the Jews, and that is what has happened to us.

The project enabled members of the family to construct their own meaning and understandings from the various details. It enabled the constructing of explanations, both as an individual exercise and as a group activity. Examples of individual explanations include the conversation I had with my brother in 1993, just after he had read the first four chapters. It needs to be emphasised that we had spent a lot of time talking over this subject throughout our lives. One of the topics dealt with was the journey that he and I had undertaken in May of 1990 to the North Island when we had deliberately sought to meet up with our lost relatives.

*Gavin*  To me the trip that you and I went on was a pre-determined journey - like a play where it had already been written and we just had two parts to play. This journey was left-brain stuff. If you start to think logically it falls apart. If you think about that trip you could explain it all away but to understand it you need to use the left hand side of the brain. Maori use this and this is why they don't fit into the Pakeha world. The right-hand side covers maths e.g. numerical blood links, whereas Maori as left-side, look for whakapapa. When you are gardening for example, you can switch into another mode, you are able to pull in ideas without consciously thinking.

Gavin explained that to him, creativity is a function of the left side of the brain dominating the right side. The right side when dominant covers measurements, quantities, the cognitive, genealogy measured in amounts of blood and promotes compartmentalised thinking. When transferred into the cultural symbols and language then quantitative analysis becomes the preferred mode and in time becomes hegemonic. The left side covers qualities, the affective, where whakapapa is holistic, where your descent and your relationships to others is paramount. The dominance becomes hegemonic when, 'our current society rewards maths/science/languages but, not music, artists and story-tellers'.

Gavin writes and illustrates children's books. We spoke about his book on Katarina, our Great-Aunt. Gavin completed the illustrations for the book, including an illustration of what he thought our tupuna whaea (ancestress), Peti, may have looked like, complete with moko (tattoo), and forwarded them to the printer in June of 1991. In October of that year, I finally obtained a photograph of our tupuna whaea, Peti. We had
never seen this or any other picture of her before. However, when his book was published in December 1991 and I saw the illustration of Peti with an identical moko as that on Peti in the photo, I immediately rang him up to see where he had obtained the photo from. How he managed to reproduce the moko of his long-lost great-grandmother was another topic that he suggested was open to diverse explanations. "To Maori, the explanation of how I managed to reproduce the moko was okay. To Pakeha, I must have known already or (have been) mistaken".

A subject that became open to a group debate was that of the status of our tupuna whaea. This type of concern affects the very mana of individuals and how they represent themselves in everyday life. In this case, Pauline Shuker addresses a concern that has affected her self knowledge and understanding for all of her 63 years. At the family reunion organisation hui, held in August 1993, Tukawekai Kereama stood and addressed the assembled family. He spoke for some time about bringing the two branches of the family together, then he turned to me.

Tukawekai Another thing I will be straight is about that word you have in your book Russell, mokai. I don't accept that word mokai for Paea. I don't do the whakapapa of Ngati Pukeko. You say that it comes from the family. Kihi was a well known chief and if she was a puhi the word mokai doesn't come into it. If she was a low-born woman then yes, I accept, but she was not. We have had the same things happen among our people down there. We had to give up land in the wars because of the same thing happening. So I don't accept that word that Irihapeti or Te Paea was a mokai.

My sister went to Ngaruawahia in 1922. Te Puea, took her and had her staying with her for a whole year. That's my eldest sister, she was only 14 years of age and she even had a husband sorted out for her, but she bolted back home! She found out who she was. We were acknowledged, so I don't know why you are not acknowledged and you are calling yourselves mokai because you are not. You don't come from a mokai kuia. Kuia Rangatira to koutou Kuia.... If you are doing that, you are calling yourself the same! If you are not going to stand up and pupuri you can stay down there. I have come to one of your reunions before and I said on the marae that we come from Tawhiao but if you people are going to keep yourself down then, well do it, rather than pick yourselves up.

The mauri passed and other people had a chance to talk to the take (topic under consideration). Pauline Shuker, a member of the Stewart family branch and a family historian reflected on the opinion expressed by our kaumatua.
Pauline Can I just say that this is very important information. We have always known her to be a mokai. I am so pleased to hear that (she was not). We were told that she was slave. I am the granddaughter of Albert McKay, my parents were cousins. My mother said to me that they didn't talk about it, because she was a slave. Maybe that came from Kahungunu. I don't know but my mother was. You must excuse me [she was crying at the time] but it has been hard not to say who you were. I'm 63 and I always felt that she was a mokai.

This was not just a situation of a 'have I heard you correctly' type of response. Rather it is reflexive in that a participant was enabled to challenge the author's use of a concept. I had gathered these stories in my attempts to construct a meaningful explanation about how Peti had contributed to the Europeanisation of her children. As Pauline had described, her family had suppressed the stories of Peti because of the thought that she was the daughter of a mokai. However, in one liberating announcement our kaumatua, in reflecting critically upon the implications of my going into print with such a story, had also empowered other members of the family to raise their heads.

This story also illustrates the relationship between kaumatua and pakeke (adult), as one of a tuakana/teina (older/younger). In this sense the task of the teina is to ask questions of and to seek clarification from the tuakana. Out of such interaction and conflict comes resolution if the means of conflict resolution are agreed upon. In this case the process of resolution was within a hui context where kaumatua preside, where all have a right to contribute and where peace is paramount.

Emma Tonga also spoke at the family reunion meeting on 22 August 1993. She spoke at length about her theories about the family's need to reunite.

Emma It thrills my heart to know that we all think about our (old) people. I have written here

_To those who we call dead, death is not the problem, being forgotten is the problem_

It does my heart good to know that we are all striving here to find one another. I am an historian in my own right. I read the Bible. From the time of Israel, Moses led those people out in the wilderness until the old people died and he had a new generation to work with, and that is what is happening here. We need to meet these people to learn of the new generations that are coming up. We have our books and they need to be recorded. These are the lost ones. God never meant anybody to be lost. I'll
tell you that ... I am thrilled with Russell waking us all up, getting us to pull our socks up, find answers to what he is looking for. We are choice people. God didn't put us here for nothing. That is why we were given big families and we were sent all over New Zealand, scattered, so that we could scatter among everybody, for the time of gathering. We know that these are supposedly the last days and we need to gather our whakapapa and gather our people together, and Russell this is the answer to your people's being chased all over New Zealand, to gather in more people ... I am thrilled today to see everybody here. It thrills my heart so much to see that we care, we are a people that care and if God knows we are a special people and he has entrusted a big job to us, chasing up all our relations to put them in a book so that our children would know who their grandparents were and who we were. I know that God would bless us in our efforts.

As a family historian, Pauline Shuker was one of those to receive a copy of my draft book. Two weeks later I received the first of four letters disagreeing with my story and challenging what I had gathered from other members of her sub-family, the Stewarts and from other members of the wider family. She had been to see other people mentioned in the text to verify her suspicions and had written extensive notes over the text. She was very whakama (shy) about being so picky with 'my' text. However, I rang her to explain that I was thrilled that she had spent so much time on the text and that it was my intention that she do so. However, we were clearly not understanding each other's approach on the telephone, so we decided we needed to meet face to face. There was no option but for me to fly to Rotorua to spend time with her talking through the issues she had raised. We spent three days together thrashing out the issues, commenting on each other's ideas, going over source material and working towards a consensus. This was done in the most hospitable manner possible. I was made most welcome and we attacked the issues with gusto. Following my return I received four more letters; this time they were of support and offering more ideas and thoughts.

This then was an example of a sequential interactive interviewing process. The main feature was the dialogic nature of the interchange. There was no hierarchy between the 'researcher' and the 'researched'. In fact this distinction became very fuzzy. It did not disappear altogether for we knew who had what task to fulfill in relation to writing up the book. However, this was a real hui, a weekend-long meeting where we thrashed out issues and ideas. Many valuable things came from this hui. One was that when we were debating the authenticity of a photo of Peti that I had acquired from Elva Kelly, Pauline remembered her brother had another photo of Peti and what was to turn out to be the only surviving photo of John Horton MacKay. Pauline was able to remind
her brother of their location and the photos were eventually brought to the family reunion, completing the collection of pictorial taonga.

**Reflection on the process of generating explanations**

These accounts illustrate to me that research participants are able to, and do theorise about/explain their own lived experiences. However, these experiences are not explained in terms of 'grand theories' or sociological 'laws' about the organisation of the world, but rather in a similar manner to the 'grounded theory' approach that is described by Glaser and Strauss (1967, in Strauss and Corbin, 1994). That is, a 'bottom-up' approach to identifying themes and patterns from experiences. However, the major difference between what occurred in this family research and the 'grounded theory' method is that it is the research participants together, in a dialogic manner, who are developing the explanations in terms of the cultural contexts of the participant, rather than that of the researcher.

This realisation illustrates for me the importance of humility, of working within a situation that enables the experiences and understandings of the research participants to be heard. This in turn raises a number of 'world-view' issues. Lather (1991) is critical of the neo-Marxist researcher's common approach as the 'interpreter of the world' and the expositor of 'false consciousness'. At the heart of the matter is the concern that in the name of emancipation, researchers impose meaning on situations rather than constructing meaning through negotiation with research participants" (p. 59). Lather (1991) further states that at present there are few research designs which encourage negotiation of meaning beyond the descriptive level. The involvement of research participants in data interpretation as well as (to take one further step toward maximal reciprocity) theory-building remains largely an attractive aspiration(p. 59-60)

However, the problem may not just be with incorrect application of a complicated methodological framework. It may be that it is impossible to operationalise this proposition because of its being based on notions of cultural superiority that are simply unacceptable to potential research whanau members.

A related issue is that of intellectual arrogance among researchers. This problem is rooted in the specialisation of labour within societies. In cultures where a collectivist ethos is paramount, specialists are constantly reminded of their fealty to and interdependence within the collective whole. On the other hand, the specialist in the individualist culture, over time not only loses the interdependence of the researcher with the researched, but justifies this distancing from the group in elitist terms such as the
need for freedom of expression, for academic freedom, for individual initiative and for unfettered intellectual leadership. This latter stance has flourished, particularly within the Western dominated academy. The expert, the intellectual or the academic is seen as the most suitable person to generate research questions, to select or construct methodologies and to construct meaning from the data that is gathered. However, the normal means of addressing problems of inappropriate controls by means of paradigm shifting does not necessarily eradicate this problem, because within the post-positivist, neo-Marxist emancipatory paradigm, there is an inherent tendency for researchers themselves to initiate emancipatory research for those whom they consider to be oppressed, and to "direct attention to the possibilities for social transformation" (Lather, 1991, p. 61).

The intellectual arrogance of theory-driven emancipationists has contributed to a new form of evangelism. This is only a little different from the evangelism of those monogenetic, benevolent, paternalistic, evangelistic missionaries who arrived in New Zealand in the early 19th century. They were convinced that Maori were human beings, obviously uncivilised, but capable of being civilised if only they followed the path laid down for them by the missionaries. When the Maori people resisted walking this path in order to retain control of their own development, some missionaries resorted to joining the army and supporting the war against Waikato Maori in order to humble them (Bishop, 1991a). One wonders what will be the result as Maori reject the 'help' offered by Western emancipationists who insist in working within their own mono-cultural, theory-laden context, irrespective of which paradigm they espouse.

Reconsideration of action research

The focus on 'reconstructing suppressed possibilities and desires' as embodied in action research may not be sufficient to develop empowering relationships because such an approach does not clearly address the ideological power of agenda setting. In order for research participants to address the problem of external agenda setting, they require access to 'specific research tools.' In a Maori context this would include hui, whakawhanaungatanga, whakamihi (introductions) and techniques and information (that is, a technology) to undertake effective empowering actions. These tools are especially needed if empowering actions are to be located within the cultural context of the research participants. Issues to do with ethics and control must be addressed in this context. Carr and Kemmis (1986, p. 186) suggest a method whereby this can occur. They claim that in some senses "technical action research has significance within the framework of emancipatory action research" (p. 205), because by using the action method 'moments' and methodology the "technical character of the action research is transcended by its location within the community context" (p.205).
However, this claim still fails to address Ohia's (1989) concern about initiation. Carr and Kemmis (1986) describe how initially outside facilitators form co-operative relationships with practitioners helping them to articulate their concerns, plan strategic action for change, monitor the problems and effects of changes, and reflect on the value and consequences of the changes actually achieved (p. 203).

Carr and Kemmis (1986) then go on to explain that such research is not emancipatory until the group becomes 'self-reflective'. However, it is the process of initiation and subsequent transformation that is of crucial concern. If, initially there is the need for an 'outside facilitator', when does the 'outside facilitation' disappear? Is there not a danger that the goals established by this outside facilitator remain as the driving agenda of the research? If the 'real goals' are defined by outsiders (i.e. researchers who are ideologically part of the majority group) then the 'emancipation' could still be hegemonic evangelism rather than internally-driven empowerment. The research relationship would remain paternalistic and hegemonic despite the degree of the concern of the facilitator, or the attempts to make the group 'self-reflective'. How are external facilitators from one culture to understand the needs of another culture except through participation in the social contexts of that culture? Furthermore, participants in Maori cultural contexts will educate researchers into the need for following Maori preferred methods of research initiation. Maori people have their own system of checks and balances when research is initiated, their own systems of referrals and permission seeking processes and consultation. Educational researchers need to be cognisant of these processes, and know how to take part in them.

Further concerns about the action research approach are raised by Gibson (1985) and Robinson (1993). Gibson (1985, 1986), critiques action research's "powerlessness, even irrelevance in the face of structural inequality and injustice" (p. 59) because, despite all the examples in the accompanying Reader taking place in classrooms or school settings, there is at least an implicit hope that action research can take place in the wider socio-economic context and thus pursue a wider emancipatory objective. Gibson (1985) claims that the jump from the classroom to the school context is huge and requires different methods and processes of negotiation. Similarly, the jump from school to community may well be greater still, and will likely require different methods for different problems will arise. Gibson (1985) concludes that at the institutional or structural level, the forms and locations of 'emancipation' are probably more diverse and the problem of effecting it [emancipation] far more difficult (p. 63).
To leap from small, closely defined groups within a school setting to intervene critically in isolation of poverty, alienation and powerlessness within whole cultural or ethnic groups would seem to be very ambitious.

Robinson (1993) identifies that one crucial reason for this potentially serious limitation of the action research/critical approach to address systemic change is because paradoxically, while critical researchers locate the powerful in their analyses of problems, they exclude them from their solutions. The exclusion or bypassing of the powerful is counterproductive, given critical theorists' own claims that they (the powerful) are frequently partially responsible for the problem, through their direct or indirect control of the economic, political or communicative practices which sustain it. Unless revolutionary change is advocated or contemplated, social change requires the involvement of the powerful in the process of education and action designed to serve the critically examined interests of all (p. 236).

The difficulty of addressing the potential power and control dichotomy between researcher and researched by means of action research limits its usefulness for addressing structural change. Further, for emancipatory action research to proceed there must be initiation from the inside. If the methods of incorporating outsiders are methodologically suspect, then it would appear that there is an artificial limitation on the size and scope of the interested group. Often to achieve structural change the 'interest' group must include people who may not see themselves as part of this interest group. Surely such people ought to be included?

Hence, it is necessary to go beyond presently constructed approaches to research. What is required is a more focussed framework of research that addresses Maori cultural aspirations and is located within Maori cultural practices. Kaupapa Maori is such an approach. Kaupapa Maori promotes self-determination of the research participants as a primary goal, and is a research strategy that relates theory to practice in an indigenous based context and in a manner that aims to promote symmetrical dialogue.

Conclusion

This chapter has identified a number of concerns that are central to a Kaupapa Maori research strategy. The first is the idea that Kaupapa Maori is not simply another paradigmatic shift within Western epistemology. Kaupapa Maori research is located within an alternative world-view. From within this world-view solutions to problems can be generated and cultural aspirations met using the existing cultural preferences and
practices of Maori culture, even though these have been marginalised through
colonisation. For example, Smith (1992b) suggests a series of critical change elements
that offer "exciting potential for intervening in the general Maori schooling crisis" (p.
13) that are grounded within the Maori cosmology; Tino Rangatiratanga (relative
autonomy principle), Taonga tuku iho (cultural aspirations principle), Ako Maori
(culturally preferred pedagogy), Kia piki ake i nga raruraru o te kainga (mediation of
socio-economic factors), whanau (extended family management principle), and kaupapa
(collective vision principle). Smith (1992b) suggests that these crucial intervention
elements are already proving successful at many levels for the children attending
Kaupapa Maori educational institutions. These elements also have the potential to speak
to other educational institutions intent on addressing the current crisis in Maori
education (p. 20).

A second idea is that theory generation is not a matter of 'top-down' deductive
experimentation located within the discursive practice dominated by the researcher's
interests, concerns and methodologies. Neither is it simply a matter of 'bottom-up'
inductive construction of experiential meanings aimed at promoting empowerment for
the research participants by means of clarifying their 'opaque' world-views. Rather,
reconsideration of my study of my own family (Bishop, 1991a) taught me the need to
seek explanations from the context within which I was positioned. In other words,
theorising was a function of the individuals' constructed meaning about their position
within culturally specific discursive practice.

The methodological implications of this stance are examined in the following
chapter. Experiences and constructions of the meaning research experiences have had
for a number of researchers positioned within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Maori
are examined in chapters 4 to 8.

Reflection on the process of research implementation revealed that it was
necessary for me to consider how I positioned myself as a researcher within a Kaupapa
Maori discourse. My arrival at this understanding came from reconsideration of my use
of emancipatory theory and methodology. This reconsideration was prompted by a
series of critical questions that partially constitute the discourse of Kaupapa Maori
(Smith, 1991; Smith, 1992b; Bishop, 1992b). These questions address the definition,
legitimation and ownership of knowledge. Specifically, they suggest that the researcher
needs to consider carefully how projects are initiated, who will represent the
knowledge, what processes of legitimation and accountability will be entered into, and
perhaps above all, who will benefit from the research?

These considerations led me to realise that there needed to be an initial process
of negotiation and agenda-setting which acknowledged the concerns, interests and
desires of the research participants. The series of questions used in this thesis may
serve as examples of initial questions that are important to consider before (and during)
a research project. Engaging with these questions began the process of positioning
myself within a whanau of interest (an action group of all interested parties). Engaging
with these questions also led to a means for consultation, collaboration and conflict
resolution within the whanau of interest in terms of the preferred cultural practices of
the research participants.

Some of the further realisations that come from such a process of positioning
and negotiation are that by establishing a research whanau of interest, the locus of
control was extended beyond the hands of the individual researcher. Even if the whanau
is in Metge's terms a metaphoric whanau of interest, it still makes decisions in ways
established by the literal (blood-linked) whanau, that is by consensus-seeking methods
where above all power and control are vested in the entire whanau, and not in any one
individual, whether that person be the researcher or the researched. In my family
project, while the family group was a regular whanau in terms of blood links, there was
a whanau of interest constituted within the wider whanau by a group of family members
and spouses, who constituted the 'family historian' network (Bishop, 1994b).

Kaupapa Maori research is an innovative resistance and pro-active stance that
addresses the dominance of Kaupapa Pakeha research in which Maori people figure as
passive partners. Kaupapa Maori research duplicates the dual purpose of Kaupapa
Maori educational institutions; that is to redevelop an education system rooted within
Maori aspirations, preferences and practices and to challenge the mainstream education
system. It can demonstrate to mainstream educators how structural theory might address
and transform the social realities of Maori and other marginalised and oppressed
peoples so that they address the current educational crisis of under-achievement, non-
participation and under-representation. Emancipatory theory, as defined in terms of the
Western academic tradition has failed to step outside of the concerns and agendas
established by Westerners. It remains for Maori and other indigenous peoples to speak
with our own language and voices to the current emancipatory debate in the social
sciences.

The voice of Kaupapa Maori research is one that desires to reassert control and
promote and conduct research for our own purposes, in terms of our own agendas and
concerns. Kaupapa Maori research does not conduct research in terms that are defined
by non-Maori people, who then term us as the 'other.' Simply put, we do not feel that
Pakeha agenda research has been of benefit to Maori people anywhere near to the extent
that research into Maori people's lives has benefitted other researchers.

Rather than seek to locate Maori concerns about research within the domain of
the dominant discourse, this thesis seeks to address colonial and neo-colonial
hegemonies by locating research within Maori cultural contexts. However, in
addressing Maori concerns about research I do not wish to divorce this discussion from
contemporary debates within the social sciences. This is not to suggest that Maori
culture does not contain answers to these problems within its own structures. On the contrary, I believe that research conducted within Maori contexts, that meets Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices has much more to offer the ongoing debate within the social sciences, than just presenting a critical and distanced voice. The danger of not engaging in the contemporary debate about the development of social sciences is that Maori concerns and solutions will continue to be dismissed as irrelevant to the mainstream. A Maori critical gaze on neo-colonialist practice is uncomfortable for some. However, unless this gaze is firmly positioned within the contemporary debate it can too easily be marginalised.

1 The concept of hegemony is used here in the sense defined by Foucault (in Smart, 1986) who suggests that hegemony is an insidious process which is gained most effectively through" practices, techniques, and methods which infiltrate minds and bodies, cultural practices which cultivate behaviours and beliefs, tastes, desires and needs as seemingly naturally occurring qualities and properties embodied in the psychic and physical reality of the human subject "(p. 159).

2 The family today consists of the descendants of a Maori woman from Waikato and her two Scottish husbands. Her Maori name was Te Paea, her 'English' name was Irihapeti (Peti) (Elizabeth) Hahau. Her mother was from Ngati Pukeko of Poroporo, near Whakatane and her father from Ngati Mahuta of Waikato. She lived from about 1820 to about 1900.

She and her first husband, John Horton MacKay, who was originally from the town of Paisley in Renfrewshire, Scotland, lived at Putataka bay, Port Waikato, for about twenty years. John MacKay drowned in 1859, soon after the birth of their eleventh child, Mere. Irihapeti remarried and she and her second husband, Sam Joy (Joyce), lived at Raglan, and had three children. Irihapeti left Sam Joy soon after the birth of her last child and moved to Taupiri, where she lived with one of her daughters, Clara, on repatriated confiscated land she was able to claim because of her Waikato heritage. One of the children of Irihapeti and John MacKay was my Grandfather; my mother's father, Benjamin Charles MacKay.

Of the 14 children of Irihapeti, four of the sisters remained in the Waikato, married Pakeha or bicultural men, and lived as settlers, close by one another. These families kept in contact, but not with their Maori whanaunga. Annie Marshall farmed at Opoutia, near Glenn Murray. Harriet Wade lived at Rangiriri, seemingly she and her husband ran the local hotel. Maria Stubbing farmed at Ngaruawahia and Clara Campbell farmed the family land at Taupiri. It was at this farm that Irihapeti was to spend her last days. Marian Stewart also married a Pakeha, and went to Whakatane in 1868 when her husband was appointed magistrate to that district. Catherine Carran (Granny Patterson) travelled to Southland in 1860, following her husband, William Carran to the goldfields at Tapuka. Her brother Benjamin was sent down to help her following Carran's drowning in 1870, and he stayed on, marrying a Pakeha woman, my grandmother. John went to Auckland, Albert to Mahia and Henry to Thames. The youngest Mackay, Mere, was sent to
Whakatane in 1859, at the age of three, on the death of her father, who drowned in Lake Whangape. The three Joy boys appear to have remained about the Waikato as settler farmers.

3 Those members of the family who had been raised as Maori had usually been put in this situation by accident more than design. Generally it was the result of shifts in location while the child was young, brought on by extraordinary circumstances, that opted the child to the Maori world. However, such generalisations need to be read in the context of the sheer size of this family. There are over 6500 known descendents of Irihapeti Hahau.

4 An example illustrates this process. Kit Davis a granddaughter of Catherine Patterson suggested one orientation for the study, when she recalled that although Granny Patterson had never spoken Maori to her "she spoke with a Maori tongue". This raised the question as to why Catherine Patterson had suppressed this element of her upbringing? Why did she concentrate only on those things of her Pakeha upbringing and ignore those of her Maori heritage? She had been taught in Maori, had grown up speaking Maori, yet felt it necessary or expedient to suppress this aspect when living in the settler society of Fortrose, in Southland, New Zealand. It later became clear that those members of the family who remained in the Waikato had also suppressed their Maori language, even though they were living as 'settlers' very close to their own whanaunga (relatives), with whom they must have spoken originally in Maori. Suppression of the Maori language seems to have been an essential part of the process of Europeanisation as decreed by the dominant settler culture. In contrast, the process of Europeanisation as implemented by the Missionary, Maunsell whose schools most of the family attended included the retention of their language. This raised many questions about the education systems within which these children were raised and the effects on family of the struggles for dominance between the missionaries and the settlers.

5 Whanau is used here in a metaphoric sense (Metge, 1990a) which has developed from Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori initiatives, in that kinship is not the only structure within which to form a whanau. It is now seen as relevant and appropriate for whanau to form under the auspices of a common goal or local residence (p. 73-74).
Chapter 3: Collaborative research stories as Kaupapa Maori research

... in many ways the idea of studying the studies came from within the projects themselves, from the other people involved in the projects who identified this as a necessary and worthwhile enterprise. The task for me became one of identifying an appropriate method to analyse the processes used in the projects while engaging in a research strategy that itself promoted self-determination through power sharing.

... my basic point being that stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world; they also become the method colonised people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history (Edward Said, 1993, p. xii)

Introduction

This chapter examines the implementation of a Kaupapa Maori approach in a range of research contexts. Consideration is given to the development of an appropriate method by which to examine these implementations. The notion of dialectical 'paradigm shifting' is challenged. It is suggested that irrespective of the paradigms within which researchers prefer to position themselves, the problem of researcher imposition remains. This chapter addresses researcher imposition directly by proposing the notion of Collaborative Research Stories as a self-determining research process. The chapter then locates this argument within Maori cultural practices in a manner that addresses Maori cultural aspirations and preferences.

Establishing a research group

This thesis involved a study of the experiences of a number of researchers working within a Kaupapa Maori framework. This framework constitutes the agenda of the bicultural education research group within the Education Department of the University of Otago, Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. The research group's participants are all located within educational institutions. However, there is a common appreciation of the need to look beyond our institutions and institutional concerns about research and to look toward local Maori organisations for support and authority. As a result, the kaupapa of Te Ropu Rangahau was presented to the Otago Maori Council (OMC) (Bishop 1992c), via its associate committee, the Maori Education and Training Association (META), in order that local Mana Whenua runanga (local tribal councils) and Mata Waka ropu (groups of Maori from other areas) could consider the idea. Initial
approval for the idea was given and negotiations for the appointment of a kaumatua and a wider community based support and monitoring group were instigated.

The need for this bicultural research group within the Education Department of the University of Otago was also presented to educational researchers at the 13th New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE) conference in Dunedin in November of 1991 (Bishop, 1991b) and to an international workshop on inter-cultural communication at the East-West Centre in Hawaii curing July of 1992 (Bishop, 1992a). The results of the projects undertaken in 1992 (and that are the subject of this thesis) were presented at the joint New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australian Association for Research in Education (NZARE/AARE) conference at Geelong, Australia, in November 1992 (Glynn, 1992; Bishop and Glynn, 1992b; Bishop and Kapa, 1992; Holmes, 1992), to the Post Colonial Formations Conference, Brisbane, July 1993 (Bishop, 1993c), to the Special Education Service Conference in Dunedin, February, 1993 (Bishop and Glynn, 1993; Glynn, 1993) and to the World Indigenous Peoples' Conference at Wollongong in December, 1993 (Glynn et al., 1993c).

Five research projects conducted within Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua form the focus of this thesis

Five of the current projects conducted within the kaupapa of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua were selected for study as part of this investigation of Kaupapa Maori research process. The projects are:

1). He Whakawhanaungatanga Tikanga Rua. A posopographic (multiple life history) study of a family diaspora created by the impact of conflicting hegemonies during the crucial decades of New Zealand's history. The initial results of this project were reported to the 13th NZARE conference in 1991 (Bishop, 1991c) and returned to the family members who participated in the research. Subsequently this project became the focus of a Masters thesis in Education (Bishop, 1991a).

2). The investigation of Tatari Tautoko Tauawhi, a reading tutoring procedure implemented within Maori kaupapa contexts. The production of a training video is now completed and the process of collaboration and participation was reported to the joint AARE/NZARE conference in Melbourne, in November 1992 (Glynn, 1992), to the Inaugural Special Education Conference in Dunedin (Glynn et al., 1993a), the N.Z. Psychological Society in Christchurch (Glynn et al., 1993b), and the World Indigenous Peoples' conference in Woolongong, Australia, in December 1993 (Glynn et al., 1993c).

3). Tu mai kia Tu Ake. An evaluation of those characteristics of Taha Maori programmes in Otago and Southland schools that are indicative of success. The results of this project were also presented at the joint AARE/NZARE conference in November of 1992 (Holmes, 1992) and the report (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993) was
forwarded to the funders, the Ministry of Education in May, 1993. A follow-up study is currently producing a training and information video and compendium of resources. These resources aim to provide southern resource materials and understandings to enable implementation of Tikanga Maori (Maori customs) programmes in Kaupapa Maori and mainstream schools in Otago and Southland.

4). The Otago Maori Plan. An investigation of iwi-preferred school strategies and practices to improve Maori education in Otago. Initial investigations related to this programme were presented to NZARE conference in November, 1991 (Montgomery and Joyce, 1991). The final report was handed to the funding agency, the Ministry of Education by local Mana Whenua Runanga members in late 1994.

5). Conducting systemic change through the process of 'spiral discourse' within a College of Education outpost campus, and the Special Education Service. This project initially formed part of the long-term goal of developing research skills among senior Education students. Students for Education 320 and 421 and individual research papers are encouraged to conduct their research within the kaupapa of the research group. A monograph of examples of student research was produced in 1992 (Bishop, Bradley and Tokona, 1992) and a preliminary report made to the joint AARE/NZARE conference in November, 1992 (Bishop and Kapa, 1992). Since then the author of this study has been involved in promoting systemic change within the Special Education Service of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The central question

Critical reflection on the process of conducting research within my own family (Bishop, 1991a, 1994b) was matched by the interest that other people involved in the research group displayed toward conducting research within a Kaupapa Maori framework. From these experiences, I became interested in interviewing other researchers and co-researchers who were involved in research projects located in Maori, bicultural and cross-cultural contexts, in order to consider the meanings they had constructed about their experiences when addressing Kaupapa Maori research issues. At the same time I was engaged in developing a research strategy for myself which recognises and addresses the potential for researcher imposition in research.

Initially I had intended to incorporate the stories of other key people involved in the projects in order to create a multivoiced narrative of the projects. However due to the growth in size that seems to be an inevitable by-product of all research projects, the focus was narrowed down to the stories of researchers based in education institutions, and their attempts to position themselves within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Maori.
My objective was not to judge other researchers or their projects against a set of criteria that I had established while conducting my own study. Rather, my idea was that, together, we could engage in a process of critical reflection and build on the formal and informal meetings that were part of each of the projects. These researchers were also enthusiastic about the idea of further reflection on their work. The researchers were already aware of the importance of the processes they were part of in the various projects. Ted Glynn, Alva Kapa and Huata Holmes had all presented conference papers about their projects, which included consideration of the process of the research (Glynn, 1992; Bishop and Kapa, 1992; Holmes, 1992).

Other research participants also expressed support for and interest in examining the process of operationalising Kaupapa Maori research. For example, one day Katherine Atvars, a participant in the Tatari, Tautoko, Tauawhi (TTT) project, remarked to me as she raced down one of the corridors in the University on her way to help edit the first TTT video, "this is so empowering for the parents, isn't it?". Another example was at the first meeting of the service providers for the Otago Maori Education Plan, when during my mihi (self-introduction) to the others present, I explained that I was interested in the research process, that is, how it was being done. This was very early on in my own study and the idea of studying the process was just taking shape. David Ellison, the local manager of Te Puni Kokiri (Ministry of Maori Development), rose to speak after me and gave his whole-hearted support to my project and said that to him, given time, this study of process might turn out to be the most valuable study of the lot.

Therefore, in many ways the idea of studying the studies came from within the projects themselves, from the other people involved in the projects who identified this as a necessary and worthwhile enterprise. The task for me became one of identifying an appropriate method to analyse the processes used in the projects, while engaging in a research strategy that itself promoted self-determination through power sharing.

As a result, it was agreed that a number of the projects conducted within the kaupapa of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua would be examined by myself and the researchers along the lines of an 'agreed-to-agenda'. This agreed-to-agenda is the Kaupapa Maori agenda of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. The concerns identified in chapter one as crucial to a Kaupapa Maori process, thus became the focus of the study. The main question became how did the researchers address these issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability when they undertook research?

The following specific questions (after Smith, 1991; Smith, 1992a; and expanded in Bishop, 1992a, 1992b) became the focus of discussions with researchers as to how they undertook research in Maori contexts or within a Kaupapa Maori framework. The interview guide is presented as Appendix 3.
1) Who initiated the research, and why? What were the goals of the project? Who set the goals? Who will benefit? Is the research for the betterment of Maori people? If so, in what way?

2) Who designed the work? This raises the questions about power relationships within the research community; is there a hierarchy where only token representation is introduced or indeed are Maori people directly involved with the design and outcome of the research. Also issues of mana whenua and mata waka status need consideration.

3) Who did the work? Were the participants organised hierarchically? Was there someone who was required to do work that they had not really been part of designing and of which they had not really been able to share in the rewards? What were/are the power relationships between all participants in a research project? Hierarchical? Co-operative? Empowering? How were decisions made? Of the people involved, were they a co-worker/researcher? Did they feel part of the project? Was there a clear boss who directed operations, or was there a community of responsibility?

4) What rewards will there be? Who gets the rewards? Who will get their name on any publications? What assessment and evaluation procedures will be used to establish rewards? Who decides on the methods and procedures of assessment and evaluation?

5) Who is going to have access to the research findings? Processes of evaluation and access to research findings are areas in which Maori and Pakeha views differ enormously, and present weighty challenges to researchers. Ethical considerations affecting both cultures need to be considered at the commencement of the project. Will the findings be available to the wider educational community in a form that is readily understandable? Will the findings presented in a culturally appropriate manner within one culture be acceptable to the other?

6) Who are the researchers accountable to? What are the levels of accountability? Iwi members to iwi, hapu members to hapu, whanau members to whanau? Who defines what is accurate, true and complete in a text?

7) Who has the control over the distribution of knowledge, including the modes of distribution? Often, Maori people view knowledge as belonging to the group, individuals being repositories of the knowledge for the benefit of the group. What cultural principles control access to knowledge?

An interview schedule was constructed (which underwent constant modification) in order to guide researcher reflections on their participation in a Kaupapa Maori research approach, examine how the research community operationalises the issues of initiation, research design, work, rewards and benefits, legitimation, accountability, and ownership of knowledge within a culturally appropriate context and to find out to what extent the power to define and protect the knowledge created by the research participants was constituted within the research process.
In order to learn how each researcher constructed meaning, that is made sense of these central concerns of a Kaupapa Maori approach, a method had to be devised that allowed the voice of the researcher to be heard. To ignore my own role in the process of investigation was not acceptable because I was also a participant in the projects with views, experiences and interests of my own. Hence, it seemed that a more realistic approach was to facilitate a joint construction of meaning. As a result, negotiations were conducted and agreements reached to carry out a series of formal, in-depth, co-structured interviews (after; Tripp, 1983; Burgess, 1984; Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991; Reinharz, 1992). In addition a sequence of informal "interviews as chat" (after Haig-Brown, 1992) took place. Both formal and informal interviews were conducted within the context of co-joint participation in the projects.

This process of co-joint construction of meaning was predicated upon mutual respect between the participants. It provided voice and agency in order to achieve a collaborative research story. Methodologically, the project did not intend to offer descriptors of predictability (that is advice), or replicability (that is a formula), or to consider reliability and validity external to the projects themselves. Rather the approach was to allow for a multivoiced construction of meaning, in a manner that promoted self-determination by the research participants through a process of power sharing. In order to realise this goal, a means of constructing collaborative stories was developed. The remainder of this chapter details the search for an appropriate method and positions the method within a Maori world-view.

The search for a method

Bearing in mind concerns about researcher imposition, the search for a suitable method concentrated on ways to facilitate a collaborative, multivoiced construction of meaning carried out in a dialogic, reflexive manner.

Qualitative approaches lend themselves more readily to this process than do quantitative approaches. Elliot Eisner (1991) argues that qualitative inquiry is concerned with sets of principles, arrays of heuristics, critical reflections and expressions that allow complexity and diversity to be acknowledged and examined, rather than quantitative inquiry concerns about establishing a procedure, a formula or a set of rules. In qualitative inquiry, the researcher does not follow a set of 'how-to's', but rather paints a picture, potentially facilitating the voice of the research participant to be heard, for others to reflect on. This reflection will be complex and involve a variety of levels of abstraction, abstractions of the reader's own consciousness. A qualitative research study may engage the reader in reflections on similar experiences of their own, in critical reflections and questioning of assumptions about their own approaches to research, or in their own interpretations of the research narratives.
Qualitative research will involve the researcher in considerations of disclosure, advocacy, subjectivity, consciousness, participation, identification, positionings, and agency, in contrast to research that operates within a framework of logical positivism, with its emphases on objectivity, reliability, replicability, hypothesis testing, controls and statistical analyses. As Lather (1991) suggests, qualitative inquiry is part of a shift in the dominant discourse where

rather than fitting into conventional notions of social science, I am part of a movement that is reinscribing science 'otherwise' reshaping it away from a 'one best way' approach to the generation and legitimisation of knowledge about the world (p.3)

Methodologically, Eisner (1991), Reinharz (1992), and Haig-Brown (1992) characterise this stance in terms of there being a paucity of prescriptions in qualitative methodology, in contrast to the prescriptive, testable approach of quantitative methodology. Eisner (1991), Reinharz (1992), and Haig-Brown (1992) argue that this distinction reflects a number of factors. These include:

1) Rather than seeking standardisation, uniformity and normalisation, qualitative enquiry seeks an idiosyncratic focus on the relationships between individuals' strengths, ideas, aptitudes and ideologies and the cultural context within which they are located.

2) The form of the research process is influenced by style, and style is seen as personal and subjective. Far from trying to minimise personal style in order to ensure replicability, as does positivism, the individual researcher is seen as inextricably part of the work, where "the whole self is the instrument of research" (Haig-Brown, 1992, p. 104).

3) It is impossible to predict the flow of events that will unfurl nor is it possible to predict how long a project may take, therefore, "qualitative inquiry works best if researchers remain aware of the emerging configurations and make appropriate adjustments accordingly" (Eisner, 1991, p. 170).

4) The power of individuals in the research relationship is granted recognition in that the end product of any research project is the result of the reciprocal interactions between researcher and researched. "As in a good conversation, one listens to the other, and how, when and what one says depends upon what the other has to say" (Eisner, 1991, p. 170). In this sense conversation is a metaphor for reciprocity.

5) As Reinharz (1992), suggests, qualitative inquiry focusses "on interpretation, relies on the researchers' immersion in social settings and aim(s) for intersubjective understanding between researchers and the person(s) studied" (p. 46).
6) Qualitative inquiry rejects the idea of an external 'discoverable reality' independent of the researcher. Instead, it is necessary for researchers, by participation to acknowledge "that they interpret and define reality" (Reinharz, 1992 p. 46).

These six factors, emerging from the work of Eisner (1991), Reinharz (1992), and Haig-Brown (1992), illustrate that there is a considerable and ongoing movement from the dominant positivist paradigm by researchers. Integral to this movement from the dominant paradigm has been the realisation of the importance of meaning and interpretation of people's lives within their cultural contexts. As Thomas (1993) explains, this position is consistent with an understanding that people in their contexts are "engaged in attempts at relating and communicating: are making efforts to understand and interpret their own behaviour and that of others in their community, context or milieu" (p. 232). Thomas (1993) suggests that one of the implications of these 'strivings and activities' is that there is a possibility of developing "shared or negotiated meanings and shared and negotiated interpretations of both behaviours and thoughts" (p. 232). Such a stance diverts the focus of attention away from information and data to ideas, thoughts, perceptions and especially meanings by substituting organic, holistic metaphors for mechanistic ones.

**Shifting paradigms for research: challenges from indigenous peoples**

This thesis locates itself within the broad framework of qualitative research. However, it is important to note that the Western social science research approach to constituting and defining knowledge, as well as approaches to improving its methodologies by shifting the research paradigm, is challenged by indigenous peoples. This challenge rejects the binary dialectic implied in simply replacing quantitative research with qualitative research. This challenge is focussed at the impositional tendencies of all research processes that embody artificial and hegemonic power relationships (distances) between the researchers and researched. This challenge is directed at the domination of agenda-setting by researchers. Both quantitative and qualitative researchers need to address the problem of researcher imposition in their enterprises and to critique research methodologies that are rooted within the ideologies of dominant cultures.

Paradigm shifting (after Kuhn, in Lather, 1991) need not result in any change in the relationship between the researcher and those they research. Paradigm shifting may still perpetuate researcher domination through maintaining control of agenda setting within the domain of the researcher. To suggest that a qualitative as opposed to a quantitative approach would itself reorient the research enterprise to meeting the needs of the researched peoples, remains an unrealised hope. Simply stated, if this were to have been the case, then surely it would have happened already! While this thesis suggests that post-structural discourses address such issues, Western tradition will not
be able to solve these problems on its own, despite the trend in qualitative research to develop a politic of liberation. Post-structural discourse is therefore used in this thesis to demonstrate that solutions will come only from within Maori contexts by using methods within Maori control.

**Development of the interview as a method within qualitative inquiry**

From the vast array of methods and approaches available within the field of qualitative inquiry, the interview was chosen as one of the main methods to investigate issues concerning researcher imposition. However, the interview itself can be a strategy controlled by the researcher and repressive of the position of the informant/participant. In a critical review of the literature of the previous decades, Oakley (1981) concluded that

the paradigm of the social science research interview promoted in the methodological textbooks does, then, emphasise (a) its status as a mechanical instrument of data collection; (b) its function as a specialised form of conversation in which one person asks the questions and another gives the answers; (c) its characterisation of interviewees as essentially passive individuals, and (d) its reduction of interviewers to a question asking and rapport-promoting role (p. 36).

Oakley (1981) is critical of the prescriptive nature of this approach to interviewing that focusses on gathering data from essentially passive informants who are led through a series of pre-determined questions by a 'neutral' interviewer. She is also critical of the prescriptions laid down for the interviewer to be a recorder, not a debater, and that the interviewee must be treated as an 'object' or as a data-producing 'machine.' This essentially reproduces positivistic research approaches which reduce both interviewer and interviewee to the status of "depersonalised participants in the research process" (Oakley, 1981, p. 37). Oakley (1981) is also critical of those who suggest that the interview be conducted in a non-directive manner. She suggests that researchers in this hierarchical, 'expert-client' relationship use non-directive comments, such as "tell me more", "why?", "isn't that interesting" or "uh-huh" to encourage a free association of ideas in order to reveal the 'truth' that the research has been designed to uncover.

Oakley (1981) concludes that both of these approaches to interviewing see the interviewer-interviewee relationship as one which can be defined in terms of binary problematics where
Development of an 'enhanced research relationship'

Developments in interviewing have been toward mediating the tensions identified by Oakley (1981) and developing an 'enhanced research relationship'. Oakley (1981) suggested that finding out about people through interviewing "is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship" (p. 41). The need to encourage disclosure on the part of the researcher is also elaborated by Burgess (1984), Lather (1991) and Haig-Brown (1992). Reinharz (1992), from a wide-ranging review of pertinent literature, develops this notion of reciprocity further and suggests an orientation that is 'interviewee-guided' so that subtleties are identified and reacted to, and that the meaning being expressed/sought by the interviewees becomes paramount and mutual trust is developed. Reinharz (1992) also suggests that the interview process needs to explore people's views of reality (p. 18), and needs to encourage openness, trust between participants, engagement and development of potentially long-lasting relationships, (also in Oakley, 1981, p. 42) in order to form strong bonds between interviewer and interviewee.

Sequential, semi-structured, in-depth, 'interviews as conversations'

Semi-structured or unstructured interviews (Reinharz, 1992), 'interviews as conversations' (Burgess, 1984), 'in-depth' interviews (Patton, 1990), co-structured interviews (Tripp, 1983) are procedures designed to interview research participants in order to implement the enhanced research relationship. This procedure addresses the tendency for researcher imposition by offering researchers more than just people's ideas encapsulated within the words and ideological frameworks of the researcher. To Reinharz (1992, p. 19), semi-structured interviews offer access to people's ideas, thoughts and memories in their own words. To Burgess (1984), Oakley (1981) and Haig-Brown (1992) among others, this type of interview offers the opportunity to develop a reciprocal, dialogic relationship based on mutual trust, openness and engagement, in which self-disclosure, personal investment and equality is promoted. This in effect defines a symmetrical relationship. Further, Lather (1991) suggests in-depth interviews offer means of constructing what experiences mean to people. Tripp (1983) adds that these meanings can be constituted in terms of what people mean to say rather than simply the words they said.
The analogy of an in-depth interview as a conversation is suggested by Burgess (1984). However, Patton (1987) suggests that conversation is perhaps not the correct analogy because in everyday conversations questions lack clarity. Answers go unheard. The sequence of questions and answers lacks direction. The person asking questions frequently interrupts the person responding (p. 108).

As a result, conversation is best seen as a metaphor for this type of interview, which focusses on depth, detail and "probes beneath the surface, soliciting detail and providing a holistic understanding of the interviewee's point of view" (p. 108).

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews promote free interaction and opportunities for clarification and discussion between research participants through the use of open-ended questions rather than closed questions. In-depth interviews will "more clearly reveal the existing opinions of the interviewee in the context of a world-view than will a traditional interview where the interviewer's role is confined to that of question-maker and recorder" (Tripp, 1983, p. 34) as in survey research (Burgess, 1984; Eisner, 1991). Further, reflection of meaning rather than asking an interviewee to choose from a range of options predetermined and presented by an interviewer will better promote an interaction of ideas between the people participating in the interview. Tripp (1983) specifies that "for the interviewer it is as important to learn what questions are important to the interviewee as it is to learn what questions are considered important by the interviewer "(p. 34). Hence, allowing for reciprocal design and co-joint responsibility for structuring the interview partly addresses the impositional power of the researcher to deny a symmetrical relationship.

Lather (1991) suggests further that a sequence of semi-structured, in-depth interviews has the potential to maximise reciprocity through negotiation and construction of meaning, "... at a minimum this entails recycling description, emerging analysis and conclusions. A more maximal approach would involve research participants in a collaborative effort to build empirically rooted theory" (p. 61). This allows for a "deeper probing of research issues" (p. 61) by the process of returning to topics raised in previous interviews. The topic is revisited, in light of reflection undertaken by the research participants in the interim period. Tripp (1983) suggests that what is written as a product of the interview interaction may well differ from the actual words spoken, but may represent a consensus of the views and opinions held by the participants at that time, but also subject to modification through being revisited in subsequent interviews.
Problems with researcher imposition

However, all of the above considerations may prove to be necessary, but still not sufficient for the development of an interview relationship orientated at promoting self-determination. Indeed, 'finding out about people', 'self-disclosure' and the 'development of long-term relationships' even through a series of in-depth interviews as 'conversations', focussing on developing an 'enhanced research relationship', will still not address researcher imposition so long as the interview is seen as a data-gathering exercise. Graham (1984), for example, states that "the use of semi-structured interviews has become the principal means by which feminists have sought to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives (in Reinharz, 1992, p. 18; italics added). Patton (1990) also suggests that "the basic thrust of qualitative interviewing is to minimise the imposition of predetermined responses when gathering data" (p. 122; italics added).

If the orientation of qualitative interviewing remains "a research approach whereby the researcher plans to ask questions about a given topic but allows the data-gathering conversation itself to determine how the data is obtained"(Reinharz, 1992, p. 281) the researcher's agenda is still promoted. This is so because the agenda of the interview, that of data gathering, for use by the researcher, remains as the focus of the exercise, as defined by the researcher. No manner of researcher disclosure, engagement, or development of long-term relationships will necessarily address what happens to the data if the focus of the interview remains solely on data collection. How those data are interpreted and used is implicitly if not explicitly out of the hands of the researched.

As Tripp (1983) suggests, the crucial question becomes, "Who controls what happens to the data and how?" (p. 34). In other words, what considerations are given to the processing of the information, the sense-making processes and the means of constructing meaning/seeking explanations. In order to address the imposition of the researcher in processing the information, we need to question what happens to data beyond the gathering stage. Most importantly, for a research stance located within Kaupapa Maori, we need to question who constructs the account of the research interview, how is it constructed and who judges it to be fair?

The treatment of research participants as objects "for whom meaning and recommendations are unilaterally constructed by the researcher" is rejected by post-positivist researchers (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, in Robinson, 1989). Therefore, when deciding how to present an analysis of data "the problem of finding a focus and selecting and organising what to say is crucial" (Eisner, 1991, p. 189). How do you reduce events occurring in 'real time' to a 'portrait' that represents the salient features of an experience? Eisner suggests the use of an inductive approach similar to that of Glaser and Strauss's (1967) grounded theory4 which is described in Burgess (1984) and
Delamont (1992), and further developed in Strauss and Corbin (1990). In this process there is an assumption that qualitative research, by relying on induction rather than deduction, will address issues of imposition, participation and power sharing by the formulation of themes, those recurring messages construed from the events observed and the interviews transcribed.

In the process of formulating themes, researchers are required to "distil the material they have put together" (Eisner, 1991, p. 190). The notes, interviews, ideas, comments, recollections, reflections can be used to "inductively generate thematic categories" (p. 189). Eisner (1991) suggests that this categorisation can be simple, for example in a study of a middle school classroom the categories can just be "messages from the children" and "messages to the children". Most categorisation, however, is more complicated than this. Goffman (1961, in Eisner, 1991) organised his themes (recurring messages) about games, play and gaming, spontaneous involvement, ease and tension, incidents, flooding out, structure and process, interaction membrane, and conclusions. Eisner (1991) comments that

all these categories represent efforts to distil the major themes that would provide a structure to the writing. Within this structure authors select material, which they then use to illustrate the theories they have formulated. To do this well, authors must construct what is essential and use enough description to make the thematic content vivid. Themes also provide structures for the interpretation and appraisal of the events described (p.190)

He continues by considering that the

thematic structures derived inductively from the material researchers have put together and from the observations they have made can provide hubs around which the story can be told. The stories told around these thematic situations can then be used as material for a summary account of a story as a whole (p.191)

However, an approach that leaves to the researcher the categorisation of themes and the subsequent sense and meaning construction (as Eisner suggests, the development of a summary account of the story), does not address the impositional tendencies inherent in this activity. Inductive development of themes may well come from the author's ideas alone. Data can be selected to fit the preconceptions of the author and data can also be selected to construct theories. Tripp (1983) suggests that the fundamental question being addressed by Eisner, regarding the processing of data, or as he puts it "making people's views public", is really of a political (with a small 'p')
nature. In this sense then, Eisner's original 'how-to' questions render this process a quasi-positivistic search for prescription in the name of pragmatism. Instead, Tripp (1983) suggests a return to those fundamental questions about "who controls what happens to the data, and how?" and "in the research interview, who writes the account and judges it fair?" as being of primary concern. The approach that Eisner (1991) suggests perpetuates the imposition of the researcher's interpretation and editorial analysis and therefore locates ownership of the information with the researcher. This outcome obtains despite methods being employed which might facilitate the 'voice' of the researched person to be heard.

Tripp (1983) also warns of qualitative accounts that intersperse interview quotations from the interviews of a dozen informants among the author's own narrative. The danger is that this approach may impose "particular interpretations over which any one interviewee has absolutely no control" (p. 35). Qualifying or countering statements may be omitted, statements may be taken out of context and used to support the views, assumptions and aspirations of the author.

In addressing the problem of researcher control over what happens to the 'data', Opie (1989) describes a common practice that has emerged in recent years.

In order to minimise appropriation through misrepresentation and stereotype, to expand the researcher's appreciation of the situation as a result of discussion and reworking the text with the participants, and to realign the balance of power in the research relationship, a practice has developed, which crosses disciplinary boundaries, of giving a draft of the report to participants and asking them to comment on its validity (p. 8/9)

For example Middleton (1985), in an attempt to "develop a methodology which would enable the women being interviewed to assist in the analysis of their own interview data and to avoid imposing alien constructions upon their experiences" (p. 167) sent out to each woman involved in her "sociological analysis of the lives of twelve feminist educators who were born in Aotearoa/New Zealand in the years immediately following World War II" (p. i) a copy of the interviews (there were over five hundred pages in all from twelve women), colour-coded into categories representative of the "five categories on the checklist". These categories had been developed inductively by Middleton from the earlier interviews. She then describes how the responses led to "collaborative theorising" in one case and to "supportive comments" in most other cases.

However, this procedure may not be sufficient (Opie, 1989). Problems may develop when disagreements arise over interpretation. Opie suggests that, should there
be such disagreements, rather than engaging in further time consuming negotiations, the researcher may subordinate their position or simply eliminate contentious material.

There is another more subtle consideration in terms of the power relationship created by this exercise. The person who receives the (often huge) transcript, or analysis by the researcher, is obliged to spend a considerable amount of time interacting with the text. Unless the person is a co-researcher/co-participant then this may be an imposition of dubious benefit to the researched. Many authors, for example Walker (1979), Smith, (1991), Smith, (1992a), Lather (1991), and Opie (1989), all suggest that there needs to be obvious and immediate benefits to all concerned in a research project. Hence, the arrival of a vast colour-coded transcript in the mail, assuming recipients to be interested enough to interact at the level of concentration practised by the researcher, raises the issue of the 'response cost' in terms of the 'cost of non-compliance' (Glynn, 1994). That is, the cost of resistance in terms of time and effort required may be too great for them to engage in, particularly if as what they are asked to engage with is the analysis undertaken by the researcher, rather than their being asked to reflect on what they said in terms of their own analysis. The problem may be compounded in cases of cross-cultural translation of meaning as Urion (1990) addresses (in Te Hennepe, 1993). In all, a high degree of compliance with the researcher's analysis and constructions may be an inevitable, if unsuspected and invalid outcome. In this thesis, it is suggested that returning the script to the co-participant is a necessary part of the ongoing dialogue. However, it is emphasised that engagement is to be with the text in the sense termed by Connelly and Clandinin (1990) as "the restorying quality of narrative" (p. 11) and not with the analysis done by the researcher. This is to maximise opportunities for reciprocal negotiation and a collaborative construction of meaning by the participants.

Furthermore, depiction of the actual words of the research participant is often insisted upon. However, there is a danger that this strategy may replace the search for meaning through engagement in sequential discourse with a concentration on literal representation. Often, the actual words used at a particular time may not convey the full meaning that the person wanted to express. They may be able, on reflection, to express themselves in a manner that further explains or advances their position and understanding. This highlights the importance of sequential interviews that are, in Lather's (1991) terms, conducted within a framework of "dialogic reflexivity". This method insists that the theory generated (i.e. the meaning constructed/the explanations arrived at) must be a product of the interaction between the interview and interviewee, researcher/researched. In other words, to ensure the fair representation of the participants' views, "negotiation of the account of meaning is essential" (Tripp, 1983, p. 39).
An example of collaborative construction of meaning

Te Hennepe (1993), when reporting on researching Canadian First Nation students' experiences with anthropology classes, indicated how such an approach could be developed. She divided the research process into three phases that were distinct as to process, knowledge revealed and limitations and problems encountered. Initially there was the phase of participating in conversations, which she describes as "We discuss what you heard (experienced) and what it meant to you" (p. 213). This was followed by her "analysis of what we said" (p. 214). During this second phase she coded the transcripts into "general categories that emerged from the transcripts as topics of conversation in the stories I had been told" (p. 214; emphasis added). These categories were used to identify the common themes which were then used to recode the transcripts in order to generate questions from a central theme, in this case authority.

However, on reflection, Te Hennepe raised two concerns about her approach. She acknowledged that the typed script "is the beginning of the research participants' loss of control over their words and over ways their words will be manipulated. Some might say that the speaking of the words was the beginning of the loss" (p. 218). The second concern she raised was that her coding of the interviews created a representational problem. Although she was familiar with the First Nation's peoples' perceptions she was outside of their actual lived experiences. The categories employed were her categories, based on her perceptions. On reflection, she suggested that "only collaborative coding would be legitimately representational" (p. 218). Te Heneppe considers that she could have sought to create a representational language that spoke with the voices of those involved. Her concern was that by removing segments of conversation from their sense making context, she was removing the individual from their cultural context, that cultural complexity which gives an individual 'voice'. She therefore questions how researchers, especially those from a different culture, can position themselves as creators of space where those directly involved, and with actual lived experience, "can act and speak on their own behalf" (after Lather, 1989, in Te Hennepe, 1993, p. 218).

Te Hennepe's work suggests that the first two phases described should be collapsed into one (holistic) approach, seeking the authentic voice unconstrained by the categories developed by the researcher. She appeared to be considering how an interview could be used to construct meaning. Mishler (1986) addresses this idea by suggesting that in order to construct meaning it is necessary to appreciate how meaning is grounded in, and constructed through, discourse. Discursive practice is contextually (for example, culturally) and individually related. Meanings in discourse are neither singular nor fixed. Terms take on "specific and contextually grounded meanings within and through the discourse as it develops and is shaped by speakers" (p. 65).
'community of interest' between researchers and participants or among participants (call them what you will) cannot be created unless the interview is constructed so that

interviewers and respondents, strive to arrive together at meanings that both can understand. The relevance and appropriateness of questions and responses emerges through and is realised in the discourse itself. The standard process of analysis of interviews abstracts both questions and responses from this process. By suppressing the discourse and by assuming shared and standard meanings, this approach short-circuits the problem of meaning (Mishler, 1986, p. 65)

This thesis therefore suggests a trade-off between two extremes. The first position claims "the words of an interview are the most accurate data and that the transcript of those words carries that accuracy with negligible loss" (Tripp, 1983, p. 40). In other words, what people say should be presented unaltered and not analysed in any way beyond that which the respondent undertook. The second position maximises researcher interpretation, editorial control and ownership. This thesis suggests a third position where the 'coding' procedure is established and developed by the research participants as a process of 'restorying', that is the co-joint creation of further meaning. For example, in this thesis an agreed-to agenda was derived from the Kaupapa Maori research context. This agenda was used by the research participants to identify issues, descriptions, analyses and conclusions that became part of a narrative and also to identify issues that needed clarification and consideration in the next interview. Further, from this position, the participants' words themselves are flexible, being of less importance than the collaboratively constructed views and meanings of the research participants. The narratives become 'co-authored statements', an agreed-upon account of the discussions that employs a "cycle of negotiation, discussions and writing ... an accurate record of the actual words spoken is of less importance than the effective transformation by the researcher of what was actually said into what the participants want written about what they said" (Tripp, 1983, p.35).

This thesis further suggests there is the need to develop a way to conduct interviews so that the 'coding' exercise, as a product of shared meanings, becomes part of the process of description and analysis. It is suggested that sequential, semi-structured, in-depth, "interviews as conversations" conducted in a dialogic, reflexive manner need to be developed in order to facilitate ongoing collaborative analysis and construction of meaning/explanations about the experiences of the research participants. It is suggested that it is this process that could contribute to creating material for a summary account of the story as a whole, that is, as a narrative, rather than as Eisner (1991) suggested, for an analysis derived inductively by the researcher.
Consequently, rather than needing to reduce the distance between researcher and researched in quantitative terms (as suggested by Troyna and Carrington, 1989), there needs to be a qualitative shift in terms of how participants relate to each other. One way of achieving this shift is by focussing on stories and narratives of these stories. In this approach it is important first to consider in what ways those who are traditionally the passive 'researched', those who are traditionally without voice, can speak. This next section identifies what constitutes narrative inquiry and identifies that such an approach requires a shift in the relationship between those traditionally constituted as researchers and those traditionally constituted as researched.

**Research as stories**

The main claim for the use of narrative in educational research is that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the ways humans experience the world (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 2)

Narrative inquiry (after Connelly and Clandinin, 1990) in the form that Ballard (1994a) terms "Research as Stories" is an approach that may allow us as researchers to address a range of stories as involving and being involved in research. In other words, the researcher is not the only one involved in the research beyond the 'data-gathering' 'stage'. Other people involved in the research process are not just "informants, but are participants, with meaningful experiences, concerns and questions" (p. 298). Research as stories is aimed at uncovering the many experiences of the participants, emphasising complexities rather than commonalities. This approach challenges research that seeks to reduce diversity to common experiences, normal solutions, standardised responses and even the use of politically correct language and attitudes. All these strategies promote the dominance of the agenda of the researcher.

Research as stories addresses Kaupapa Maori concerns about legitimation, representation, and accountability in an holistic, culturally appropriate manner because story telling allows the research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in the language chosen by the researcher. In this manner stories are able to address the potential for hegemony by the researcher. Researcher hegemony is seen in researchers' beliefs that their interpretations and assumptions are more 'common-sensical' or more 'natural' than those of the participants. Stories are a way of representing truth. Different stories give different versions of and approaches to truth. Stories allow the diversities of truth to be heard, rather than just one dominant version. Stories allow power and control to reside within the domain of the research participant. Jackson (1994) identified this control as "the
power to define" what knowledge is created and how it is created/defined. For example, at a societal level, Maori people controlled, protected and defined this land and the people on the basis of chiefly control and responsibility (tino Rangatiratanga). The Treaty of Waitangi was an attempt to identify the powers to protect and define by both signatories. Maori stories of the Treaty are different from the stories presented by representatives of 'the Crown'. The process of colonisation entailed the hegemonic imposition of the 'truth' created by the Crown over the 'truth' created by the Maori. Colonisation removed the right guaranteed to Maori people to protect and define their own stories. The Crown's story of New Zealand is of one people, of assimilation, integration and biculturalism. Maori stories differ greatly.

As at the societal level, storytelling at an individual level, within an enhanced symmetrical research relationship, determines that the storyteller maintains the power to define what constitutes the story and the truth and the meaning it has for them. Stories are related within the cultural frame of reference incorporating the language of the research participant, rather than that of the researcher. While the storyteller makes every endeavour to ensure understanding on the part of the listener, there is a real sense that it is up to the other to understand, and to bring their own understandings to the interpretations. In this sense, the agonistic position of researcher as interpreter and 'conduit' from the research informant to listener/reader of the story is challenged. Story as a research approach therefore opens up the complexity of human experience and the multiplicity of reflected interpretations where none is privileged, absolutist or authoritative beyond the sense in which it can be contextually verifiable.

Stories teach us about life within the ongoing informal education system we all take part in. One type of story fundamental to the identity of Maori people is their whakapapa and the associated raranga korero (stories of people, events and places associated with the names of the whakapapa). Stories of whakapapa are located in specific places and "tell" the uri (descendants) how they relate to that place. The stories are particular to the people of that place and time. The stories are idiosyncratic and are specific to that iwi or hapu. Stories contain information about the power to protect and the power to define, and contain messages for living (Walker, 1978). The language used is contextually defined. Word and meanings create a social relationship, create the story and create understanding.

Like the Maori proverb "to see the future, we look to the past", the text of a story looks two ways. The text looks backwards into the events that led to the telling of the story within the cultural world-view of the story teller. The text looks forward to the social and cultural contexts of the reader. This consideration of the reader is fundamental to story telling. It addresses the oft-quoted concern for 'readerly' accessible text, for less elite language.
There is a wairua (spirituality) in story. Story has a powerful interest attraction. I can still remember nearly every moment of the situation when I first heard the story of Haunui a Nanaia, how he chased his errant wife from Southern Taranaki to the Wellington area, naming the places as he went. I remember being spell-bound as Tipene O'Regan told us the story of Haunui's namings in Toa Rangatira Whare whakairo (meeting house). As the namings were revealed, so were the details of the oral map that Haunui left in the form of a story, an oriori (lullaby) for his descendants. This type of response can be seen in the eyes of students when the lecturer steps from their lectern and says "now, there is a very good story about this point...". The message and the meaning of the storyteller get across in such a way that there is joy in the telling and in the hearing. There is a wairua to the story that binds the listener to the teller beyond any linkage created by the words on their own.

There are strong cultural preferences for narrative. Historically, Maori, as an oral culture, devised methods to pass on the multiplicity of knowledge that any culture gathers and constructs about itself. Story was one of the common ways of imparting knowledge. Particular messages and proverbs were told in narrative form or in waiata (song), moteatea (poetry), pakiwaitara (story), and kauwhau (moralistic tale) (Metge, 1984). Some stories had to maintain strong criteria of accuracy, for example whakapapa and associated raranga korero. Others did not have such restrictions. Other stories were meant to be embellished to maintain the interest that invoked the wairua and the mauri of the story. The message was more important. Of course stories varied from iwi to iwi, hapu to hapu as memories changed and local circumstances dictated. The mana of the story teller in this case was not only in the exact recitation of the words, but also in the power of his/her delivery, the power the storyteller had to persuade others of their position. Among Maori people today, story is still a strongly culturally preferred medium of instruction.

Joan Metge (1989) recalled that when she was first involved in talking to Maori groups about the need to develop the Maori Education Foundation, she presented her 'story' with diagrams and statistical data documenting Maori underachievement and the educational crisis. The next speaker was John Rangihau, an eminent Maori scholar. He proceeded to tell a story of his childhood and some experiences that he had had at school. Metge was bemused by this approach until she realised that he had covered all of the points that she had made, and that he had covered them in such a way that related to the lived experiences of his listeners.

Maori students often recount the importance and pervasive nature of stories in their upbringing. In fact it would seem that a Polynesian cultural preference for story as a medium of education is widespread.

Donmeyer (in Ballard, 1994a), Guba and Lincoln (1989, in Robinson, 1993), Connelly and Clandinin (1990) and Geertz (in Haig-Brown, 1992) suggest that
vicarious experiences are powerful ways of learning. "Stories convey knowledge within
the context of the complexity of human affairs, expanding an understanding of other
people and our sense of community with them" (Haig-Brown, 1992, p. 302). This focus
on complexity is in opposition to the traditional notion of research as analysis for
synthesis, analysis for simplicity, essence, kernels of truth. Stories increase the range of
interpretation, knowledge and experiences available to the potential researcher.

What does this mean for the researcher?

The general agonistic trend in research has been for the 'research story'-teller to
be an outsider who gathers the stories of 'others', collates them and generalises as to the
patterns and commonalities. As a result the 'individuals' stories are subsumed within
that of the researcher as the storyteller. One response to this form of researcher
imposition has seen researchers gathering stories as told by others, then presenting these
stories as finished products for the reader. The involvement of the researcher in this
type of exercise is that of a collector of experiences. This is a respectful, empowering
position which Thomas (1993) describes as "collections of autonomous experiences".

However, this thesis seeks to investigate my own position as a researcher within
a co-joint reflection on shared experiences and co-joint construction of meanings about
these experiences, a position where the stories of the research participants merged with
my own to create new stories. Thomas (1993) terms this position as being part of a
collaborative narrative construction, Tripp refers to this as creating co-authored
statements, Connelly and Clandinin (1990) term it collaborative stories, that is the co-
joint construction of a story about (in this case) the research process. This thesis seeks
to contribute to the conversation about collaborative storying which is an approach that
goes beyond simply focussing on the co-operative sharing of experiences and focusses
on connectedness, engagement, and involvement with the other research participants
within the cultural world-view/discursive practice within which they function. This
thesis seeks to identify what constitutes this engagement and what implications this has
for promoting self-determination/agency/voice in the research participants.

As with other forms of narrative inquiry where Connelly and Clandinin (1990)
suggest that the research participants need first to tell their story, so too in attempts at
collaboration the researcher needs to enable the person who has long been silenced in
the research relationship to have the time and space to tell their story. This allows other
participants' stories to gain the authority and the validity that the researcher's story has
had for so long. This initiation sets the scene and the pattern for subsequent interactions,
where the research participants (termed as such to remove the discursive distance
established by the conceptualisation of researcher and researched) engage in an
interactive, complex, holistic approach to research. This involves mutual telling and
retelling of stories by people who are living those stories. In such an approach to
narrative inquiry, research participants are engaging in a discourse, where meanings are контextually grounded and shift as the discourse develops and is shaped by the speakers (Mishler, 1986, p. 65). In this way, research participants tell others of their experiences and relive their experiences and their stories of their experiences, their stories of their stories and so on. The researcher becomes involved in the process of collaboration, of "mutual story-telling and re-storying as the research proceeds ... a relationship in which both stories are heard (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p.4). This relationship creates a setting in which the researcher becomes an inextricable part. Such an approach is similar to other contexts where the other research participants relate their story, for example at a lecture or in a wharenui (meeting house), for they have made decisions and selections regarding what and how it will be told, according to 'Who is the listener. What is their culture? What is their status? What is their age? What is their kaupapa? What parts of the story will be important to them? What parts will be safe to tell them?' The restorying can then proceed on this basis once such acknowledgement of the location of power has been identified.

This consideration reinforces how the personal element is inextricably involved in the research process. Inextricably involved in the sense that Oakley (1981) identifies where "personal involvement is more than dangerous bias, it is the condition under which people come to know each other and admit others into their lives" (p. 58). In many types of positivistic research, personal involvement is denied, and measures to control, minimise or eliminate personal individualism are instituted. In much qualitative research, the subjectivity of the researcher is acknowledged and attempts are made to acknowledge and reduce the distance between the researcher and the researched (Lather, 1991; Fonow and Cook, 1991; Troyna, 1992), and so control the effects of subjectivity. However, the crucial consideration is that the person of the researcher influences the research relationship, no matter what actions they perform. In this sense, there is no distance between the researcher and researched because distance is a construct created by researchers, who then constitute discursive practices to account and deal with distance, whether it be in terms of objectivity or subjectivity. Instead of addressing distance, Heshusius (1994) suggests that researchers need to acknowledge their participation, and attempt to develop a "participatory consciousness." This means becoming involved in a "somatic, non-verbal quality of attention that necessitates letting go of the focus of self" (p. 15).

Such a position stands in contrast to those who escape into objectivism, "that pathology of cognition that entails silence about the speaker, about (their) interests and (their) desires, and how these are socially situated and structurally maintained" (Gouldner, 1976, in Tripp, 1983). Similarly, Heshusius (1994) questions what we as researchers do after being confronted with 'subjectivities'. "Does one evaluate them and try to manage and to restrain them? And then believe one has the research process once
again under control? Both these positions address 'meaningful' epistemological and methodological questions of their own choosing. Instead, Heshusius suggests researchers need to address those questions that would address moral issues, such as 'what kind of society do we have or are we constructing?' (p. 20). For example, how can racism be addressed unless those who perpetuate it become aware through a participatory consciousness of the lived reality of those who suffer? How can the researcher become aware of the meaning of racism if they perpetuate an artificial 'distance' and objectify the 'subject', dealing with issues in a manner that is of interest to the researcher, rather than of concern to the subject?

Hence, participating in the construction of the research account acknowledges that the researcher is linked and is an integral part of the process, no matter what they do. As Connelly and Clandinin (1990) suggest "the two narratives of participant and researcher become, in part, a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through inquiry" (p. 4). This narrative will be specific to the research participants, idiosyncratic, culturally specific to the degree of cultural competency of the participants and non-generalisable beyond the context of the participants. To involve another person in the process, either as a reader or as a listener, is to alter the interaction, for the next person will not see the stories as the original people do. Instead, additional people will bring themselves into a process of reconstruction of the narrative in order to address questions and raise issues that are of concern to them.

Rather than there being distinct stages in a research project, of 'gaining access', 'data-gathering', to 'data-processing', to 'theorising', in this approach the image of a spiral, a koru is suggested as one that describes the process of continually revisiting the kaupapa of the research. From the very first meeting, total involvement by both researcher and participant is developed. Decisions about access, description, involvement, initiation, interpretation and explanations are embedded in the very process of storytelling and retelling where "interviews are conducted between researcher and participant, transcripts are made, the meetings are made available for further discussion, and they become part of the ongoing narrative record" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 5).
Constructing the narratives within this thesis

The narratives presented in this thesis are the result of responding to the methodological issues as outlined in this chapter.

The research participants were interviewed formally at least three times. The object of the interviews was to investigate what people's experiences in the research projects under consideration meant to them, in terms of Kaupapa Maori concerns. Although I was a participant in most of the projects, the people I interviewed, in four of the projects studied, were primarily responsible for much of the work in the project. Nevertheless, there was a very real sense that these interviews were conversations/discussions between interested parties, not strangers or even people who had met for the purpose of the research.

The interviews were not unstructured conversations but were semi-structured in that they focussed on the concerns of a Kaupapa Maori approach to research. Research participants were asked to narrate their research story in terms of those concerns about research that constitute a Kaupapa Maori approach to research.

Considerable negotiation with some of the participants was necessary before the first interview to establish the ground rules of the discussions, and to introduce the idea that I wanted to move beyond data gathering. The agonistic approach to interviews is still very pervasive. With others, however, it never entered their heads that I would want to engage in any other activity than a full debate of the issues. The first interview tended to focus on the initiation of the research project/s, the problems as identified by the researchers and/or areas of concern that were part of their world-view. As appropriate, other considerations were introduced into the conversation. Although the interview schedule (Appendix 3) is presented as a series of formal questions, it was never operated in this way, but rather was kept in front of me as an "aide memoire" (Eisner, 1991).

The initial interviews were later transcribed by either of two extremely competent typists. The transcription was then reviewed, word for word by myself to check that it was a true and accurate transcription of the words on the tape. It was important to check the transcriptions for sometimes we all spoke at once, or spoke in Maori, or laughed a lot. This presented a challenge to the transcribers. After the first time through the tape, and after negotiating with the research participants that my task was to do so, I began the process of rendering a collaborative story by beginning to turn the spoken words into written text, by changing grammar, deleting hesitations and gaps, and generally attempting to transpose oracy and body language into a written text. As Tripp (1983) suggests, "it must be recognised that the conventions of oral speech are quite different from those of written speech, in terms of their generative and communicative processes" (p.35). In fact, it is important to reiterate that the purpose of constructing collaborative stories is to produce a product that speaks directly to people
beyond the people who usually hear a tape transcription, that is a researcher who is using the interview to collect information that is then processed in order to speak to others. Therefore as well as attempting to 'speak' in text, there is the need to revisit the debate on a number of occasions. It is almost axiomatic to suggest that the meaning constructed by the reader will be different from that constructed by the co-participant/listener in the interview because the differences in the basis of their shared understanding will transform the content and structure of the message. It was necessary to revisit the meaning of the words. Changing the spoken words was but one means of doing this, in order to effectively communicate the intended meaning through the medium of writing. In this sense, the revisiting of the stories is to develop a narrative located within a particular context, that may serve someone else as a guide to the study of other such contexts.

This approach where the research participants were attempting to talk to the reader directly, also had major implications for my own position as a researcher. If I had abrogated the function of interpreter of gathered data, what was my function? Beyond participating in the research story, my function was primarily to act as an editor of the narrative, or perhaps more as the first author of a collaboratively constructed story. I drew out highlights, conclusions and considerations that were made, and returned them to the 'pot' for revisiting in further interviews.

After Tripp (1983), it also appeared that my position was not one of reflection and polite consideration of the opinion of others, but rather may well have become a warm argument ... both participants ... may be forced to take account of inconsistencies in and objections to their expressed viewpoint, and to examine and possibly change their views, rather than simply to articulate them for transcription (p. 34).

Arguments may be put up for evaluation, probing and responding, positions may be challenged by suggesting the other person is wrong, that they have misconceptions, clouded views, blurred vision and so on. The aim of this approach is to explore the assumptions and the implications of the positions taken by the research participants.

I did return the transcripts; a copy of the raw draft, the 'tidied-up text' and the initial narrative to the co-participants, not to swamp them with paper, nor to seek their compliance but as information about where we were up to in the process of telling the research story. We went through the story, identifying points of interest we considered that we needed to return to in the next interview in order to address the kaupapa. This process was repeated and the resulting transcripts joined together along the lines of the themes that were suggested, either by the kaupapa of the interviews or by the development of the story itself. As will be seen in the narratives, the results are research
stories that weave together the experiences of researchers in relation to a Kaupapa Maori approach to research.

However, while this somewhat orderly pattern was followed with Ted, Alva, Monty and Marie, the interviews with Huata developed in a very different manner. We were working very closely on developing the second of his two projects while we were constructing the narrative about the first project. The three interviews with Huata happened very quickly. No sooner was the first interview over than he came to me with questions and comments that he had reflected on following the interview. What he had to say was so comprehensive and added so much to the story of the first interview that we immediately sat down and got out the tape recorder again. It soon became clear that this was a different story from any other I had heard before. Indeed his mana as a tohunga (expert) so encapsulated the research method I had developed and extended it by adding relative positionings for each of us drawn from a Maori context. This process went on at the same time as we engaged in collaborative storying and restorying. It was not possible for us to enter into a co-equal relationship as described in much of the literature on semi-structured, in-depth interviewing because our knowledge levels were so different. After the initial interviews where we spoke about the process of conducting the research, and I maintained my role as 'editor' and co-participant, the relationship became very much a tauira teina (student) seeking explanation from a tuakana. For example, when Huata was in my office one day, I mentioned to him how I was puzzled by such and such. He said, "the concept you are searching for is te whai ao" and so the third interview began.

When constructing the narratives as text I paraphrased as little as possible and used extensive quotations in order to maximise the analysis/voice/experiences, as well as the interactions, discussions and meanings constructed during the interviews. It will be seen as the narratives progress, less and less editorial commentary was needed. Indeed the narratives take on a life of their own by presenting the considerations and the constructions made in the voices of all the research participants. The aim of this was threefold. The first was to respect the integrity of the analysis and constructions by the interviewed themselves. The second was to reduce potential errors in communicating the thoughts of others, and to enable my readers to form their own analyses. I wanted to offer my readers the opportunity "to consider alternative ways of organising and presenting what people have said" (Haig-Brown, 1992, p. 109). The third aim was to present my own analysis along with the voice of the interviewee either during the interviews or as editorial comment and explanations within the narratives.

I am not attempting to speak for the other researchers or co-researchers. My intention is to present the voices of researchers, mine included. There is an attempt within the interview and within the series of interviews to actually co-construct a mutual understanding by means of sharing experiences and thoughts. Where it is obvious that
this is happening, extensive excerpts of this dialogue are included in the text, allowing the participants to speak for themselves.

A related problem that concerns a number of qualitative researchers is how to convey the non-verbal context of the interview and the fact that the interview is an oral presentation, Opie (1989) refers to this as the "intensity of the speaking voice", an awareness of which can assist in analysis (p. 7). The non-verbal issue is complex and there are a number of factors to consider here; the environment of the interview, body language, expressions, emphases. To transfer all that to paper is impossible, yet it is the task challenging us. However, if the process of placing the voice into the printed word is done in conjunction with the co-participant, then at least there is collaborative decision making on this difficult task.

**Interviews as 'chat'**

It is important to acknowledge that these interviews were conducted within an ongoing relationship that included what Haig-Brown (1992) describes as "interviews as chat". This is a form of interview that she conducted when undertaking her research into First Nation peoples' control of an institution. She describes this second type of interview as informal interviews that are

so close to everyday conversations ... they often served as an opportunity for people to follow up on more formal interviews or simply to comment generally on the day's significant events, or on details they thought I might be interested in (p. 105)

This type of interview formed a crucial and important part of the conduct of the present thesis/construction of the narratives, because the projects presented in the thesis were all conducted within a research group, and as a result communication between a significant number of the people involved in the projects was continuous. One example of such 'chat' interview was a comment Ted Glynn made to me on 21 April 1994 when we were talking informally about the latest developments in the Tatari Tautoko Tauawhi project. He said that the whole process of sequential, semi-structured, in-depth interviewing focussing on a series of issues was interesting because it forced him to think about things in much more detail and in a more focussed manner than he would when undertaking a project where the focus is on the work at hand. We returned to this topic later in a formal interview. It was often these informal discussions and questions that threw up issues of process that were not dealt with within the project under study itself. Indeed, as in Ted's case, the issues were often driving the projects, but this process of reflective dialogue brought them out in sharper focus.
This description of interviews as 'chat' is useful, and aptly describes the process of participation and observation that occurred within these research projects. There was frequent informal dialogue between the members of the research group, as well as formal meetings to discuss the progress of the projects. Further, because I had participated in the development of the projects themselves, I had access to them in order to research the process of the projects. Just as other researchers in these projects had to initially establish themselves as part of a network, I had to participate in the network of each of the researchers and research projects in order to establish my credibility to proceed with the interviewing and reciprocal analysis of the projects.

'Access' to the people I spoke with was not just a matter of asking them, but was gained by means of two years of participation in the planning and implementation of the projects. My participation in the process of reflective interviewing about the experiences of the researchers in the projects was possible because I became a 'known' face and developed a common purpose with the other participants of the projects. The researchers felt it was alright for me to interview them about the projects because I was accepted as a person known to each of the groups. This is significant because as Reinhartz (1992) says "every aspect of a researcher's identity can impede or enhance empathy" (p. 26). Therefore, when the interviews with the researchers began there was no need for 'ice-breaking' type activities because everyone knew me. The interviews were seen as a natural flow-on from the actual work of the projects.

**Hui as a metaphor for collaborative storying**

Just as storytelling is a culturally located and culturally legitimated process, so is the process of collaborative storying. The situation of two or three people collaboratively constructing a story about their experiences within a particular research context can be extrapolated and understood within Maori cultural practices. Metaphorically, the concept of a Maori hui describes the interactions between the participants within the interviews and the process of arriving at an agreed story/write-up of the narratives. The interviews for the present study were conducted within a context where there had already been a ritual of encounter, a metaphoric 'powhiri' process (Salmond, 1975) in which there had already been an expression of the 'take' under discussion. These take had been "laid down" as it were, and there had already been participation by the interviewer in the activities of the researched. This was not a case where interviews were conducted with people selected by the researcher for the likelihood that they would contribute to the researcher's agenda. These interviews were a useful part of an already existing and ongoing exercise.

A real hui includes a formal welcome, a welcome rich in cultural meaning and imagery, and cultural practices which fulfill the enormously culturally important task of recognising the relative tapu and mana (uniqueness) of all the participants (Salmond,
Once the formal welcome is complete, and once the participants have been ritually joined together by the process of the powhiri, hui participants move onto the discussion of the 'take' or the matter under consideration. This usually takes place within the meeting house, a place designated for this very purpose, free of distractions and interruptions. This house is symbolically the embodiment of an ancestor. The participants address the matters under consideration, under the guidance of kaumatua, whose primary function is to create and monitor the correct spiritual and procedural framework within which the participants can discuss the issues before them. The 'take' is laid down as it were in front of all. Then people get a chance to address the issue without fear of being interrupted. Generally the procedure is for people to speak one after another, either in sequence of left to right or of anyone participating as they see fit. People get a chance to state and restate their meanings, to revisit their meanings and to modify, delete, adapt their meanings according to local tikanga. The discourse spirals, in that the flow of talk may seem circuitous, opinions may vary and waver, but the seeking of a collaboratively constructed story is central. The controls over proceedings are temporal in the form of kaumatua, and spiritual, as in all Maori cultural practices. The procedures are steeped in metaphoric meanings, richly abstract allusions being made constantly to cultural messages, stories, events of the past and aspirations for the future. They are also highly effective in dealing with contemporary issues and concerns of all kinds.

Rose Pere (1991) describes the key qualities of a hui as respect, consideration, patience, and co-operation. People need to feel that they have the right and the time to express their point of view. You may not always agree with the speakers, but it is considered bad form to interrupt their flow of speech while they are standing on their feet; one has to wait to make a comment. People may be as frank as they like about others at the hui, but usually state their case in such a way that the person being criticised can stand up with some dignity in his/her right of reply. Once everything has been fully discussed and the members come to some form of consensus, the hui concludes with a prayer and the partaking of food (p.44).

The aim of a hui is to reach consensus, to arrive at a jointly constructed meaning. This takes time, days if need be, or sometimes a series of hui will be held in order that the kaumatua monitoring proceedings can tell when a constructed 'voice' has been arrived at.

This procedure was replicated in the sequence of formal semi-structured, in-depth interviews and the informal 'interviews as chat' within the agreed-to agenda of Kaupapa Maori framework of research. The object was to conduct a sequence of
interviews that enabled a jointly constructed narrative of the meanings of the
experiences of the participants in the research process to be constructed.

This chapter has identified that collaborative storying as a research method
addresses Maori cultural aspirations and preferences. It is also located within Maori
cultural practices. Collaborative storying addresses the problem of researcher
imposition, a major concern to this present study. The next section of this thesis puts
these ideas into practice. The collaborative stories in the next four chapters demonstrate
how the researchers were involved in creating collaborative stories within their own
research projects in order to address Kaupapa Maori research issues. These next
chapters also demonstrate how we were involved in constructing collaborative stories
when we jointly sought to explain our participation within these projects.

1 Preliminary considerations of the issues raised in this chapter have been published previously as
Empowering Research, New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies. 29 (2).

2 Literally a dispersal.

3 These were the decades immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi when the struggle for
sovereignty was at its height.

4 Delamont (1992) describes the development of "grounded theory" in 1967 as 'ground-breaking', in that
it provided the major intellectual justification for not using statistical sampling techniques.

5 However, the third phase of Te Hennepe's research has culturally appropriate messages for New
Zealand. She said that this final phase was where "I create a text to represent what I learned" (p. 206).
This locates the researcher into a whanau context, as teina, as a learner, as a participant who is working
for the good of the group and who is stating what they have learnt from their tuakana in the whanau.
Chapter 4: The stories of Tu Mai Kia Tu Ake and Mahi Tu Tonu

Introduction

This is the story of two interrelated research projects; Tu Mai Kia Tu Ake: the impact of Taha Maori on Otago and Southland schools and Mahi Tu Tonu: the construction of a compendium of resources to implement Taha Maori in Otago and Southland schools. These two projects were undertaken by Huata Holmes during 1992 and 1993. This account of Huata’s experiences and understandings of these projects was constructed by a series of in-depth interviews, numerous informal discussions between Huata and myself and through my participation within the projects as supervisor, kaitiaki (guide), and kaiawhina (helper) and co-author of the report of the first study.

The account is arranged about the themes of initiation, benefits, work, consultation, gathering and processing of data, accountability, conflicts and overall impressions and other themes that emerged from our discussions. These other themes became evident as the interviews were conducted and later during analysis of the interview transcripts. It is important to this process of conducting in-depth interviews that these subsequent themes were not just presented in the text by myself alone, but rather were developed within and returned to the interview context for reflection, clarification and joint construction of meaning. The themes used to organise the interviews were intended to facilitate examination and reflection on the subject matter. They were not designed to elucidate any particular response nor any particular evidence for subsequent processing.

Huata Holmes, the researcher

Huata Holmes is a kaumatua of Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha people. He has a unique background because he is one of the few remaining native speakers of the Southern dialect of te reo Maori (Maori language). He was educated in the language and culture of the South by his grandmother and great-grandmother at Waikava and on Stewart Island and later by his cousins at Tuahiwi near Christchurch. He is currently the principal of a local contributing primary school, a commercial pilot, and a skilled navigator. Among many other official duties is his position as the Pou Here Tangata (the person who binds people together) of the Education Department of the University of Otago. During 1992 and 1993 he was seconded to the Education Department as a Research Affiliate. During his time in the department he continued to act as Pou Here Tangata and as Kaumatua for the research group Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. He also undertook the two interrelated research projects described and discussed here.
The projects

In 1992 Huata commenced the first of his two projects in Otago and Southland schools. This project evaluated the impact of Taha Maori on clusters of schools in Otago and Southland.

Taha Maori was an initiative of the former Department of Education in the early 1980s, in response to the growing call among Maori and non-Maori educators for some recognition of the place of Maori as tangata whenua (indigenous people) in Aotearoa.

Taha Maori suffered from many limiting factors since its advent; lack of funding, lack of training, lack of follow-up and lack of clear goals and guidelines (Smith, 1990). In addition, in the South, the impact of colonisation was so devastating that there has been a dramatic loss of language and tikanga among the Southern people. So great is the gap between the understandings of the non-Maori and Maori people of Otago and Southland that it was highly debatable as to whether Taha Maori programmes were the appropriate medium for bridging the gap.

Taha Maori programmes were further criticised (Smith, 1990) because of 'Pakeha capture' of Maori knowledge. Pakeha capture reorients that knowledge from meeting the needs of Maori children to the needs of non-Maori and the needs of the non-Maori dominated education system. It was felt that the net effect of these programmes, rather than promoting Maori achievement, was to further limit the life-chances of Maori children, and ironically to enhance the life-chances of non-Maori children, often at the expense of resources for Maori being used for this purpose rather than for Maori preferred purposes.

The circumscribed information about te reo and nga tikanga Maori added little to the knowledge base of local iwi, while being sufficiently bland to be 'acceptable' to non-Maori, and therefore able to be assimilated by them" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. i)

Simon (1990) details how policy decisions by education authorities in the early 20th century were based on racist ideologies that justified and underlaid these limited educational outcome for Maori children. One major concern of the critics of Taha Maori was that these ideologies still underpinned the policies of Taha Maori (Smith, 1990).

However, since the advent of the Taha Maori programmes in the 1980s there have been many other major changes within the education system. The Education Amendment Act 1989 heralded the reforms known as 'Tomorrow's Schools' with devolution to locally controlled boards of Trustees. The devolution of the administration of schools, while giving more say to communities in the running of their schools also required them to consult with their local Maori communities when
producing their mission statements and policies. From this consultation schools were expected to develop charter statement containing objectives and policy. This charter was to signal the action they expected would be undertaken in various areas of school life. Schools were also required to incorporate provisions to address the Treaty of Waitangi in their school practice. However, this was made optional in 1991 with the incoming National Government. Despite this option none of the schools that Huata visited during his research journey had dropped their commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi by 1992, thus demonstrating a continued willingness and commitment by Southern educational groups to address this crucial document and its implications for Maori education.

There were also many changes in the wider socio-cultural context that heralded the resurgence of mana whenua (local Maori people) pride. The growth in pride of being Maori and the growing realisation among the non-Maori population of New Zealand that Maori people were not sharing equitably in the benefits of the modern state gave strength to a growing ethnic revitalisation movement (Banks, 1988). In education, developments focussed on the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 as the founding document of the new nation, a treaty that guaranteed Maori security and sovereignty in Aotearoa. Further, the development of a Kaupapa Maori movement, together with the rapid proliferation of Kohanga Reo, Wananga Maori and the consequent development of Kura Kaupapa Maori heightened the focus on the self-determination principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. This added strength to Maori resistance to traditional colonial structures in education by promoting the need for Maori controlled educational institutions.

Initiation of the project, Tu Mai kia Tu Ake

The project was inspired by the changes brought about by the new directives in the Education Act 1989 within the wider context of socio-political change in New Zealand in the late 1980s. In contrast to the 1980s there is in the 1990s a statement of commitment by each school to address Treaty issues. How these various changes in school administration and policy influenced Taha Maori programmes became a major focus of the research project.

_Huata_ Well, it's the liaison thing. In the good old days, 10 years ago, say 12 years ago, if one wanted a Maori resource centre they would just talk to their local school committee, and hey presto, if they had the money up she would go. Perhaps a few Maori parents would be consulted. But today, of course, you would consult the Maori parents in the school.
A second consideration was the recommendation by Walter Hirsch (Hirsch, 1990, p. 39) that due to the lack of research, the impact of Taha Maori programmes needed urgent investigation. Hirsch's report was based on an intensive investigation of opinion among Maori and non-Maori educators during 1989.

A third factor in initiating this project was the concern being voiced among local Maori runanga (tribal council) members and communities at large about the approaches taken by schools to the education of their children. Generally it was felt that the schools' response to the needs of Maori children was inadequate. The needs were being inadequately addressed by programmes that came under the heading of the Maori side, te taha Maori. This voice of concern was one that Huata was able to hear often for he was a participant in many regional mana whenua and mata waka activities. He was a vital part of a Maori network that was expressing concern about the conditions affecting the education of their children. He was in a unique position to respond to these concerns by identifying the problems and suggesting solutions.

At a meeting of te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua, it was suggested that there needed to be a baseline survey undertaken as to what the schools actually meant when addressing Taha Maori, particularly in relation to their statements of intent and their community demands. It was decided to examine clusters of schools within Otago and Southland to gauge the impact of Taha Maori and the schools' policies in respect to implementation in relationship to the local community. It was also decided to gather supportive information from additional schools, institutions and monitoring agencies in order to get a fuller picture of the impact of Taha Maori in Otago and Southland.

The organising questions of the project

The organising questions for the study focussed on the areas of partnership in policy orientation and consultation processes and on Taha Maori in practice.

A: Policy issues

1) How do schools' charters and other policy documents identify schools' initiatives for empowering Maori students and their families, for enhancing the achievement of Maori students and for enlightening the majority culture about Maori language and history?

2) To what extent is the local Maori community involved in school policy and decision making with respect to supporting the school, delivering the curriculum and acting as partners in the learning of their own children.

B: Taha Maori in practice

1) What do schools understand by Taha Maori? Who defined it? How is Taha Maori delivered in the classroom?
2) What financial and other resources are being targeted specifically for implementing Taha Maori?

3) To what extent are Maori pupils' and parents' needs being met by these programmes and initiatives?

Results of Tu mai kia tu ake: the impact of Taha Maori.

The baseline survey of schools identified an interlocking matrix of problems, that while being able to be differentiated for the purpose of writing a report, were intertwined in such a way that no one part could be addressed without addressing others. At the request of the school communities that he visited, Huata determined to address these problems in his second project. Some of the key information obtained included.

A. The schools' mission statements

Of the 18 schools examined in the survey, only one had a mission statement that had a "directly New Zealand flavour" and only two mentioned "culture as a concern" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p.5). The effect of the focus of these statements was to promote homogeneity rather than exhibiting any desire to promote ethnic and cultural diversity. There was no mention of the Treaty of Waitangi in these fundamental orientating statements or its implications for management or curricula. This identified a problem for schools for as they appeared to favour the 'we are one people' idea ... "then it will be very difficult for them to action biculuralism which is predicated upon ethnic diversity at social and political (power sharing) levels" (p.5). This conclusion indicates a mismatch between the aspirations of schools to educate all children as New Zealanders and the aspirations of many parents to have their children educated as Maori.

By not acknowledging Maori aspirations or the implications of the Treaty in these charter statements as to the purpose of the school, implicit control of the agenda remained in the hands of the majority culture acting in an assimilationist mode. Of major concern to Maori is that the schools seemed to be oriented to a universal standard by prescribing one particular means of attaining this standard by not allowing that Maori culture also has its means of attaining these standards.

B. School policies

The policies that the school Boards of Trustees had developed to guide the functioning of their schools in the main reflected a lack of bicultural direction laid down in the mission statements, for example
the policies indicate a clash in priorities between attempting to solve one
problem, the low level of te reo Maori use, while continuing to follow an
integrated curriculum approach. Schools have received the message about
the need to preserve the language and to preserve tikanga Maori, but they
appear to have just grafted these concepts onto the existing structure of Taha
Maori. ... Some policy statements made grand goals such as affording
"equal status" for the Maori language, but provide no action plan as to how
to reach the goal" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 6)

Huata's report however, did highlight one example of a realistic Taha Maori
programme. There was a clear statement that the policy was "oriented to the needs of
non-Maori children" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 6). This policy was realistic
in relation to Maori children given "the structural limitations of Taha Maori
programmes for meeting the needs of Maori children" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn,
1993, p. 6). Overall, the policies were oriented to the expectation that Taha Maori
would raise the status of mana Maori in the eyes of the non-Maori members of the
community. However, even though Taha Maori was also originally intended to meet the
needs of Maori children and to improve educational achievement of Maori children
(Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 7) this was clearly not a priority of these
programmes in the schools studied.

C. Attitudes to Taha Maori

Findings revealed that non-Maori community members, in most cases the vast
majority, tended to set the agenda and the pace at which Maori community members
could come to terms with their own cultural aspirations. However, "both Maori and
Pakeha were supportive of those Taha Maori initiatives developed in their schools, and
probably the most significant finding in terms of potential for change was that the initial
"resistance to Taha Maori evident at its inception a decade ago has diminished"
(Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 33).

However, a further problem was found to exacerbate the tendency of Pakeha to
dominate, namely that "Maori parents themselves are often divided on issue of
curriculum change. Some want a traditional Pakeha curriculum for their children,
concerned that too much Maori will hold their children back from achievement in other
subjects" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 33), while others wanted tikanga Maori
(Maori culture) taught in the schools. However, "the majority of Maori parents are keen
to develop their children's bicultural appreciation of their heritage and to see its rightful
place restored in school curricula". This demand for recognition within schools of
tikanga Maori will continue, especially in Southland where the concentration of Maori
pupils is growing and by the year 2000 A.D. will reach 50% of the school population (Kapa, 1991).

Of major concern was the hesitancy felt by a number of the primary school teachers, especially many of the older teachers, to participate in Taha Maori programmes. They were supportive, yet felt inadequate due to limited pre-service and in-service training, the plethora of other curriculum demands, limited budgets and sometimes their school's remoteness from large centres.

Five schools reported that there was a concern among staff about Pakeha people teaching Maori language (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 35). This concern was focused on possible criticism they might encounter from Maori. This had become a very sensitive issue in some schools.

Maori knowledge had become a very sought-after commodity in some of the schools. However, to Maori, this was a double-edged sword. It had a good side in that it was forcing non-Maori to come to terms with their need to become sensitive to and competent in the Maori world. However, the other sharper side was that non-Maori may use their limited Maori knowledge to gain jobs that Maori students could attain. That non-Maori could use Maori cultural capital to compete for jobs is a somewhat bitter pill for young Maori to swallow. It is of interest that a major reason advanced by schools in this study for including Taha Maori in the curriculum was the enhancement of employment opportunities that it offered their students, especially as most were going to jobs outside their local communities. There was virtually no evidence of schools arguing that Taha Maori was beneficial for promoting better understanding between Maori and non-Maori within their local communities (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 35-36).

D. Taha Maori activities in the schools

The report detailed the range of initiatives, projects and programmes that were running under the aegis of Taha Maori. However, one major area of concern was identified. Initiatives taken by some schools did not appear to be spilling over into other schools as the 'cluster concept' is intended to facilitate. The organisational structure for schools recommended in the Education Act 1989 was that they 'cluster' together. That is, schools who service a particular community or district and/or who provide a stream of education for children as they pass from primary to intermediate to secondary should communicate in order to discuss their approaches, share resources, consult with communities and discuss common matters of concern.

This clustering appeared to be crucial for the promotion of Taha Maori programmes. Where there was a lack of realisation of "the need to establish and maintain networks between schools, service providers and the local community ... Taha Maori programmes are really non-existent" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 42).
The orientation of existing Taha Maori programmes was their major emphasis (essentialy by default) "upon awakening the understanding of non-Maori to the existence of a Maori world-view, history and epistemology. For Maori, the benefits are more incidental" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 43). This can be related back directly to the contents of the mission statements of the schools.

Often the material culture, for example as umu/hangi(earth oven) was the major focus of these programmes. However, Maori spirituality was found to be recognised and incorporated on special occasions; whakawatea (e.g.: blessings at the opening of a new building, tree plantings and the like). However, it was evident that both material and invisible elements of Maoridom were 'additive elements' rather than an integral part of the schools' programmes.

E. Maori language in the schools

The most striking result of the report was that "there is little, if any Maori language being taught in the schools and there is confusion over who should teach it and how it should be taught (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 50)."

There was a paradox between the conflicting demands placed on the limited resources available to promote this important aspect of Taha Maori. This paradox was directly attributable to the contradictory nature of the initial objectives of the Taha Maori programmes in the schools. The dual objectives of Taha Maori as originally stated in the Department of Education's guidelines, and as understood by Maori people in 1989 (Hirsch, 1990), were that Taha Maori programmes were to educate the non-Maori about Maori and to educate Maori to improve their achievement through increasing the Maori content of instruction. There is a problem with these two objectives because they both draw on the same limited resource, but the control over implementation remains in the hands of the majority. This will inevitably favour the non-Maori objective over that of the Maori objective.

A further problem is that including Maori content, while not in itself a bad thing, is also in the hands of the majority who have little knowledge or understanding of the Maori context which needs to be the focus of reform.

A common feature was that school principals played very significant roles in sustaining a commitment to Maori language in their schools. "If the Principal is keen, them the promulgation of programmes will follow." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 51).

Burgeoning demand for the few available tutors in te Reo Maori had created severe competition among education institutions, yet teachers were hesitant in the face of the fear of criticism. "Correspondence courses are difficult for students to complete satisfactorily without the assistance of skilled speakers of the language" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 51) and "There are few families who speak Maori at home
and students experience difficulty in seeking help from fluent Maori speakers after school." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 51).

F. Local history in the schools

There was a widespread lack of knowledge about Maori place names; Maori oral maps, Southern place names, spelling, compounded by a general difficulty in obtaining local Maori histories, place names and spellings. This difficulty stemmed from most schools having no ongoing links with knowledgeable kaumatua of Kai Tahu descent in their area.

G. Financial problems

The overall impression gained from the survey was that Non-Maori people had control over funding and over special Maori factor funding as well. They seemed unaware that there should be any other approach. As a result, "many schools ... are using the Maori funding component in a general way for the benefit of all children within the school" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 68). Again it was the lack of a clear focus of how Taha Maori programmes and initiatives are to address Maori children's needs that was the cause of this confusion over how to fund Taha Maori programmes. Specific Maori factor funding was for Maori children, not all children, whereas Taha Maori is intended for all children and needs to be funded out of the school's operating budget. The problem was summarised in the report as there being "a lack of understanding of the principles of 'mana Maori' and therefore the purpose of Maori funding in mainstream education" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 68). The confusion was further exacerbated by a general lack of understanding by non-Maori parents as to the reasons why Maori funding had been introduced in the first place.

A related problem identified in the survey was that Maori education initiatives within mainstream schools struggle in their formative years due to lack of funding.

H. Resources in the schools

There were a number of problems identified with the provision and use of resources:

1. A lack of useful and well presented Southern resources
2. A lack of training and resource provisions
3. "Resources without training or at least explanation in the language of teachers is bound to fail." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 77)
4. Who controls purchasing/gathering of resources is a crucial question, "just as important as who produces the resource" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 77)
1. Marae visits

Marae visits were becoming an integral part of Taha Maori programmes in many schools. However, there were a number of problems associated with this activity.

1. Marae numbers are limited and marae are seriously under-funded
2. Reliance upon Maori to educate non-Maori is burdensome and consumes resources for Maori educational initiatives, both within and out of mainstream education systems
3. There was also a spiritual cost. Colonisation has left many Maori groups spiritually bereft. Current revitalisation of Maoridom is marae-based and holistic. Maori parents increasingly see education as perhaps the only way out of their economic subservience in Aotearoa/New Zealand today. They see the whole child needs to be fostered; bodily, emotionally and spiritually
4. Enormous burdens are placed upon kaumatua (particularly those of the mana whenua people), for example "Government agencies advise their staff to liaise with marae and tangata whenua without proffering assistance to these often over worked institutions and individuals." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 70)
5. Often the koha laid down on a marae does not pay half of the costs of the hui. "Most recent hui held at local papatibua marae have run at a financial loss to the marae." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 84)
6. There are very few kaumatua
7. Some Maori people were suspicious, saying "How come you people ignored us for a century, now all of a sudden you want to come (to our marae)?" and "Is this the latest fad or band wagon? What will be the next one?" (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 88)
8. Maori voices are not heeded when allocation of resources is mooted. "This raises again the issue of control over decision making ... the outcome may well be different resources for different children." (Holmes, Bishop and Glynn, 1993, p. 86)

Initiating the research with the schools

Huata approached the schools in a way that any Maori would do when visiting another area or another institution. In order to recognise the mana of the hosts, after asking if they would like to participate in the project he requested that they give him an opportunity to explain his take. In line with Maori protocol he left it up to them as to the context within which the take was to be explained. He was also very particular to consult closely with the local mana whenua, that is the people of the marae of the local area, so that they could offer support for his visit as and where possible. This indicated that the procedure for the research was determined by much more than the preferences of the researcher, even though he was a Maori researcher. The process of initiating the research was determined by the context.
The initial thing was by way of courtesy, a phone call then ... a letter outlining in printed form what I hoped to achieve and who I would like to see and visit and suggested ways of liaising with the school but left it open for them to make the final decision. In other words the principals and Boards of Trustees were to arrange the carpet as it were for me to tread on when I arrived.

When he went to a school he never went alone, but always as part of a small ope whakaeke (a group travelling to marae). He always took a local woman, one who knew the tikanga involved in a visit of this kind in case they were required to answer a welcome call (karanga) and take part in a powhiri or mihimihi (informal ritualised introductions).

I'd always have a woman's voice with me, also it added a lot of panache and great mana to my presence there.

Huata was manuhiri (guest) and the school were the hosts. However, there was a more subtle pattern beneath the surface. Huata addresses this pattern of connectedness between himself, the landscape, the schools, the local communities and the teachers in terms described as participatory consciousness by Heshusius (1994).

Although I was a visitor I also felt that I was a part of them because of my close association with the provinces and also my association with the profession within which I was conducting my research. At no stage did I feel I was ever like a manuhiri. I really felt part of the school, even though I felt I may not have visited the school before because I know the history of the area and I have passed through the areas many times, and as a local principal I had an affinity with the personal side of my liaison (and I had also taught) for many, many years in both areas. I was part of the landscape because I was brought up in the landscape, the landscape I was visiting for my learnings as a child, as a young tohunga took place in those very places that I visited, learning from my elders.

Huata's contact with the region had begun before his birth, as his mother followed the traditional seasonal migratory pattern of food-gathering through the area. Following his birth his training as a mana whenua tohunga began. This training as a tohunga was later reflected in his approach to this research project. One example was that he eschewed the somewhat traditional university method of becoming well-versed in the literature on the subject, preferring to rely upon being well-versed in Maori tikanga and language.
Russell You say you hadn't read anything beforehand. Was this so you wouldn't pre-judge the situation, go in there with a theory that you wanted to fit material to?

Huata Absolutely, yes. I felt that to have done a prior study of other studies that had been conducted elsewhere in New Zealand that it may colour my thinking. I didn't want that to happen, I wanted to see it for myself and I wanted to be an ear rather than a voice. I wanted to listen and I wanted to be an eye to see. That's why I took a camera with me because a picture paints a thousand words, and that's why I took a recorder with me so I could hear over and over again the voices, those people who are speaking.

Huata's approach invoked a Maori preferred system of learning (Mataira, 1980). Whakarongo, titiro, korero. Listen, look, and then talk. Listen to the others first, make your own observations, then do your talking/questioning. He followed this pattern with most visits to the school. Following a welcome, talking to the teachers and Principal and children. Then, either during the day or in the evening he spoke with Board of Trustee members, parents of Maori children and Maori community members. The second visit followed a similar pattern, only this time he was returning information to them that he had garnered during the first visit. The second visit continued the conversation. His questions were open-ended, which fits with (Southern) Maori protocol and what Burgess (1984), Lather (1991) and Patton (1987, 1990) call 'unstructured' interviews which are conducted in a conversational style.

Huata There were no really closed-in questions. They were all very open questions that were asked and in fact in most cases there were no questions asked. It was "Hello have you got the billy boiling, what's going on" ... In Southern Maori protocol that is a good thing because then the polite introductory have been conducted and then you can tell them why you are there and if you have anything to tell me, as broad as that, "Have you anything to tell me?"

This Maori approach to research had positive effects in other ways.

Huata The other reason I think it was so successful, why people gave of themselves so freely was that I was a Maori who was doing research about Maori things for Maori and for Pakeha in a Maori way. It was that other dimension and when I arrived it was plainly obvious that this visitor was no
ordinary visitor and that this visitor demanded that certain protocol be followed.

He was also careful not to whakaiti ta ratou mana (belittle them) and he was careful to undertake the research in an unbiased, non-threatening manner. He was mindful that some schools were just beginning along the road to Taha Maori programmes. Therefore his question was not "How far have you come?" but rather, "Where to from here?". This positive approach to questioning identified the same problems and concerns as a more negative approach would have done, but this approach was one that recognised and attempted to preserve the mana of the research participants. He described how one school had agreed to be part of his sample because they were in the process of deciding whether or not they were going to delete their Treaty of Waitangi charter statement in light of the National government's optional clause. This caused him to reflect upon his own training again:

**Huata** I respected them for that too, because the training is, the greatest respect is often accorded to those who have lots of points of view or those who are even enemies. You respect them greatly and value their view point.

**The sharing of the concerns.**

He was warmly welcomed by the schools—schools, however, who were themselves very concerned about their handling of Maori issues. They were expected to consult with their Maori communities and in principle they agreed that this was a valuable and timely action. However, their concern was, 'How to do it?' What were the practical means of instituting such liaison and what did they do once they had instituted such negotiations? What were the implementation procedures?

The Maori communities' representatives who participated in the visits to schools, or to whom Huata spoke at meetings at school or in the evenings identified a great range of concerns. These ranged from those who were concerned that too much concentration on Taha Maori would disadvantage their children in the Pakeha world, through to those who felt that their children's needs to be educated as Maori was being neglected even where there were Taha Maori programmes. There was also the call for tikanga Maori to be taught in schools. Huata's visit gave voice to these incipient concerns.

**Huata** They came with a whole barrage of questions from different schools, from different communities. After analysing these questions and statements made by people it became abundantly clear that many of these questions had been asked not only once or twice but as often as 20 or 30 times.
Russell

What sort of questions were they?

Huata

It would be, what sort of policies should we write as the outcomes of our charter statements pertaining to the Treaty of Waitangi? That’s one that’s comes up time and time again. How shall we spend our Maori factor funding grant? What are the facts about the Southern Maori language? There was a great interest shown in a Southern Maori language. Can you tell me please some Maori history about our area. Did the Maoris live in this area before? Who should I contact or who should I see to establish a resource centre in our school, or a marae in our school, or put a Maori mural on the wall of our school? Do you think that we should have BOT Maori representation, Board of Trustees Maori representation? What is the role of kaumatua? Can you tell us something about Maori spirituality? Could it offend other religions? How to get the ‘show on the road’, rather than having policies in between the covers of books and not springing into life? What to do with Maori factor funding?

These concerns were not new. He had been regaled with requests for assistance from schools for some time before this research project.

Huata

Prior to my taking up the project, I used to get hundreds of phone calls, and I mean hundreds of phone calls. There might be a thousand phone calls, about things pertaining to Taha Maori programmes. I wasn’t an adviser or anything. They just happened to know that I was a kaumatua and that sort of thing. And it took a great deal of my time actually. And so, when I had this opportunity of the two years - this wonderful opportunity - I began to collate the common factors, as you might say, the common questions that were being asked time and time again. So I began to describe a list of common queries by teachers, Boards of Trustees, caregivers, Maori parents, children, and this was really exciting because I found that the same questions were being asked time and time again, and that the schools were really hanging on by a thread there. They were doing Taha Maori programmes ... without any great depth of thought. And so for the second year of my research I was really motivated to go right through my research and through the last 10 years of my experience of teachers’ questions, and to actually put down on paper some answers to the common needs. The answers to common questions, or suggestions to answer common questions. And of course the second year’s research, I had a clear idea of what it was going to be right
from the very outset, but as I went along the track, that idea, that very clear original idea, changed dramatically. So what I’ve now completed in the second year is a response to the common needs, as Huata Holmes sees it, amongst my colleagues - those teachers in schools, Boards of Trustees, caregivers, children, school communities. Great motivation. Great stuff.

As a result of these requests, Huata undertook to address these concerns by producing a training video with an associated compendium of resources/explanations. However, he determined that the compendium was not going to be a collection of resources and handy hints but rather was going to address the fundamental structural problem and mismatches he identified from a Maori point of view. For example, he noticed that most of the concerns that were coming from the schools were procedural in nature which he attributed to the imperatives created by the initiatives in 'Tomorrows Schools' requiring consultative actions on behalf of the schools. However, the concerns of the parents were different. While they were also concerned about procedural issues, they were more concerned with the achievement of their children in the schools. This mismatch is attributable to the focus of Taha Maori programmes in the past being toward integration of a 'Maori perspective' into an existing structure designed by and for Pakeha (Smith, 1990). This systemic limitation was not addressed by Taha Maori in the 1980s. The limited change in achievement rates for Maori children attests to the reality of this problem for Maori. Huata attributed the problem to a systemic misunderstanding of crucial Maori considerations, such as mana Maori. He also exhibited some of the frustration that he had felt when confronted with schools who tended to ask him somewhat simple questions. He tended to reply with somewhat complicated answers explaining that "once you start explaining, you then start expounding equally incomprehensible words which then have to be explained as well".

A major problem of this 'talking past each other' was that, 

\textit{Huata}  
Nothing came out at all about Maori children achieving, although isolated questions were asked but not a whole lot. Therefore, in response (to our concern for the achievement of Maori children) I have included in the compendium a section on mana Maori. The mana Maori is an essential element that all Boards of Trustees, caregivers, children themselves, should be made aware of. It enhances the Maori child’s ability to achieve, it enhances the Maori child’s self-esteem and it also enhances the chances of that Maori child through achieving self-esteem, to become a better citizen, a better NZ citizen, to help his Pakeha brothers and sisters as well. The language is the operating key, because mana Maori is so important that the pedagogues have to realise that it is the language that is the vehicle for the
culture to flourish, in fact the language is the true culture. Culture stems
from the language and the language stems from the culture as well so they
are intertwined. That is a very important point and the compendium directly
lists the reasons why mana Maori is so important.

Networking
Huata was able to undertake the work because he was part of an existing
network. He was part of the contemporary education scene and also he was part of the
Southern Maori education system. He often mentioned that although he was
constructing a compendium of resources, he was not alone in his task. I asked him who
he worked with and where his knowledge came from. His response clearly identified the
difference in epistemologies; ways of seeing and constructing knowledge between
himself and the schools. He also emphasised the value of including people with
different perspectives in a community of interest.

Huata I represent the educational scene being a principal of long standing, but also
as a tohunga and kaumatau of Kai tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha peoples ...
mana tangata, that recognition by the iwi is endorsed by the tasks they
ask you to perform. I’m talking about Aramoana, I’m talking about clearing
greenstone. So that’s where the essence of this knowledge is coming from.
The essence for the knowledge itself is through the people that I have been
brought up with, brought up with in a Maori way. That’s where the essence
of the knowledge comes from, from the time the seed sprung from my
father’s loins, from the time it was nurtured in my mother’s womb, from
right through my childhood being brought up by my elders, and from
speaking the reo and from the continuing time working amongst our people,
that’s where the essence of knowledge comes from, through living it, and
through sleeping and eating and from standing alongside. The tu taha ke ai
(stand alongside me and learn) some of the greatest tohungas that some
people have ever known, that’s where it comes from.

Russell But it's not just Huata Holmes, though.

Huata No … experience. See, we have the ihi (essential force), the wehi (awe) and
the mana of Huata Holmes. In other words, it's just not one person. It's a
whole collection, a myriad of people who stand behind the voice and who
are part of the recording process, because Huata Holmes is only a mouth,
that's all he is, and the tikanga flows from him. He is a network, you might
say, and this is borne by experience both as practical teacher in theory and
from the time he sprung from his father's loin to his present age. A complete immersion in matters Maori. The research is actually the emulsion of that experience.

The concept of tu taha ke ai reveals how Huata was taught as a young man. The essence of the process is that the tauira is taken alongside of the teacher. Through constant instruction, recitation, involvement, imitation and reinforcement the student becomes a part of the knowledge of the elder. The process has enabled him to be a conduit for the messages of the old people for the people of today, those taonga that are referred to as taonga tuku iho, those treasures handed down from the ancestors. Therefore someone trained as a tohunga in this way has to act as an intermediary between the needs and aspirations of the present-day world, in light of those teachings and preferences of the old world for their people. It is from this context that he addresses the concerns of the schools to implement Taha Maori programmes.

The attributes of a researcher

We often spoke at length about his reflections on his experiences. One of the topics was the attributes of a researcher.

Huata Yes, I think that a researcher has to become a good listener, a researcher has to become involved and very close to the subject he is researching, a researcher must have great respect for those he is researching, or she is researching, even if it is Adolf Hitler you are researching you have to have great respect for enemies, and those with different points of view; well not enemies but have different points of view and the recording must be honest.

These opinions about the attributes of a good researcher challenge the traditional notions of a detached 'distanced' researcher. The engagement that Huata identifies is also found in his relationship to others in his tribe.

Russell You started off with some hassles at the start of the year, I remember, about getting the okay for the project. There was some to-ing and fro-ing about whether you should actually do this compendium, whether it was going to have iwi blessing. Could you tell us a bit about that process, what happened?

Huata Well I knew at the beginning of the year that I would have to address this question of language once and for all, and for many years the Southern people have not been speaking their own language and it's extinct apart from
ourselves and our immediate families, that is my immediate family. We are the only ones left, plus a few disciples or tauira, about 22 people left probably. The stance has been within Totuherunagka, in the Otago area, and we will keep it to Otago because we decided to keep our research within Otago, that it's alright to speak the old language and the old sounds but we mustn't write it down. But I do not agree with that. So my research has unrestrainedly written the language down in a phonetic way, but I have been cautious to state at the out-going that this is a phonetic rendering of southern korero laid bare for all to see and it's a challenge as you might say to others to pick up a pen and do likewise, so it is a clear as that, it's actually the true recording of how my language is spoken, how our language is spoken, doing it phonetically.

This whole process of constructing a compendium of resources raised many concerns among Maori people about the ownership of knowledge, and the commodification of knowledge where "Maori language, knowledge and culture is to be packaged up as marketable goods which can be bought and sold on the open market" (Smith, 1993).

There is another issue. Were you able to give some of those stories into the custody of schools and were they able to use them?

Yes. One elder was worried about me recapitulating even well-known stories for schools to use. There was concern there that people are making lots of profit and profiting by me compiling these stories and there is no return back to the iwi. I went to the local runakas, and told them what I was doing and they would like to see the stories before I publish them and I will do that.

We then turned to a related issue of how to address the needs of other Maori people besides the mana whenua.

What have you done to bring other present-day Maori people on board?

Ah, with total respect to variances, if that's the right word, or variations of tribal tikanga, or how do you say that; tribal cultural differences. And utter respect for different dialects. ... A large section (of the compendium) is devoted to Southern Maori conversation, because it could be my last chance to record in full my own vocabulary and ways of joining sentences together,
which are an echo from the past, and which could be taken up by a lot of young aspirants, young people aspiring to learn more of their own tikanga within this area.

Mata waka (Maori people from other areas) have been very, very thirsty for the history, the Southern history of this area, and I've allowed my computer to print out history stories. Some have never been told before, and I've gone one stage further and brought them on board by letting them have a view of how these stories could be expressed in the Southern way, for them to compare it with their own particular language, their own dialect. So I've brought them on board by actually making them closer to the land, of their adopted land, because Maori are forever looking for kinship, and they find that kinship in the language. They find that kinship in the names that we place on the place of the earth, because many names are repeated, even if the dialect in form is slightly different. And through the raranga korero, the history, and through the 'raranga igoa' or whakapapa as they call it in the Northern dialect. So that's really the recitation of the names.

And if I was to have had another year, I would have joined up every tribe in New Zealand with their own tribes here, and that would truly be a masterpiece, because it would then place in the hands of the public a vehicle by which every tribe in New Zealand could find kinship with the mana whenua of the South. They could directly share in our history through those links.

But the main difficulty in setting out something like this is our audience, because traditionally we choose our audience, and to put it in such a form, this is coming to the very philosophy of the research. The prerequisite to learn that greater knowledge is to understand the Maori language because it would not be accompanied by a European translation. It would be all written in Southern Maori and that Southern Maori would be translated in Northern vernacular. Full stop.

Russell So that would be your means of limiting access to that knowledge?

Huata Yes, because the language is the very essence of our culture, and our culture is our language. So if you’re practising Maori culture and you think that that’s the Maori culture and you’re talking English like I am at the moment, you’re not really practising Maori culture.
Protection of knowledge

This raised the issue of the protection of knowledge, a great concern in the Maori world. Also of importance is the notion of esoteric knowledge, which is only for certain groups of people and these people have to qualify to gain this knowledge. I asked him to consider the dilemma created where one of the major features of the modern university is that knowledge is open to everybody and to consider that he was insisting that knowledge was only open to certain people. "How do you mediate between that tension?"

Huata  You have to look at my upbringing because my uncles and aunties looked amongst the family to see who would be the one to learn all the family connections, and they would look amongst the family to see who the speakers would be and so on and so forth. In other words the ariki chose the tauira. The teacher chose the students but today this has been reversed and the students choose the teacher. I'm talking about tertiary institutions. I mean they choose their subjects, but in the good old days riding around on the horse, out on my boat, it was the other way around and it could be a good thing or a bad thing.

Now why I persist in this and why I think it's a good thing is because by leaving it in Maori language I am challenging our people, Maori and Pakeha. I don't mind Pakeha learning so-called esoteric stuff if they've a lot of guts and they are kia mauwai to matou reo rangatira ata ratou kea kia whai matou ranga noa te ra. So that door is open for them because they've made that effort.

I'm not interested in people who want to learn something like a little parrot, that's no good, they have no tata korero. Tata korero, close talk, ordinary conversation. I look beyond the marae. The marae has never really been a small place for me. The marae is infinite. It goes beyond space itself and that's why you'll very rarely see me picking my nose under the verandah of the marae, because my mana, or the physical marae that people call a marae today, is only an infinite speck. It's a place I'll call in to from time to time. The marae as a meeting place deserves great respect, but that is also borne by the Southern outlook because we have been roamers, roamers ever since time began. We have always been on the move.

Accountability

Russell  Are you answerable to anybody?
Only one and that is the collective of ātipuna. They are the ones that I’m accountable to. That might sound a sweeping statement but you must remember that our people are only learners. They are infants. I’m talking about the Kaitahu people; they know very little. In fact it could be said they know nothing, and that’s a great pain. They do not know their language, that is even standard Maori; they even doubted the existence of a Southern language, but we had our Southern language stories and histories of the past.

In essence, then, Huata was resurrecting a traditional learning method of Maoridom in order to teach Taha Maori to pupils that he selected. That is, to the schools. He went out and selected a ‘sample’ of those ‘students’ who were desirous of learning about Taha Maori. He then listened to their concerns and worries, and in concert with his teachings and his ātipuna he decided how best they were to be educated.

He decided to present them with information at a variety of levels. The first level was to be in easily accessible form, a video in English, suggesting that his students undertake extensive reviews of their knowledge pertaining to Maori approaches to knowledge. He was also presenting to ‘his students’ in a compendium of resources, information that went into much greater detail that had the video, yet it lead directly from the video. The next level of education was to begin to provide more detailed information about each topic. This is where the means of education changed from English language into Maori language, a further level being written in Southern Maori, those wanting access to this information being screened by this very effective means of selection. At this point, only the most dedicated and able students would gain access to the information.

Metaphors

I mentioned to Huata that his way of seeing things was different from a Western way. I suggested to him that rather than it being a binary system of black and white, temporally of new replacing the old, of present replacing the past, it was more like seeing things where old and new existed together, where ancestors were with us now, the living and the dead intermingling. I also reflected on the meaning of whakapapa, considering that whakapapa was at once a complex yet linear pathway to the past, but it is also a recitation of those who are with us today. I suggested that rather than this being a world of oppositions it was more a world of complementarities along with oppositions.

Huata suggested a concept that would cover what I was trying to express, ki te whai ao. He went on to explain a very fundamental yet complex metaphor based in the Maori world that guides activities.
'Whai ao' means pale light. It's neither bright light nor is it infinite darkness. Whai ao is the melding of many things, many colours, and it is a philosophy for life. It's give and take. It's a sharing of your communal family spirit. It's so important. The very first words that were ever uttered to mankind, when the first breath of life was exhaled into him was "Tihei Mauriora". That's the breath of life, and "ki te whai ao, ki te ao marama". From pale light to infinite brightest light. And so that's what was happening when that breath was bred, it was actually the breath into light, from pale light into brightest light. And of course in the beginning it came from the most infinite darkness. That is 'te po', in some philosophies, and in our Southern cosmology it's 'te korekorenga'.

How does that relate to us today?

Well it puts us on that road, the road of evolution, the road of life. It is a continuing story of our being, on earth and in whatever environment we find ourselves. It's from the korekorenga to pito ana te po right through to the time of Tuterakifanoa, right through to the time of the first man and the first woman, right through our whakapapa to our present stance here on earth, and it goes beyond that into the future, forward looking and backward looking. Those concepts of mua and muri come into it, too. Mua can either be in the past or it can be in the future, it's not defined. In fact, we're continually advancing and looking from where we came, and at the same time looking towards where we're going to. So we are tu taha ke ai, walking with both eyes fully aware of what is in the past, what is in the present, and what lies ahead in the future, guided by the past.

In what way are those from the past with us?

They are gathered with us all the time - they are there. Those that have passed before us are always with us - that's our tipuna, and those aitaga that are yet to be born, they are in great confusion around us, and profusion, waiting to spring from the loins of their fathers and into the wombs of our mothers, to bring about the generation that lies in wait to be born. That's what it is, it's a melding of past and present.

You also said that 'ki te whai ao' stood for the way that you could live with your environment.
Yes. Whai ao is that ability to be one with your environment. To be at home wherever you are, to be at home even though you're not in your immediate environment, it goes through the oral map. You can recall whichever environment you want to, and you can make yourself at home. You can make your mind at rest because you can become at one with your environment even though you may not be physically standing in it.

And to work with the elements, not against them.

Practical situations. If you were perhaps in hospital, and your home-land was in the Manapouri area. Just by closing your eyes you could bring that whole scene to you. You could bring your friends within that scene to you for comfort. And likewise you can bring your tipuna to you, just by willing them to be with you. And that sense of comfort makes you one with your environment. It makes you in harmony. It balances things out. The whai ao is the intermediary between deepest, darkest, most infinite void, to brightest and most brilliant light. That's the intermediary.

Why do we live there?

I think we live there because it's called equilibrium. You find the optimum place to reside. And if you find the optimum place, it allows you to reach out to the periphery, to the most different spectrum, to the most infinite horizon. And it's like when you're flying an aeroplane, a small aeroplane, up a narrow valley. You never fly in the middle of the valley, you fly on one side of the valley. So that if anything happens you have room to turn round and fly back the way you came out. It's like that. It's an equal area. It's a neutral area, and that is why you have so many references. Ki uta ki tai; Maori talks about 'ki uta', that's inland, and 'ki tai' that's towards the sea, depending on where you're standing. And the area of probably greatest importance is that area between the two zones, that's between your high-tide mark and your low-tide mark. That's why that area is tabu. That's why you don't clean your fish on that area. You either clean your fish well out to sea—I'm talking about Southern—well out to sea. Some tribes don't do it anywhere. Clean your fish well out to sea—and I'm talking about 3 miles out to sea—or well inland, well behind the sand dunes and that sort of thing. That's so that you can bury your toenga (remnants).
Huata continued to draw on a number of other culturally located metaphors to explain the importance of living in the 'whai ao' context. I reflected on the implications of this metaphor, suggesting that the area in between the high and low tides, the area that the waves wash backwards and forwards over, was a tabu area, a 'whai ao' area, was another metaphor for a preferred lifestyle, as a prescription for life. I suggested that perhaps there was a very good reason for its protection by the strictures of tapu, on one level being practical, being where your main food comes from, but in the other sense it's a metaphor for the way you should live, looking after your land, looking after your food supply, don't foul your own nest, don't take too much, just take the right amount.

Huata

That's why the first words that were ever uttered began with "ki te whai ao." That's the most important. Those intermediary regions of life, as we live it. Like you might go out to wild party; you don't stay out partying all the time. Or you might go into meditation; you don't go into meditation all the time. You live between those extremes, and that's how you live life to the full. You place yourself in the position where you can reach out and attain anything you like, and that's how you gain your stimulus to carry on in the whai ao, in that intermediary zone. As well as that, in the modern world, particularly with stress of business and education, no matter what line of business you are in, you must learn to tread that mid-path, more frequently than the other paths.

Huata went on to explain that to live at the extremes was not the objective, but rather to focus on the interactions between the extremes, "and you will notice that first emphasis is placed on that." He then referred to a tauparapara (chant) that illustrated what he had just explained.

Huata

Tihei Mauriora
ki te whai ao ki te ao marama
E manawa mai te putaga a te Ariki
E manawa mai hoki te putaga he tauira
He tauira putaga Ariki no ruga
ki te whai ao ki te ao marama
Ano pano
Hara mai te toki
Hui e, Haumi e, taeki e.

Huata

That chant was the very first chant that was ever associated with mankind. That was the chant that was responsible for the breath of life into man. It
also tells you how it is the wish of the ariki for the tauira to rise up to his status so that the tauira will one day be able to grab hold of the axe of life and perpetuate life and move forward to the future. Now that is an instantaneous translation and could be much deeper than that if I really thought about it. But it's pretty deep even at that stage. It also signals to the ariki or teachers or professors, or tohuga of today, that there is a time when the tohuga should step backwards and leave things to competent tauira. And then the tauira will become an ariki and therefore life will perpetuate. But remember the beginning of the chant starts with *ki te whai ao ki te ao marama*. That's the beginning point. The *whai ao*.

*Russell*  At the end of the chant you come to 'Hui e, haumi e, taiki e'. What's that about? That seems to fit in with it.

*Huata*  That is the actual melding together, or the weaving together, of all that has been uttered beforehand, to make it a good bind or a good meld.

*Russell*  And at that time, when you actually do that tauparapara at a function, at a hui, is it incumbent upon the rest of the men there to join in at that particular point? I notice you slowed down naturally at that point, as if expecting the rest of the men to join in and say 'Hui e taike e'. What's the purpose of that?

*Huata*  The purpose of the tauparapara is to breathe life into something. It might be a new building, for instance, that has just been blessed. And so you choose a very well-known tauparapara, which is known throughout all the tribes, so that the people will have a chance to join in with the final breathing of life into the ceremony that's just been completed. Now in the South here, I've been taught by my tohuga that that should be used at the very end of a ceremony, but other tribes may use it at the beginning. But the reason why the Southern tohuga use it at the end is to bring the people all together in unison with their voice, and to breathe life, to give everyone the opportunity to breathe that breath of life into the building or the kaupapa - whatever it is they're blessing - at the very end. Then of course that is followed by the women's call, because the women have the first call and the last call. And there will be some reference in that call to the tipuna and also to the tumanako or the hope for the future. That's the southern karakia; it will always have that, from past on to the future. Of course, they will only join in if they agree with what you are doing, and if that person reciting the tauparapara has their support and general assent.
So that's why you put Aunty Mori at the end of the Tatari, Tautoko Tauawhi (TTT) tape, and at the end of your tape you're going to use Aunty Mori again aren't you?

Yes. When we've finished the TTT tape, Aunty Mori's karaga was calling everyone "Nau mai, haere mai", you know, something like that, and our very lovely Northern friends say, "but that sounds like a beginning karaga" and so I had to reply with great mischief that ae, to tikaga tera, no te mea, ko tenei te timataga, which means yes, you're quite right, but surely is this not the beginning of something? Although it was the end of the video, it was calling everyone to take up the message that was in the video, and indeed they were called to take it up and to expound the philosophy of the video right throughout New Zealand and across the seas, wherever they could.

Another metaphor Huata had used many times during the interviews and the many conversations that we had before, during and since the formal taped interviews was that of weaving. I said, "You use the word weaving quite a lot, and even if you don't use the word weaving, you use the idea of weaving. Can you explain why that keeps coming up all the time?"

It's because, I think, Maori have had to always stick close together. It's a whanau thing. It's a hapu thing. It's a tribal thing. It's a national thing, nowadays, with communications and one thing or another. Maori folk like to do things together in groups. They like to work together as teams. I know other cultures like to do the same thing. But if you look at their marae complex, it's just one great team effort, and preparation for visitors. And when the visitors arrive and when the visitors are farewelled, and after they're farewelled, it's all a great team effort. Like we had the Kai Tahu hui here at Otakou only two months ago, and Kati Huirapa and the people from Moeraki and South Otago, both before, during and after the hui, all came up to help the Otakou marae people. Well that's team effort in a grand style. No plea for help. Help was there. Help was not on it's way. It was there. So I think it's important, and it's also, as far as studying and that goes, it's not called weaving, but it's that 'tu taha ke ai' that I've told you about before, that walking side by side with people with great knowledge. It's not studying on your own. It's studying within a group and being supported by a group. And that's how very often Maori folk find—this is my opinion, and I might be quite wrong—but I do know that they find it quite hard to study on their own.
My son, for instance, he always comes home to study, and he asks me questions which I've no idea what he's talking about other than in terms of the language. But he always says "Oh, thanks Dad", even though I know nothing at all, and I've probably confused him more. But he always thanks me. It's just that assurance that there's someone there. That's why I find it hard to work in an office here. The people are lovely, they're lovely people, but I prefer to be at home where there's a group of people around. It may be true, it may be false, but that's just my own feeling about it.

Russell I know one of the first things I did when I got here was to try and develop our research group, and have you as kaumatua, and get Ted as a co-convenor and an organiser, etc, and to get as many people involved in it as possible, and to form ourselves into a whanau, because I didn't feel right working on my own. It feels much better now that we've got that group together.

Huata And that group itself generates more people, and it becomes like a great, big, evergrowing molecular system. That walking alongside people is very important. I think all cultures have it, but it is really pressed home to the Maori because it's actually in our chants and things. The messages are telling us this. The one I just recited is one example. Another one is:

He tapa tu a ko i uta
he tapa tu a ko i tai
he tapa tu a tane
he tapa tu a Tagaroa
Hai tapa tu a tane
Hai tapa tu a Tagaroa.

That's another one, and I can go on and on.

Ko reoreo a ke ki uta
tana haparagi a tu ki toroa ki tai
i te po ki po

That's illustrating the carriage of messages, from inland and along the coasts, across the seas and to lands beyond. But it also has a tipuna there, the moko ki po, the owl by night. There was a messenger by night. So you have kea inland - he's doing his messenger bit - and we have toroa
(albatross) along the coast and across lands and sea, and then we have the morepork or ruru by night, and so that is perpetually going. So you have that balance in all these things.

The other one is the tapa tu ki uta, tapatu ki tai. It refers to naming places on the environment. Tapa means to name. Our Northern friends sometimes think that we're laying some sort of a curse, but we're not. We are saying that the sea and coast be named, let the inland places be named, and let us remember and honour the reason why those names were placed there under the name of Tane, who is the atua of the land, and Tagaroa who is the atua for the sea. So in other words let us honour those people who have been in this area before. That's our way of doing it.

This reflection explains Huata's reasons for focussing on naming in his compendium and video that he is planning to return to schools as his koha for their allowing him to conduct research into their schools. In a Western sense, this renaming could be explained as an engagement in an anti-Colonising exercise to reassert the Maori presence on the land. However, an alternative way is explained here. It is the honouring of those who have passed here, that acknowledgement that the past and the present are here intermingled and this perspective on time is like an accordion compressing and extending to create music, the whole picture. Neither compression nor extension on its own is enough to create the music, nor is an examination of a fully extended accordion enough to understand how the music is created by an interaction of compression and extension. It is only those who study the full dynamics of the music-creation process of an accordion who will have a grasp of how the music, the product is created. Also, in order to do this, the studier must acknowledge their participation in the exercise for the music will inevitably affect the studier.

A further outcome of this approach is an acknowledgement of the whakapapa of the land, that the past is with us in the present and the past is not replaced by the present.

Huata There is only one one subject in the Maori curriculum and that is whakapapa ... from whakapapa comes the whole meaning of creation, each so-called subject falls in line with whakapapa. How did each subject originate ... who were the key players in that knowledge; the naming of the landscape, or sea or sky or the permanent above or the very bowels of the immortals below, plants, etc, botany, zoology as well. The whole catwalk of subjects is whakapapa. Another name is ... Apatekurapa in Maori. The evolution and the knowledge never ceases, it just keeps continuing, naming, renaming and so on and so forth, discovering and rediscovering and so on. As I say, it
springs from the father's loins and into the mother's womb, into life and it
doesn't stop there, it goes beyond death to the time where you regain your
tipuna and you intermingle with those spirits hovering about, ready to be
springing again from the father's loins. That is how it happens.

I suggested to him that when people come in here and renamed everything, for
eexample renamed Kapukataumahaka as Mt Cargill, they destroyed and disjointed that
whole flow from the past and the future. However Huata's response was in keeping with
his earlier comments about weaving as opposed to replacement. My dialectical
argument stood in contrast to his idea that

Huata

we remember the two names, and that adds another stitch to our fabric,
another feather to our bow. We take it on board. Because we place our
names in the environment to remind us of our history and who we are. And
that is who we are. We are a meld of two peoples now, and so that's no
sweat for us.

My first name is Huata Waiparerau, that's very good, but I can live with
Stuart Holmes as well. Even though it's false for me, it's comprehensible to
others, and I've no problem with that. So that is it, it's that middle path, the
whai ao.

And you look at the extraterrestrial spacecraft. They are not a binary
system either. They are a 'tri' system. In Maori it's easy, tokutoru e a ranei,
ta ratou ahua. They are three. I was watching it on video last night. Some
photographs of these craft, and they had three pulsars on them. And our
moon craft they had three too, except the moon buggy, and it nearly self-
destructed. It should have had three by rights, if they'd used their brain a
wee bit more.

Te Waka o Aoraki. That was a spacecraft. In the Southern story of
creation, it was a spacecraft that came here. And people laugh of course. My
Maori friends from the North really laugh. And my son's friends, who don't
really know their own culture, laugh too. But when it's explained to them,
it's not so funny, because that's Waka o Aoraki and that came from outer
space and it landed here. That is a true story. And their names - the members
of the crew - are on our hills. There's Aoragi itself. That's Mt Cook. And
then we've got Kakiroa (Mt Sefton), he was the navigator on board. And so
on and so forth. It was his tauparapara that did not allow it to take off again,
because he'd made a mistake. And any captain of any airliner or fighter
plane will tell you that your tauparapara is
trim,
mixture,
full rich,
carburettor,
undercarriage,
hatches,
flaps
harness secure
and then take off.

That's your tauparapara. Kakiroa, he missed out one of his checks, or there was one thing on the check that was wrong and it wasn't rectified, and so they never took off. And so here we are. That's it. Simple as that.

If you have actually been instructed by your tohunga, like I have, I can relate it to everything I've done, like flying and everything. Tauparapara is a preparing of the way. The way I see some people doing tauparapara now has no relevance whatsoever with the kaupapa. A taupara is a chant which sets the mood for an activity, and you've got to choose the right tauparapara...

I reflected on what he had said and suggested that we could extrapolate this idea to say that the messages about the way that we should live now are in the chants, are in the waiata, are in the oriori, the raranga korero. These messages are those taonga tuku iho, those messages that the tipuna left for us to follow.

_Huata_ Yeah, they're there. They're in place. And they're ageless, because they're couched in such sloppy terms. I know - the Boeing 707 now, if you had a choice of engines, and you had a Pratt-Whitney engine and had Rolls Royce engines. Well I would rather fly with a Pratt and Whitney engine because the Rolls Royce engine was too finely machined. It could ingest moisture, or perhaps a lot of dust, and you'd be having loss in power or something like that. Whereas the P and W could suck all sorts of stuff and it would keep going. And so that's a sloppy engine. Now the same with life. I'd say you should be fairly loose. And that goes over when they say "Get cool man". I think that's from there. That's the whai ao, that's it. You're in a handy position to deal with anything. The fire extinguisher's always close at hand. Your consort is there. It's a matter of knowing where to hit the right spot at the right moment, to deliver the most efficient mode. It's as simple as that. And if you keep the philosophy simple, you are relaxed, even under the most extreme conditions, and therefore capable of greater thought.
I couldn't be relaxed if I was not sticking to what I believe in. No. In fact, if someone told me to take these cannisters of napalm and blow out the village of people over the other side there, because their people had blown out a village of ours the other day, I couldn't do it. I couldn't be relaxed about that. But I can be relaxed as long as it's truth, and as long as that truth is in line with my philosophy. And the philosophy, of course, is goodwill to mankind, but it's a philosophy, my philosophy.

Russell: Yeah, and it's based upon what you were taught as a kid?

Huata: That's right.

Russell: How does this relate to your research over the last two years?

Huata: Well in the research, I have felt really happy going into schools, and meeting people that they say were rednecks, etc. And they were completely opposite, the rednecks' philosophy to mine, and yet I love them very dearly. And I think that they probably love me very dearly, too, because we were on the correct stage and we believed in what we spoke about, and we were prepared to manoeuvre, we were prepared to listen. We were in that little road again where we could reach out from either side and pick the fruit from either side, and then eat it or discard it. And very relaxed. And both sides got a lot. I've learnt all about the - well not all about, but quite a lot about - the Scottish history, and Irish history. It affected my research by me being able to give as much as I learned from my research. That's whitiwhiti korero.

Russell: So you weren't just there taking? You were giving. They weren't just there giving, they were taking as well? So there was a reciprocal in the dialogue as they call it?

Huata: Yes. And we were sharing. That's what was happening. It was a sharing process.

Discussion
This story illustrates vividly the differences between two completely distinctive worldviews; a general Western-European world-view and a Southern Maori world-view. They define and construct knowledge, and they record and transmit knowledge in totally different ways.
This story also illustrates a collaborative strategy to facilitate the construction of a shared meaning. This narrative also illustrates how in-depth interviews can go beyond mere data collecting, beyond seeing the other participants merely as informants, as a receptacles of data awaiting to be collected and processed by the researcher. This narrative illustrates how collaborative processing of data and facilitation of theory/understanding development by the participants is possible. It is suggested that this particular process of in-depth interviewing is empowering for it facilitates processing and theorising by the person being researched. The process is not aimed at arriving at some predetermined idea of the researchers, nor is it aimed at fitting the researched person's ideas into a framework predetermined by the researcher. The aim is to facilitate the sharing of power, to minimise the impositional tendencies of the researcher and in this case by reflection and example to promote action for the betterment of Maori people.

The concerns that Maori people have about research were the guiding ideas that helped construct the interview schedule that was used during this sequence of interviews. Out of these interviews came the account of how Huata approached, reacted and theorised about the experiences he underwent. Some of the major themes that arise from this study are:

**Tohungatanga**

Huata's personal training as a tohunga is inextricably tied into his actions as researcher. Verification of his status is made by his own people by their actions of calling on him to fulfill tohunga tasks, tasks that he was trained to undertake as a young person and this status/position has important implications for how he conducted his research.

For example:

1. His approach to people with different points of view was based on his being mindful and respectful of each as an individual

2. He saw and made sense of the whole process of gathering and identifying concerns and responding to these concerns from the perspective of his training as a tohunga. He found that in the ten years prior to this study and when he first approached schools there was an initial tendency for him to attempt to answer the questions as and when he could. However, he and the questioners became frustrated with this type of approach for he was unable to provide satisfactory answers, that is answers that did not require another set of questions for clarification of the first answer. The basic problem was that Huata and the people in the schools were talking from two different cultural contexts or epistemological systems. Procedural attempts to graft Maori perspectives onto what was essentially a Pakeha cultural context identified the different levels of knowledge that were held by various people. This process was cumulative and led him
to develop an alternative strategy based on his training as a tohunga. He decided to offer to develop a compendium of resources for training and teaching what could become a development on the theme of Taha Maori, but this time as defined and determined by Maori, not by non-Maori peoples.

3. The question of the language of the Southern area of New Zealand and its imminent demise is of crucial concern to Huata and is reflected in his approach to his resource construction.

4. His teaching method is that of a tohunga. He selected a number of pupils who showed varying degrees of aptitude. He listened to their concerns and then offered them some teachings at a variety of levels, using the key to the culture, the language, as the means of selecting those pupils who were serious enough to put in the time necessary to unlock the new knowledge. In this sense, he networked the schools into a continuum of tauira that stretches right through to Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha students.

In these ways Huata responded to the concerns Maori people are voicing about the initiation of research projects, about the benefits of research, about the role of researchers vis a vis researched, about accountability and how the research is constructed. He addressed these concerns by describing how in his experience he responded as a Maori tohunga, these experiences revealing at one time the uniqueness of this man but at the same time the messages that are here for others to reflect on in their pursuit of empowering research.
Chapter 5: The story of Tatari Tautoko Tauawhi (TTT) (A tutoring procedure for learning to read in Maori)

Introduction

Ted Glynn is an educational psychologist. He has had extensive experience as an educator and trainer of professional educational psychologists. He has also been actively engaged in bicultural research contexts for a number of years. When we began to talk about the project he is currently working on, he suggested that some background would be necessary.

Background Issues: Relationship between home and school

In the mid 1970s a team of researchers from Auckland University identified an area of concern in some Intermediate schools in Mangere, South Auckland.

Ted The problem was the number of children of upper primary and intermediate school age, who were otherwise intelligent kids, but they had not learnt to read. Back at that time it had to do with things like rapid expansion of schools in South Auckland, dormitory areas and teacher turnover at an enormous rate so that continuous teaching was not possible. For whatever reason there were more children at that age unable to read.

The team of researchers from the University proposed to the Intermediate schools in Mangere that this problem was worthy of consideration, but the schools felt that they were under-resourced and unable to offer help to these students. The schools also blamed the homes and the parents for the reading problems, saying "they're unmotivated, they're apathetic". To them there were serious quality differences between the home and the school. They saw a lack of appreciation of the sacrifices the schools considered necessary in order to do well at school. They perceived a lack of education among the parents, and they interpreted hesitancy to communicate with the school and to attend parent teacher evenings as apathy. The suggestion from the research team that the researchers could visit the home to investigate and help with reading was greeted with a sceptical if well-meaning response to the effect that it was not worth the effort.

Ted We went and door-knocked. We wanted a small number of cases to focus on intensively in order to find out what sort of interaction would go on when these kids were learning to read, particularly if they had somebody helping them at home. The first sixteen (homes we went to) said, 'Yes, we're in. We want to be in this, it's important'. So we didn't have to look very far to get our families. From there on the project consisted of meeting
regularly with those students - young people and their family member, usually a mother, aunty or older person - and we worked with them intensively three times a week for about twelve weeks, supplying reading materials and for the base-line phase, just listening very carefully and seeing what happened when the child tried to read, and what they were doing and not doing. On the basis of that information we designed this remedial reading package which is now called Pause, Prompt and Praise (PPP). The kids made very good progress in reading over a 10 to 12 week period.

The success of the project with the children in the home challenged the schools in a number of ways. Firstly it challenged the assumptions that the schools had about the families of these low-achieving children "without ever having visited the homes".

Ted The message we got from the schools was one of parental apathy and lack of interest. The message we got in the homes was exactly the opposite. These parents knew these kids were not reading well, and knew that they should be and were really angry about it - concerned, highly motivated, certainly not apathetic.

This tension between the aspirations of the parents and the expectations of the schools created a second challenge when it was realised that not many of the children transferred progress into the school context because there were limited reading opportunities in the school. In other words, it was extremely difficult to demonstrate to the schools that improvement had indeed taken place. While some students did have reading programmes available, a common response to improvement in the children's reading associated with the home tutoring was "it doesn't really matter what you did, if you put in that amount of time" you were bound to get an improvement.

The research programme had a tight behavioural design, and the researchers were convinced that the data showed the amount of progress one could expect from just 'putting in the time' differed from 'actually doing the procedures' that were developed. The researchers were convinced that they could show "that faster progress came from using the procedures we developed". However, it was very difficult to convince the schools that it was worth the extra effort, or that the extra effort was a valid use of time and resources.

Ted replicated the study in Birmingham while on leave in 1979 and found the results were similar. Especially sad was the fact that

Ted the school didn’t want to know about it because it would have meant something of a challenge to their teaching system, and it would have meant
giving away power to the parents. In Britain I ... ran up against the union idea that this could be depowering teachers and that it was a union matter (a demarcation dispute) to have parents involved doing teachers' work.

The message for the researcher from the experiments in Mangere and Birmingham was that in order to address educational change there was a need to address a complex matrix of interacting elements, in short the socially responsive context that the child lived in (Glynn 1985, 1987). Approaching only one element of the interacting whole that affected the education of the child was not adequate.

Ted I learnt (that) ... you really needed to involve parents and teachers concurrently. In other words, you needed to train the parents and teachers in the same set of skills so that the kids are learning to read by the same approach at home and school. That led me to the point where you've got to go into homes to empower the parents and give them skills, but you also need to work on the school so what the kid is learning at home will be recognised at school.

Russell How do you do that?

Ted Well, I think, looking back now, you would train parents and teachers concurrently.

Russell How do you convince the teachers they need to be trained?

Ted With great difficulty.

Ted began to realise the need for a wider contextual focus for research and that there needed to be a form of systemic change within schools, especially when there are differences between the values and expected behaviours of the home and the school, that is when cultural differences are taken into account. I suggested to him that

Russell The barriers you keep coming up against are barriers of power and control. If you're going to develop a programme that is going to change things for the betterment of people you've actually got to address those issues. I'm fascinated how you've moved from a situation of dealing just with parents, then realising that that context was too simple and you needed to go into a more complex context and you seem to be hinting to me that there's a further context, a more complicated context that would be even more
empowering for students and parents. For example, how do you think the Education Act 1989 and the development of Tomorrow’s Schools and the supposed empowerment of parents on Boards of Trustees addresses this issue of systemic change?

Ted

I think the Picot Report surprised us, surprised me in a number of ways. I had totally mixed feelings about it. On the one hand to go over to that degree of local control, local school, would mean throwing away the lifesavers of outside help, experts employed in the system who would keep touch with a particular school, leaving the school on its own to provide all its services. My experience in Mangere at that time suggested that might be too much. At the time, I saw a lot of problems with implementing the Picot report, but on the other hand, Maori people that I knew at the time were fairly excited because they saw within the Picot framework an opportunity for them to develop to their own schools or their own classes within schools. They saw from that point of view that ‘at last we can do something for ourselves’, and that started me off on another train of thinking which led me to look more seriously at bicultural issues, and that’s the beginning of the path that led to Tatari, Tautoko, Tauawhi (TTT).

Becoming part of a network, a 'Kanohi Kitea'

In 1984, Ted moved from Auckland University to become the Head of the Education Department (HOD) at Otago University. He quickly found that instead of being able to let others address bicultural issues, the HOD needed to become culturally competent in order to address the needs of the local mana whenua. To do this he realised that he needed to take notice of local Maori opinion about the learning needs of Maori children. He determined to learn the Maori language. He took courses about the Treaty of Waitangi and embarked upon a Diploma for Graduates, majoring in Maori Studies. In short, Ted began to make a commitment to participate in the bicultural/Maori networks, to become a ‘known face’, a kanohi kitea. This was an essential step in establishing the trust that is a necessary feature of any research relationship.

He was also inspired to critically reflect upon his role as an educator and trainer of educational psychologists.

Ted

When the new Special Education Service (SES) was set up in ’91 I think I realised I had spent 23 years training people to work in the old 'Psych Service' with little or no concern at all about serving the needs of Maori or understanding the needs of Maori children in the school system. So while
for many people the abolition of the old Psychological Service and setting up this free-standing Crown Owned Enterprise called SES seemed nothing but gloom and doom, I think that I saw along with several of my Maori colleagues at least an opportunity with a new hand of cards as it were to do something better for services for Maori. And I have to say that that organisation has astounded me. In almost four years of existence, it now has five of its 18 districts headed up by Maori managers. It has employed senior Maori staff at head office level and it is employing Maori staff in various capacities in almost all of the districts. Having employed those staff it is now setting about finding ways to train them and help finance their training and provide time for study. So the SES is building up a strong membership of Maori and as an organisation it's becoming much more capable of delivering services to Maori kids. My contact with that organisation, my admiration for it and for people in it and my involvement in continuing to train educational psychologists have brought me into contact with the new people within SES.

'Whanau of Interest' development

As a result of the restructuring of the 'special' education services and the growth of Maori involvement in special education delivery, there developed within the service a Maori group organised along Maori forms of social organisation, the whanau. This was a whanau in the metaphoric sense (Metge, 1990a), for the members were from a variety of areas and backgrounds. Nevertheless, they established and ran their group along whanau lines. Two senior Maori women were appointed into Kaumatua Kuia roles as Kairaranga ('weaver' of people), and wharau principles and practices were instituted in the initiation and implementation of their programmes. For example, the initiation and procedures developed to address hearing impairment among Maori children was conducted in a whanau-driven manner (McCudden, Mohi and Glynn, 1992).

Because of his long-term relationship with the psychological services as a trainer of Educational Psychologists and his demonstration of interest, respect and commitment to become cross-culturally competent (Banks, 1988; Bishop and Glynn, 1992b), Ted was gradually invited to participate in whanau activities. However, over time his participation underwent a radical change. Initially members of the whanau would draw on his expertise:

Ted They would frequently consult me on bits of information on procedures or processes for trying to assess Maori children or trying to avoid assessing Maori children, and what sort of information Pakeha staff in the service
needed to hear about the Treaty and about their role as Pakeha in the organisation.

Then gradually his role began to change. He became incorporated more fully into the functioning of the whanau, being offered the opportunity to initiate projects from within the whanau. This development is of crucial significance. From being an outsider and used in a consultancy role, he was gradually incorporated into the functioning of the whanau whose prime function was to initiate interventions into the lives of children with 'special' needs. This incorporation took time and involved the development of mutual trust, respect and commitment to whanau processes from all the members of the whanau. Ted had been working on the same agenda as this whanau for some twenty years, that is initiating meaningful interventions into the lives of people with special needs. However, it is crucially significant that Ted understood that in order for the initiation of intervention strategies into the lives of Maori children and their families to be successful, they had to come from within a Maori-controlled context and not be based on his experience from within the university context. Because of his inclusion into the whanau of interest located within the Special Education Service, Ted was able to initiate research in a Maori context, from within a Maori context and using Maori processes.

The critical incident that signified Ted's change in role from outside consultant to whanau member was when whanau kaumatua suggested to him that he might like to go with them to a hui in Gisborne to present some of his ideas to other Maori members of the Special Education Service. From this event it was evident that they were signalling to him where the control over implementation of intervention strategies lay; it lay clearly within the whanau. It is also evident that the kaumatua would not suggest that Ted participate in such a manner unless they had read the messages given (kori a tinana; body language) and spoken by the others members of the whanau. Ted described the sequence of events:

Ted

It became clear that one of the goals of that group, the whanau that I’ve described that I sort of found myself growing into, was to develop teaching resources, teaching and learning resources that could be delivered to Maori children whether in Kura Kaupapa or Kohunga settings or mainstream settings. The need was to develop packages in the area of language learning, reading, maths and a range of others. Pause, Prompt, Praise (PPP) re-emerged in my mind as a possibility, even though I had left it behind for a number of years. It was a set of procedures that was effective in empowering parents at home and involving parents in their kids' education, and we had good information on its effectiveness. I was invited to take that
with me as a 'take' for a hui at Gisborne at Poho Rawiri marae. This was in 1991, and this was a hui for all the Maori staff within the Special Education Service. My daughter and I role-played (she played a child and I played a tutor) the Pause, Prompt Praise procedures, very crudely put into Maori by myself with my limited resources. However, we were able to role-play pausing, the different kind of prompting that you can use to help kids and the different kinds of praise, and we put that down as a koha to the group and sat down.

When considering how to present the ideas of PPP to the hui it became very obvious to Ted that he needed to work within a culturally appropriate context. It was not sufficient to simply re-present PPP in English in the manner it had initially been presented to non-Maori groups. He felt that for the presentation to be successful he needed to present his ideas at the hui firstly in the Maori language and secondly as a koha that could be used as the people there saw fit. He felt that by acknowledging the mana of the tangata whenua in this way that he was acknowledging the location of the power and control to determine the use of these ideas. This meant that he had to be culturally competent, for in a Maori hui context, acknowledging the tapu of his knowledge in relationship to the tapu of the hosts' right to self-determination, and doing this in the Maori language, was acknowledging and protecting the mana of both parties. They could meet, exchange ideas and leave as rangatira, Ka Rakatira ake ai, in other words they could leave as chiefs and their mana would be intact. This also allowed the hosts the opportunity to pick up the koha as symbolic of their power to control their own decision making. This is a powerful traditional action that has strong symbolic meaning for the world today.

Ted

This was the most important hui that I'd attended because it actually required me to play a particular role. I just felt it had to be presented in Maori if I was to make the point that these procedures had something to offer to SES Maori staff, that they needed to see it in a Maori context. I certainly feel that the impact that it had and the interest that came was in a large part due to our trying to do that. I'm not saying we did it well but we had a go.

The whanau of SES that went to the East Coast was made up of Maori and non-Maori people from other areas of New Zealand. An often misunderstood fact is that Maori political divisions are not nationally based on class, race or sect but are regionally or locally based on whanau, hapu and iwi. There is no effective national body for this type of activity, for example if the Maori Education Foundation or any
national Maori group went to an area, they would go through similar rituals of encounter, thus recognising the political integrity of the mana whenua of that place. When a 'ira (party) made up of Maori from one area approach Maori from another area they must go through the traditional and essential ritual of encounter, the powhiri. An encounter where the tapu and mana of each group is addressed, acknowledged and protected.

Ted The major initiative in my travelling to Gisborne as part of an ope(group) came from the whanau which consisted of the Maori staff in Waikato west and Matewai McCudden in the National Office. So this time they were taking me and other people from Waikato into the Ngati region. The organisation itself ... was still coming to terms with what its Maori status was nationally. As you know Maori work very efficiently within an iwi, but when you try to nationalise an organisation there are some difficulties. So there was a fascinating time at that hui working out kawa. What were Waikato doing on Ngati territory? Who was bringing what message to whom? From a Pakeha perspective there was a lot of learning that went on about the negotiation process. Not everybody in our ope could speak Maori, and I felt this had a somewhat negative impact initially. That further spurred me on to the idea that I should try to speak in Maori.

Kawa/Tikanga

Ted explained that when the tira arrived at the East Coast marae there were a few problems between the two groups caused by protocol differences. Kawa/tikanga/protocol problems are very common, perhaps less so in areas where mana whenua status is not in dispute, but in the cities, for example, where most Maori now live, there are constant discussions about the 'what, how, why and when' pertaining to tikanga. This political reality to an uninitiated researcher could seem as if chaos was in train. However, to the initiated it is but a signal that these issues are some of the most important to Maoridom and will be debated forever. These debates are as old as time and are fundamental to the symbolism of the powhiri, for they are tied in with tapu and mana, the fundamentals of life itself.

At the commencement of this particular hui some conflict arose that kaumatua were able to eventually resolve. The particular conflict is not pertinent to this story, but what is pertinent is that Ted was able to learn a great deal from being involved in this context. He felt that there was no way that he could have learnt a lesson of this kind apart from in the appropriate context. This principle of socio-cultural contextual learning is one promoted strongly by Ted himself (Glynn, 1985, 1987).
Ted ... until I'd actually experienced what happens when you don't follow kawa correctly and what happens when you do ... I don't think you can acquire that learning in any other way. It was very painful. Even though I was not personally responsible for what happened, it was very painful to experience.

Ted emphasised that such problems confirmed to him the need of tira or ope to move onto another people's area with extreme caution and respect. The message to researchers is that they need kaumatua support if they are to reach full respect in the eyes of the hosts. Kaumatua are necessary in order to negotiate kawa/tikanga in safe and appropriate ways and to resolve conflicts. The rituals of encounter that have been developed over many generations have enormous significance to Maori social organisation. These experiences further convinced Ted of the need to present his ideas and take in te reo Maori.

The Presentation of TTT as a koha

The presentation of TTT as a koha had a very rapid response.

Ted One of the SES Maori staff from Tauranga stood up and said as our work had been put down as a koha she was going to take it up and her office would want to work with me, want to develop the procedures, work on producing a video and a training booklet and the whole thing. I had already learnt from experience that the way to try to move anything was to work within an Iwi rather than try to work across iwi. Her iwi were Ngaiterangi and Ngatiranginui from Tauranga. That was the commitment, that she would take it back to her home and run it past their own kaumatua back home. Assuming that it would be accepted, we had a commitment to work together and make a video. So she became very much a part of this whanau.

Whanau of interest

We had discussed the use of the term whanau early on in our conversation and in two co-jointly written academic papers (Bishop and Glynn, 1992a, Bishop and Glynn, 1992b) in reference to the SES group that he was part of. Now he used the term in reference to the response from Tauranga. I questioned him on his use of this term, for Maori people are often very concerned that Maori terms can be appropriated by non-Maori for uses other than those preferred by Maori (Kapa, 1993). This form of colonialism can further distance researcher and researched.

Russell Why do you think its a whanau and not just a group? Why do you use that word whanau?
**Ted**

I think it's very definitely a whanau even though there are some modern elements of it in that not all of the members were blood-related. Nevertheless they operated in Maori ways. Various components of that whanau that I've worked with never start without a karakia, always have a kaumatua present or a kaumatua that we are working under, and the whanau accepts responsibilities for everybody present and for maintaining the well-being of the whanau as well as the kaupapa. I've learnt that the two are connected. If the whanau is well and works well together then the kaupapa is well.

He also mentioned that when a researcher enters into a modern whanau there are obligations and expectations that certainly many positivist researchers may not be prepared to meet. Many qualitative researchers join groups but the tendency is for these to be groups of people like themselves. In this situation the group that Ted was joining was not like a feminist collective or an action research group for it was a group of unlike people who were joined by a common purpose. Further, in Ted's experience, the expectations are that when he as a researcher became part of the whanau he was expected to participate in activities not only related to the research, but also related to the functioning of the whanau. There are expectations that events of importance to the whanau members, such as tangi, unveilings, births will involve all the members. To Ted, attending a tangi is of as much importance as completing a part of the research, of the level of completing the video for example. The message to the kaumatua who are being asked to support the research is that the researcher is prepared to support events and happenings that are of importance to them. It is reciprocity in action. The researcher is seen to be an active participant in all important events associated with the well being of the family and therefore further reinforcing that the research must be one of these events that is of importance to the family, and therefore worthy of support.

**Ted**

That's very much a whanau relationship and, you know, that carries with it obligations on my part to be involved in their affairs with things that happen to them. I think I might have mentioned to you already Russell, the maamae (sadness) and irritations that happen to teachers within the school system; frustrations arising out of being a bilingual unit within a mainstream primary school and issues of conflict with boards of trustees and whanau members. Those sorts of things have impacted on me as a whanau member and I felt them and felt concerned about them. At the same time you know, I've shared in the good things that have happened too and this is much wider than just the research relationship.
This is what modern whanau are like. They extend over huge distances and involve people from different iwi but nevertheless they function in terms of whanau support and I think that’s got to be understood by people wanting to (do this sort of) research. This links in with your work Russell in that the research became the property of the whanau if you like.

If the research becomes 'the property of the whanau', then this has serious challenges for university or other institution based researchers. The implications are ethical and procedural. For example the research and ethics committee of the Education Department of the University of Otago produces a booklet on research guidelines for prospective researchers. The information in this booklet reflects the interests of similar institutions and associated groupings such as the New Zealand Association for Research in Education. The recommendation by the committee in relationship to ownership of knowledge, that is the ownership of data that has been gathered in a research project is that the research informant be asked to sign away their ownership of the data in order that the researcher may be able to proceed to process the data and complete the research project without fear of a veto on the use of it.

This is in stark contrast to statements on indigenous people's rights to control their intellectual property. Such ethical statements are to be found in Te Awekotuku (1991), the United Nation Indigenous peoples' statement (in Tauroa, 1989), the Coolangatta statement on the rights of indigenous peoples (1993) and the Maatatua Declaration (in Te Puni Kokiri, 1993).

The answer to the concern that nobody will then want to undertake research into Maori contexts if they can't guarantee they will be able to finish the project is answered in two ways. The first is exclusive, for example Smith (1992a) states that this type of research may not be for everyone and perhaps researchers need to take cognisance of this suggestion. The second approach is inclusive where the emphasis is on the procedure, the usefulness of the project to the whanau involved and on how the researcher relates to the researched. If the questions pertaining to benefits, control and accountability are answered positively, in other words if the project is initiated and designed by the whanau then it will also be in the whanau's interests to ensure publication in some form or other. In other words it is essential to ensure that the distance between the objectives of the researcher and the researched are minimised by ensuring that the objectives of both parties are similar and compatible.

**Mana 'tests'**

I raised the hypothetical situation of what would have happened if someone had not picked up the koha at Poho Rawiri, the hui at Gisborne, for Ted had mentioned that
there were some people at that hui who were clearly not interested for whatever reasons, in the offer that he had made.

Ted felt this leaving a koha was a 'mana test' for him, a test as to whether he could acknowledge the principle of tino Rangatiratanga, the right to self-determination of the other people; the right of self-determination for Maori people that had been guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi.

Russell   If no one had picked up your koha there, what would you have done then?

Ted      Oh I would have left it at that. I think that for me, it's very much a 'mana' test; that you're prepared to put it down and if no one wants it, walk away from it, to leave it there. I've been in this situation several times now and really it is a test of what you understand as tino Rangatiratanga. I think if you're saying I've got something that I think you might find helpful, here it is, but if people don't want that or choose to ignore it, if you take it any further at that time then I think you are showing that you don't understand tino Rangatiratanga, that you're trying to exert more influence, more control.

Russell   As you'd worked in training educational psychologists for 23 years surely you had enough evidence to try and convince them. I'm stating a hypothetical 'devils advocate' case here, but if they say "No get out of here, we don't want any of this darn Pakeha stuff, it's all a Pakeha way of doing things, and we don't want it." Surely you could have got up after that and said, "Come on you people, what you need is this, you need some reading, you've got to get into this reading stuff, otherwise you'll fail in the system, because aren't Maori children failing in the system." And surely couldn't you have insisted that they learn it, that they use your system?

Ted      I don't think that would have been power sharing under the Treaty. Also as a naive behavioral psychologist I wouldn't have got very far with that! I was on someone else's patch. I was in someone else's culture, and I was standing on someone else's marae. The most important thing to do there is to acknowledge that and to acknowledge who you are, that you're in a visitor's role and you're in the the lower side of the role, you're not directing and you're not in control. Fortunately I enjoy that particular role and I've learnt that when you've allowed people space to listen to what you've said and to think about it, then they come back.
Russell  People could say you're disempowered as a researcher that you've given up your own power as a researcher to control your research design in projects.

Ted  You are disempowered but by disempowering the individual you empower the group and the group has been able to achieve things that I haven't. I was able to share the skills and the material by handing it over to the whanau by talking with them about it. Other members of the whanau fronted up to the school concerned and got teachers on board, got elders, kaumatua on board and what they've actually done with the procedures has probably gone way further than I would have gone or could have gone if I had been in control.

This raised the idea of disempowerment as a concept and synergistic empowerment of the collective, the gestalt of collective action. An idea we pursued when talking about the journey to Tauranga.

The tira to Tauranga

Katherine Atvars of Tauranga had taken up the koha and returned to Tauranga where she had talked it through with her people and after a considerable amount of talking she gained their interest. Ted was then invited to travel to Hairini marae in Tauranga with the University of Otago Audio-Visual team to present his ideas about the reading tutoring programme and about the possibility of making a training video.

Ted  But we didn't go up there to start work. We went up there to convince them why this was important... It was definitely the right move to offer the material as a take (topic for discussion) so it gave the mana motuhake (absolute power) to the Tauranga people to choose to take that up. Even though that invitation was given and I knew that I had Katherine Atvars, one of the SES people involved on board, and clearly wanting to go ahead with this, and even though Katherine had obviously consulted at length with Rangi Whakaehu, her kuia (female elder), and others, never-the-less we still had to be seen in person. The A-V team that came with us still had to be seen in person and we still needed to present ourselves formally at that first powhiri. Even though I knew that a fair few of the people there had a pretty good idea of what we were about and were indeed happy to proceed, I think the powhiri process probably brought more people on board. Some of the older people who were perhaps not as up with specific educational issues as they were with iwi issues generally. And I think that was an opportunity for them to hear more in detail and to hear for themselves that their kaiako were happy with this trialling procedure, with TTT. But even at the kai (meal)
after that powhiri there were still negotiations going on. There were one or two kaumatua that I hadn't personally met at that point, who were still being brought on board as it were, people explaining things and people relating backwards and forwards.

Cultural Competency

Ted Pomare Sullivan, the kaumatua who was responsible for this project, informally on various occasions, commented (to me) that for him, a critical factor in the acceptability of our group; that's the AV team and myself - when we went on, (to Hairini) was that we were able to represent ourselves appropriately in the powhiri; acknowledge who the iwi were that we were dealing with, to show that we were aware that even in one place, there was one iwi and (that we knew enough) to acknowledge their tipuna and their maunga and their wharenui (meeting house) and all of that kind of thing which may appear trivial to some researchers. But in this context it was critical.

Russell You needed a fairly sophisticated level of competency in the culture in order to participate in this hui?.

Ted Well yes. For me personally, yes, I think it was important. I have been trying to learn Maori language and culture for a number of years off and on - quite a long way back because I think it's important for me as a New Zealander to learn about these these things. I think I can be pretty honest in saying that my reason for doing that was not to try in some way to obtain power over somebody else but because I find the language fascinating, interesting; always interesting; always fascinating and it just holds such a lot of, to use an over used word, it just holds so many treasures that are accessible to anyone that's prepared to do the work.

Here again the whanau principle worked for the support of one of its members. When Ted was preparing for his journey to Tauranga to talk to the people of Hairini, he spoke to me and a number of others about who the people were, who was their ancestor, waka, meeting house name and so on, in order that the could mihi to them when he arrived. However, along with the details of the times to arrive etc,"came three or four fax pages of just general background knowledge of the marae...there was no instruction for me to learn that but I knew that information was for me to use."
Ted described in detail how he participated in the procedure of the powhiri. He had listened to the speakers on the side of the tangata whenua and then had responded himself in his role as manuhiri. The whole process as described by Salmond (1975) and analysed by Shirres (1982) provided a matching of power, a location where the tapu of the visitor was acknowledged and nurtured while there was acknowledgement and nurturing of the tapu of the hosts. I suggested to Ted that there seemed to be a process of power sharing inherent in the structure of the hui.

Ted

I like that, I like that image and concept. At least the kind of hui that I’ve been to have actually embodied the process of power sharing in that a group coming on has something to offer or something to seek and the tangata whenua usually has something to offer and something to seek, something that they need. I think the image I have is that when a hui is running well you end up creating the opportunity where people can speak on equal terms. I mean, when you get through powhiri processes; acknowledging past events; acknowledging people who have died on both sides and making all of the whakapapa links that the experts do, it’s as if you clear the way for a productive discussion to take place in which everyone is empowered to speak.

Initiation-gaining access: issues of gender.

I suggested to Ted that someone reading this account may deem it unfair that he was able to perform in a powhiri, especially considering that the kaumatua had put such store on this performance, whereas a woman would not have been able to function in this way. For example, Pakeha woman are not usually expected to karanga, nor able to whaikorero.

Russell

As a man, you were able to participate in the marae atea (the marae in front of the meeting house) activities. How would a woman fit into this? How could your experience as a male researcher be useful to a women researcher?

Ted

Well, I think it's worth stating that my experience did not start with that encounter. That was very much down the track. Prior to that I had been a member of a much earlier series of hui. I had put down the material as koha and it had been taken up. I'd got to know the people and quite a lot of work had been done on my behalf by people like Katherine. So the invitation to come up to make the video and to front up to that powhiri was already an acknowledgment of what had gone on before. What I did on that occasion
was play the appropriate role as I understood it for a male to perform as a manuhiri in that context. I also carried some of the mana of this university, (our whole group did). We had to acknowledge that but we also had to acknowledge the mana of the people that we were going to and show respect for who they were and what their achievements are in the best way that we could which reflects you know, my understanding of the role. So what I'm saying is, I did what I think was appropriate for a male to do.

For a female, a female would not obviously perform that particular role but there are equally important and equally powerful roles for a female to perform in which she could show her respect for the mana of the people that she was with and also acknowledge their contributions. Again, I make the point that male or female, the encounter would not have started with a formal powhiri like that. I can't conceive of a situation where totally out of the blue and being totally unknown without any preparation, that you would be put into a, as a Pakeha, that you would be put into a powhiri situation. I can't see how it would arise. If it did it would be because there have been initiatives taken; there's been information exchanged; there's been invitations sent and so on. Were a female to follow that process I think a female would be supported just as strongly as I was, but the role that they would be called to play would be different. It's a case of mana wahine and mana tane.

Russell Right. Right. And also - maybe if I could suggest another aspect of it - maybe that although you were talking to Pomare (later when the whanau travelled to Australia) about it, just by the very fact that you were sharing a room with Pomare, you didn't actually ask Aunty Nan about it and if I could imagine what would be happen at the powhiri, say you were a woman in that case, I would imagine that the person taking most notice of you, and the person that you would have been appealing to, would have been Aunty Nan. It would be kaumatua kuia to woman as it is kaumatua koroua to the men eh?

Ted Yes that's - I think that's where the initial response is. It's still important that both the kuia and koroua responded to me in the first instance and followed through. I mean I was put into that situation on the basis of a set of experiences which led up to it and I think that were a female in that role, she too would be led through a set of experiences and an opportunity would be created for her - a culturally appropriate opportunity for her to acknowledge the iwi and acknowledge the kuia and acknowledge the mana of the iwi.
This may be inside the wharenui after kai or at a special meeting. I would imagine that a female researcher would have similar opportunities to display some cultural competence, only what she would be doing would not be a whaikorero in that particular formal setting.

Russell
It may still seem that there's a difference in status. How do you account for that difference in status? Do you understand the cultural context that men are able to stand on the marae atea and talk and yet women are not? In the whaikorero context that is.

Ted
No, you have to put that into the whole context. I think part of the problem is that Pakeha are seeing each context as separate and isolated from every other context. I think to get an understanding of mana wahine and mana tane you have to try to encompass the whole way in which power is exerted and shared and in which control is operated in Maori contexts. The whaikorero is itself subsumed or contained under a broader kaupapa of the control exerted by women through the karanga. I feel embarrassed to be talking about that because I'm not an expert but I have been told that there is such power inherent in the karanga and the way that it's given and the way that it's received that it's possible for women, at that stage before a man has spoken, to shut down a hui or to belittle the kaupapa or to whakamana and strengthen it.

You have to be careful when you look at what you see men doing and women doing, so that before you make a judgement based on one cultural perspective, you look at the total context. And in a decision making process at a hui the powhiri is but one element of it. The power that women have both directly in terms of what they say in the whare (house) and how they contribute and indirectly through how they can control what the men speak, gives a much broader perspective for judging whether or not there's an imbalance between male and female.

Russell
You see what fascinates me also in terms of mana wahine, is that there's no way that I've ever come across Pakeha women doing a karanga. There's no way that Maori women would ever allow a Pakeha woman to do a karanga, eh. And yet Pakeha men are allowed to whaikorero.

Ted
Yes that's really interesting that one.
Russell: I wonder how long Pakeha men will be allowed to whaikorero. I've heard in some places that it's frowned upon, you know.

Ted: Yes. Yes. Well, I can certainly understand how that would be.

Russell: Yes, be that as it may, what you're saying is that the issue is not the whaiwhaikorero; it's not who does the karanga, it's the total package of the researcher being able to impress upon the manawhenua that they have some level of cultural competency that will see them being able to work within a whanau.

Ted: I started off this particular journey of my own as an adult New Zealand male who had gone overseas and obtained a PhD and come back to a university appointment by the late sixties. I had no knowledge of te reo or tikanga Maori other than the few words that you might pick up. I have started from that point so what I'm saying is that I think I started from the same point as some of those people that you're talking about. The behaviourists have a very simple model which said, you analyse what people spend most of their time doing, and that's what's important to them. And that's a good measure of motivation. And it's so simple that people don't like it, but in terms of learning about another culture, you've got to put time into it. If it's important to you, you will make time for it. But in my case the thing is self-driven because I am not learning Maori in order to be able to do research. I can do research anyway. I'm learning Maori because it's really interesting and I enjoy it and I get a lot out of it. As with all language learning, as you learn a little bit more you see a little bit further.

Differentiation of roles within a whanau

We continued to discuss the role of modern whanau research projects and the complexity of such institutions as we spoke about the process of building a whanau around a kaupapa through negotiation. This process was further illustrated when it was decided to develop a training video. Wai Harawira was approached to become the front person for the video and as such became an integral part of this whanau.

Ted: I'm not sure where the idea came from that Wai Harawira should be the front person on the video but it came from the whanau. She also wrote the booklet with us. As the original PPP was a book that I'd had personal input in, I actually had a go at setting down in Maori what we actually wanted to be in the booklet in my very limited way. Then when Wai Harawira came...
with her wonderful native language, she could see from my language what the messages were, what we were trying to say within PPP. She was able to take those messages and float them across in much more beautiful language than we could have dreamed of. Of course that brought in another dimension, that brought Tuhoe Iwi into this whanau and that led in turn to TTT being tried out at Rakaumanga Kura Kaupapa school (near Hamilton). Although the school is in Waikato, it just so happens that the Principal is Tuhoe and it just so happens that his aunty is Aunty Wai Harawira. That’s how it goes.

**Russell** So there’s a mixture of traditional whanaungatanga (relationships) and modern whanaungatanga?

**Ted** Yes, that’s right, it’s a whanau that crosses iwi lines. It doesn’t depend exclusively on traditional status for membership. On the other hand it doesn’t depend exclusively on contemporary achievement. So there are aspects that, because of who she is as an accomplished Tuhoe woman, Wai is an important part of that whanau. So as with Matewai, because of who she is, from Kahangunu and Ngati and having worked with Waikato, she is an important member of the whanau. However, the decision making is not typically along iwi lines, it is along whanau lines. Consensus seeking, and attending always to wairuatanga (spirituality) and... to the well-being of the group. I’ve had a lot of support when I’ve wanted things done and when I’ve wanted to talk about this to the media, I’ve had support from Tauranga, faxes coming down all that kind of thing.

**Russell** The whanau related to TTT, they have different rights, different responsibilities, there’s differences, there’s hierarchies within the whanau? Did some people within the whanau have more rights, more say in things than others?

**Ted** Yes, it’s like recognition of expertise. Katherine, for example, Katherine Aitvars from Tauranga would be one of the major driving forces for getting people to try it out, getting people to print the books and take it all on board. She’d be a strong advocate.

The kaumatua attended to protocol, both on and off the marae, and were actively involved in editing and construction the video tapes. Parents play their roles as tutors.
and members of the whanau tautoko (support) the class at school where the research whanau works. The teachers are an integral part as are the children.

Making the video; An example of role-differentiation and specialisation.

The production of the video gave a good illustration of the type of role differentiations found within the whanau.

Ted

The AV team and myself had to show people that we respected their kawa and tikanga and their ways of doing things, and that we would do whatever they said in making this video and we would not do what they didn’t want. I want to pay tribute to Robert and the team from the AV centre. They worked in a very positive way, with the result that we were taken around Hairini marae and the neighbouring area near Maungatapu school and Maungatapu marae to film background material, close shots of the whanau whanui and close-up shots of rafters with kowhaiwhai (rafter patterns). There was always a kaumatua at our elbow all the way. Whatever we thought might be good visually in the video, they found a way for us to get. They cleared the way with a karakia. I’m sure that helped us get the raw material for the video. Then as you know we brought them down to Dunedin to work on editing it. They sent down a kuia and a kaumatua who watched their way through hours and hours of video tape to make sure that everything was right. They watched the lot. They didn’t just watch the 40 minutes we got it down to. They advised us on writing the book. They went with us and made contact with our Pou Here Tangata in this Department and took an active role (in production of the video). I felt myself empowered by them doing that so that I didn’t have to worry.

Russell

So you got on with being a researcher?

Ted

I didn’t have to worry with how this bit would be perceived, how that bit would be perceived. We were able to draft the script for the video and the shots that were going to be in it and run it past them. Again we got nothing but support. The process was very much one of whanau building.

The functioning of a modern whanau of interest

A further example of a modern whanau of interest in action was when the invitation was extended to the whanau to travel to the World Indigenous Peoples’ conference in Wollongong in Australia in December of 1993 in order for the project to be presented to this large conference (5000 people enrolled: 3000 attending in
any one day). There was no question that the project would or could be presented by one or two of the people involved. There was no question of a traditional 'conference paper' type presentation by the 'researcher'. When it came time to present the project to the conference, the whole whanau went.

Ted explained how originally he had not considered going, for by this time he felt that the Tauranga whanau had taken over the project to the extent that he felt that, while he was not quite redundant, nevertheless he was not essential.

Ted I honestly did think that it was great that they'd thought to enter TTT or a paper based on TTT in the Indigenous People's Conference. I thought that was really appropriate and I was pleased with that in itself, but then it became clear from phone calls ... that they were expecting that I would be going too. When I pointed out that I didn't think it was necessary, that they were quite capable of representing the project and talking about it to indigenous people. They didn't see it that way. They saw me as being part of the original proposal and part of the team, the whanau, that is working with it and I'd just better get on to finding some money to get there. ...It was very clear that I was meant to be in that (ope to Australia). There were places reserved for me on aircraft, there were luggage labels all whipped out with my name on them, and I was included in a hotel booking too - along with Pomare Sullivan and John Miles. So it's clear that they had built me into the whole process. This was an enormous conference with tremendous opportunities for indigenous people from different countries and nations to get together and to talk. There was a three-day period where our group maintained a stand, in a kind of a display hall, like an exhibition.

Whereas the majority of the other displays, largely displays by Aboriginal people from around Australia, were in my view more targeted towards selling of culturally appropriate tourist items to raise money and in a few cases, selling educational materials, our stall looked quite different in that throughout those days we had a kaumatua and a kuia in attendance, either or both of them, plus the two Maori teachers who had implemented the project and others such as myself. And it was the presence of the old people, particularly our kaumatua and kuia who attracted indigenous people to that stand. They would come up and find out what it was about, to talk to them and see what was going on because we had the TTT Maori video and the Pakeha version, Pause Prompt Praise, running continuously. What was interesting was the Maori version both because of the language and because of the cultural information it contained that attracted the indigenous people to find out what it was, to talk to the old people, to talk to the teachers. The
actual tape that they then wanted to order, to take away was usually the Pakeha version because that's the language that they thought they had access to. But I'm quite convinced that they would not have been attracted to the Pakeha version if it were playing on its own. That is, seeing it in Maori and seeing the old people there who are obviously part of the process and knowledgeable about the video, brought them in. They would sit and stay for quite long periods of time.

There was also the formal presentation, a workshop, on the last day of the conference and we had a reasonable attendance at that, including some Aboriginal people and one young Aboriginal person in particular: Scott, who was kind of our kaiarahi (guide) for the conference, helping us find our way around. In our presentation we presented the project in a culturally appropriate way. Our kaumatua, Pomare Sullivan, opened with a watea, a tauparapara and a prayer (followed by) himene (hymns), and then he introduced the people. Then he had some comments, then he asked Auntie Nan, our kuia, to give her comments. We then went through comments from the teacher and at the appropriate point I was cued in to say where the material had come from and what my role in the process was. I felt very comfortable with that because I spoke when cued to speak and dealt with any questions that came directly to me and then sat down again and allowed the rest of the presentation to get on, which included a live demonstration by the teacher and one of the students from the bi-lingual class, a demonstration that they had arranged sight-unseen. So he (the student) would be reading from a Maori text as well as an English text that he had not seen before in order to demonstrate how the teachers would respond to any errors he made in accordance with the TTT programme. That was the sort of risk that I would not care to take in a totally Pakeha style presentation of that kind but I was told not to worry about it, that it would turn out all right, and it did.

In the discussion that ensued with the audience, one line of questioning that this young Aboriginal fellow, Scott pursued and pursued was, how come that a non-Maori could be so totally wrapped up inside the group (I think he used words to that effect) without trying to dominate or without trying to control it. What was interesting was that he had to put this question about three or four times. I think he thought that the Maori people there were evading him. However, on reflection, I think to them it was a non-question and they couldn't see what the point of his question was because they had come to accept me as part of the whanau and decision making was made collectively. Either they really couldn't see what he was driving at or
else they were politely giving another message. He did persist and commented very positively that for him that was one of the important messages that he was taking away; that he'd actually seen a presentation in which a non-indigenous person kept to their place and shall we say, spoke when spoken to and put the contribution in appropriately and left it at that. And he commented that that for him it was unusual in his experience.

Despite Ted's obvious inclusion within the whanau during the conference and the presentation, the question still arose about the role of him as a non-Maori person in the group. The Aboriginal person persisted in questioning the group about the placement of a non-Maori academic in their midst despite initially being ignored. One could almost imagine him beginning to suspect that this person was running the programme from behind and/or that the Maori members of the group were there for window dressing, in other words that they were suffering from 'false consciousness', where the non-Maori academic had hegemonically convinced the Maori people that his programme was the way to go and that they were really ceremonial window dressing, they were 'brainwashed', they were unable to see through the mists of obscurity/jargon/complexity and had been convinced by this sharp talker that his was the way to go. Although the narrative is quite clear that this not the case in this project, it is worthy of consideration because there is a tendency among emancipation researchers to insist that often groups who get involved in what they consider to be "non-Maori activities" are not really going to be able to sort out the implications for their own people of a particular line of action.

However, eventually the interrogator changed his impression. He reflected that in his experience he has rarely seen such a relationship in action, where a non-Maori has been an accepted member of the group. He finally realised that this was a whanau of interest in action. In most academic conference contexts the mode of operation is Pakeha; the lead is taken by the Pakeha academic and the members of any team are presented to the audience by the academic who is in charge of the overall protocol of the event. However, here the preferred Maori social organisation was in operation. Kaumatua/Kuia were in control, the kaupapa was organised by Maori cultural practices and each person had their role and function and these roles and functions were determined by Maori social processes and not Pakeha.

In reference to allocating a position to each of the participants according to Maori preferred practice, I suggested to Ted that "the concept of 'spoke when spoken to' is almost derogatory."

Ted That wasn't the meaning I intended to have. I just meant that there was a place assigned to each of us in that presentation which had been negotiated
with all of us. Nobody imposed it and we had all agreed that we would each do our particular component. What I meant was that I presented my component at the appropriate time and place; when cued by the kaumatua who was chairing. But I was doing no different from anyone else in that respect.

The presentation was based on the idea of a whanau where the rights and responsibilities of the whanau are determined by the collective, by the group; kaumatua, kuia, teachers, researcher, each having a particular place plus a role to play.

*Ted* I felt quite comfortable as well and wouldn't have seen any other way of doing it because I'd been with that group so long and it's the collection of skills that it's got that makes it such an important group. It's got professional Maori people who are professional teachers. It's got a District Manager of the Special Education Service who is Maori. It's got important kuia from Ngai Te Rangi and Ngati Ranginui and it's got Pomare Sullivan (Kaumatua) who has made it his particular business to monitor this project since he was one of the group that greeted me on my first arrival at Tauranga.

**Who benefits from this mode of presentation?**

There are many winners out of this mode of presentation, one example being the flow-on effects of such activities of members of the whanau to activities outside of the actual work of the project.

*Ted* Significantly, also, Pomare's job. He's a broadcaster on iwi radio in the area, and it's important to note that he took home with him from that conference stacks of audio-tapes of indigenous people that had come up and talked to him at the stand about what was going on and about all kinds of things about Maori education in Aotearoa and Pomare brought all that material back and I gather that chunks of that are quite frequently played out over iwi radio.

Students often raise concerns about this type of research project. For example concerns about there being no clear paths to follow, no clear ideas when a project is finished and above all there are often concerns expressed about the amount of time taken by the entry phases of such a project. I raised these concerns with *Ted*.

*Ted* I think that's interesting. Sort of going along phase by phase in, as you would say, developing a study; a research study in a positivist paradigm.
From a Pakeha perspective, I think that much, much more time was taken, if you like, to get this show on the road. In the first place, time spent in consultation with this person and that person and the other person; consideration by the iwi and the various hui involved: much more time. But now I look back in terms of what potential we now have for going further, I think the project is now entering a dissemination phase which I can see is proceeding probably very rapidly because important people, key people, are now totally on board with this kaupapa and when it comes to implementation I think there is a lot of strategies and experience in place that reflect directly the amount of time that went into the first round of negotiations.

**Constructing meaning**

The issue of cultural competence was one that Ted came back to again and again, for besides it being a topic of mutual interest, it seems to be the area that Ted considers addresses the issue of benefits and usefulness of research to Maori people. In short, he explained his experiences in terms of the development of Maori preferred socio-political structures within the research process into which he fitted. The objectives of this group were to address the socio-political crisis that Maori people are in today, rather than addressing the interests and concerns of the researchers.

I recounted that Robert Mahuta (a Tainui leader) had said recently that the sad thing about the last hundred and fifty years had been that so few non-Maori people were comfortable within a Maori context. He said, "What's wrong with us? Why don't you want to live with us and be part of us and feel comfortable with us?"

**Ted**

Well, yes, he's right. And I think what his answer was, is that we don't feel comfortable when we don't know what to do next.

**Russell**

That's control, not being able to have control because professional educators have to have control?

**Ted**

It's self-control. Self-control is like individual achievement and is one of the corner stones of Pakeha professional competence: I am in control. I know, I set my goals, plan my diary and I achieve (my objectives). That's one of the cornerstones of Western professional well-being. It's feeling in control (that is) one of the professional cornerstones of the competent self-managing professional and that's built into the psyche, you know 'being in charge'. Being in charge of myself; being able to be assertive. I mean these are all things we put into our professional
training programmes. When you put that into a marae context and you see that none of those values are the key ones to understanding what's going on. When things go wrong at hui, just as they go wrong in any culture, really the thing is to be comfortable about it.

Russell: But it's not only the things that go wrong at the hui that mystify people, it's also the things that go right at hui that mystify people. For a start the language is different. A hui is a place for reciprocity and reciprocal relationships. It's give and take; it's whitiwhiti kōrero constantly. There's parts to be played and it's a power sharing context. If you've trained in a model where you are the powerful, to be put into a model where you are power sharing, becomes very uncomfortable, doesn't it?

Ted: Yes... You feel powerless. But, it's not that you have no control, it's that you are not in charge.

Our reflections began to centre on the situations that we as researchers had experienced at hui on marae. I suggested that just as Huata had found there was a great hesitancy among Pakeha teachers to participate in Taha Māori programmes, there is a hesitancy among Pakeha researchers to participate in Māori context research on Māori terms. However, I reflected that the experience of the researchers examined in this thesis was one of support and encouragement for efforts to participate in the Māori world. I recalled that

Russell: ... for every step that I made towards the Māori world I've had ten steps back, I've had the support given back to me. Every time I've put myself out and learnt a bit more and gone a bit deeper into it I've had yet another person supporting me. The support is there - people want to support. Māori people want to share power because by it's very nature of the institution of the hui. It's there! It's built into the society!

We also talked about creating situations that would allow non-Māori people supportive experiences. However, by talking through our own experiences we realised that it will be difficult to quantify what just enhances learning in a Māori context. Indeed, it began to appear to us that the reality of the situation is that there is a need for the learner to participate in Māori learning processes in order to learn. University learning processes may limit the effectiveness of the real-life lessons.
How can we convince people that they aren't going to be put in the situation that's going to freak them out totally? For example, when I was with the family group that went to the urupa (cemetery) on Taupiri, it freaked me out when... all of a sudden after the kaumatua had spoken and addressed the urupa and nga mate (the dead), they turned around and said, 'Your turn.' That focussed the mind.

It was another 'mana check'. We reflected on the fact that one will be given these checks all the way through a project, but they won't be beyond your capability. I reminded Ted of the time when Wi Kuki Kingi, the kaumatua with the Kaumatua Council of SES came down to Christchurch. After the opening waiata he suggested that it would be a good waiata to translate. He turned to Ted and said "The professor will translate this for us." That was a mana check. However, in both cases we felt that, although we both felt that we could have done better, given time, we were able to participate and respond to these tests. To other people it probably looked as if we were just taking part in the proceedings. In fact neither of us were asked to do anything that was beyond our level of competency. It may have been stressful and 'focussing of the mind' but it was not outside of our capabilities. This situation reflected the Maori contextually orientated methods of learning and teaching (Pere, 1982; Metge, 1984) known as ako Maori (Sharples, 1989; Smith, 1992b) that specifies that learning and teaching is a function of careful knowledge of the learner by the teacher who must know what to ask people to do and also ask the right thing of the right people.

This issue of there being support is important.

Yes. I mean it's a case of showing respect. I keep coming back to that. You know, this is showing respect toward another person's culture, and one way of showing respect for it is to show that you're prepared to learn something about it, not in order to control it, ... (for) you don't have to cope with everything. The whole notion of the professional as always being in control is what is challenged in a cross cultural context.

When presenting these ideas to other colleagues, some mentioned that this was a lot of trouble to go to. Not that researchers should avoid 'trouble' or hard work but this was a daunting task to offer to students, for example. Why can the researcher not work from their own context and act more as a consultant? The reality for the whanau was that they preferred people to be fully-functioning members so they can expect members of
the whanau to behave in predictable ways, and it is very clear when a whanau is operating as to where the power and authority lies. Outsiders just don't have that level of reliability or credibility.

In Bishop (1993c), it is suggested that the outside consultant may contribute to the objectives of the whanau, but what guarantees are there that this is the case? This concern must be considered in light of the problems that Maori people have suffered from as a direct result of well-meaning research in the past; deficit theory, removal of taonga, and belittlement. The concern needs to be seen in terms of other pro-active statements about the rights of indigenous peoples; ownership of knowledge, right to self-determination, the right to explain one's own experiences in one's own terms. Especially this latter consideration is a right that is fundamental to those practitioners of qualitative research (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991), who orientate their studies to enabling the informant to explain their lives in their own terms. Why then should Maori people have to organise themselves into organisations that suit someone else's cultural preferences and someone else's cultural obligations such as the way a research project is constructed?

A further solution is offered by the concept of biculturalism. (Banks 1988) suggests that bicultural practice be an amalgam of common features while allowing those features that are distinctive to the culture to remain. The main problem with this approach is the demarcation line. Who gets to say what are the characteristics of the common features? I suspect that one of these 'common features' may just be the way we conduct research, and the way we conduct research will be very similar to the way Pakeha people conduct research.

A further problem is when the objectives of the outside consultant are different from those of the whanau. This is true whether these consultants be evangelical emancipationists, collectors of pure knowledge or liberal reformers. In all these cases the level of control the whanau has over its deliberations and direction is limited to an interaction between the competing agendas.

However, this is not to say that the consultant model is inappropriate for there are and will be some very useful and successful examples of consultants being used by Maori groups; Alex Firestone in teacher training for Kura Kaupapa Maori trainees at Auckland College of Education (G. Smith 1991) is one example where the skills of the consultant and the mode of training suited the whanau. It is simply that there is a tendency for Maori groups to work towards social organisations that are understood by all members. One where the roles, rights and responsibilities are understood by customary usage and where control mechanisms already exist. A system where kaumatua can be brought on board and understand and participate fully from the start and be placed in a position of having to understand a foreign socio-political structure. In Ted's experience, it is preferable for Maori groups to use Maori social and political
organisations rather than attempting to introduce new organisations, for new organisations have different power and control mechanisms from those preferred by Maori. So the answer to the initial query as to why step across the cultural boundary is that not to do so is to maintain hegemonic control of agenda setting and research mechanisms.

**Reflections on reflexive practice**

We continued our discussions by reflecting together on the meta-analysis process that we were undertaking, that is the analysis of a project by means of collaboratively constructing a joint narrative.

**Russell** I've given you back what I've done with the two previous interviews and I've written up a story about your story, and you've had a look at it.

**Ted** Yes. I've read through that and find that what's interesting is that through our interaction, I've actually reflected more on the process than I would have done otherwise, (for example), when you were asking questions like, why did we do things in a particular way? or why did something happen? In order to answer that question I've had to reflect back or think more carefully. Experiences that I've been part of would have just sort of been interesting at the time but not particularly recalled by me. I mean they're enjoyable; they're pleasant and so on. They're experiences on the way to achieving something. When you ask me, what were they like? Or, why did I think something happened? Or would it have been different? That's forced me to recall those experiences and look at them again in a way that I wasn't doing at the time.

It's quite an important process and the only general caveat I have and I think you were on with this one anyway, is that where I have talked on things you've raised, like gender issues on the marae and things like that, that I'm only giving you my personal perspective, it doesn't carry any authority because I haven't really made a study of gender issues in Maori contexts. What I've said to you is just how it appears to me.

**Russell** It's not an authoritative statement, it's not an evaluation of the project. It's just you've had certain experiences and what do they mean to you. In your experience, what do different gender roles on the marae mean to you. Simple as that.
Ted That's it. That's fine. That leaves me comfortable because that's the spirit in which I have given (this story).

Ted also mentioned that he had not seen research written up in this fashion before, that is in a fashion that involved him in reflecting on his own research practice and whanau/group participation as and when it is being conducted.

Ted No, that's right. It's a style of doing research that I find fascinating and can particularly relate to this particular work, the TTT project. It's fascinating because it is actually making me reflect more carefully about what's going on. I'm now more aware in a sort of metacognitive sense. I'm now more conscious of thinking about what I am doing as I am doing it, than I otherwise would have been. So now I see or experience events differently. For example if someone decided to teach us all a song at the end of a day, at a training session, whereas previously I'd have seen this as a very pleasant and enjoyable activity. But because of this project I now can't help myself thinking, "what are we doing now? And why is this important? And why is it important that we learn this particular song that they want to teach us?" And I doubt that I would have engaged in that kind of thinking prior to this.

Ted went on to explain that this process of becoming reflexive about one's practice actually helps with the process itself.

Ted When designing the training programmes (for example, for TTT), it is important to think critically about what you're doing. When we thought about where we were coming from, and that we had a commitment to Kaupapa Maori, and that we had a whanau, we realised that we've actually ended up with both a more structured and a more interesting format than we otherwise would have.

Of continuing concern to researchers are the paradigms within which the researcher works and the appropriateness of the paradigm for research with various groups. One could gain the impression from the literature that working within a positivistic quantitative paradigm is anathema for researchers working with Maori groups because of the dominance of the cultural construction of positivism. I suggested to Ted that he was known as a quantitative behavioural researcher, and, as TTT is a quantitative behavioural research project, that surely it was an inappropriate means of working with Maori people and that a qualitative method would have been more appropriate.
Ted Yes, it's largely quantitative but there are some qualitative aspects about it which is why I think it's working well with Maori people, because, just to take that as an aside. If a child has made an error in their reading and you have to provide them with a prompt to help them work that out, without telling them what the word is, you have to know a bit of language and you have to understand where that child is coming from. To be able to give a good prompt to that child, you need to know who that child is and what he or she knows already and know a lot about them and understand them. Then the prompting you do in Pause, Prompt, Praise will be effective.

Russell Yes. So are you saying that this whole depiction of behavioural research strategies and behavioural modification processes et cetera as purely quantitative is a bit of a black and white argument?

Ted Yes, I think it's a non-issue because I don't think it's true. For quite a long time now behaviourists, I suppose, typify themselves as collecting only direct observational measures; what you can see and hear and touch and so on. While there is still that kind of an emphasis, behaviourists also are interested in what people think and what people feel about events that they're in and those feelings and thoughts and attitudes and so on. Once they're expressed in some way; in words or in writing or in behavioural acts, then they become accessible. You can record their statements, you can record their thoughts, so it's not simplistically limited to counting heads, or counting the number of times that kids put their hands up and so on, which is the way it tends to be characterised. Also there are very few people that I know, the so-called naive behaviourists who would try to explain all of human behaviour only in terms of what you can see and hear. There may have been some radical behaviourists of that kind; I don't think there are too many left. These days there's fields like cognitive behaviourism, where you grapple with things like meta-cognitive skills: what people know about their own knowing and what people think about their own thinking. Those kind of cognitive processes are looked at and examined by behaviourists, and behavioural measures are taken alongside so-called more cognitive measures.

Russell So it's not like black and white anymore?
Ted
No. I think what it boils down to - no it isn't black and white anymore and what we're left with is an approach to studying real life or real human behaviour. An approach to studying it that is characterised by specific procedures such as an emphasis on the individual, not the behaviour of groups as such: an emphasis on repeated measurement over time: detailed repeated measurement and looking for trends and changes within individuals, and an emphasis on research designs and research strategies which use the logic of replication to demonstrate the effectiveness of a procedure or an intervention. But that replication can be achieved by looking within individuals, not just by looking across large groups. Sorry, that's getting a bit off the topic.

Russell
No it's not. It's precisely on the topic because you see, a lot of the criticism of behavioural modification projects like TTT is that it does focus on individual repetitiveness, change over time, and that those are positivistic type measures and that they have no place in a Maori context because Maori are collaborative, co-operative people who focus on the group dynamic. Now that's often the criticism, and yet you have shown that there is a role, there is a place for another approach. And I am just suggesting that there is either something drastically wrong with your analysis or something drastically wrong with the other analyses.

Ted
Yes. I can see the issue and I can see the sources of confusion, but it goes back to something we said earlier. I think what people may have been doing is trying to declare certain paradigms, such as a positivist paradigm, a no-go area for certain types of problems, for certain social problems or for cultural problems or cultural areas of study and what I'm suggesting is that this paradigm can be used effectively in a bicultural context as well as any number of other paradigms.

Russell
Because...

Ted
Because the control lies within the group -

Russell
Precisely.

Ted
- over how it's implemented and what will be done.
A further consideration was the positions that the significant members of the TTT team undertook as the research took a new turn, this time into training others into delivering the TTT package to others.

**Ted** Katherine's employer has formally set aside a large chunk of time and money for her to implement workshops to train Maori staff and other Maori people to use the procedures and develop a training package based on those workshops: a two-step thing, kind of a users' workshop where people learn about it and then for some who want to go on a trainers' workshop where they learn how to train others. And we've been working and putting that in place and devising a culturally appropriate way of doing that, and then having done that we've actually run the first three workshops. So now there are about six Maori women who are trainers and they train others.

These workshops are led by people who have been trained by us and we've evolved, it's quite interesting the process, we've evolved a strategy for assessing these workshops because we are wanting to offer a certificate which means something: which says that these people have devised and run the workshop. And the way the tasks have sort of panned out between us is that I'm watching particularly for how well the leaders of the workshop actually understand TTT and the principles behind it, and the examples in the programme and how to use them, and knowledge of that kaupapa. Katherine appears to have picked up on the area of the teaching skills of the presenters and she takes into account how well they have prepared the materials; how well they'd set up the room with its coloured posters and pictures and all the rest of it; how well they structure the day; whether they negotiated the components of the day with the participants; what kind of teaching and learning games they used; back-up activities so that it wasn't all talk, and they've devised some very interesting games themselves to carry the kaupapa and so she's focussed on that and that leaves Te Rangiwhakaehu who tends to focus on Kaupapa Maori. We realised collectively, that these workshops should be run according to Kaupapa Maori. She seemed to be the obvious person to assess that side of the workshop and to give them feedback.

**Russell** What sort of things would she cover under that Kaupapa Maori idea?

**Ted** Well, the sort of thing that she has been looking for is that there have been kuia, kaumatua present and participating in the day to give the occasion status and to back up any decision making that has to be made: whether the
day was opened with a prayer and a wātea, and then whether kaumatua are available to be consulted across the day about local issues or people that might be involved or whether something is appropriate, whether particular words are appropriate for the iwi and that type of thing, and then at the end of the day to close the session appropriately and to ensure that what was going across in the workshop was not in any way giving offence to iwi or treading on iwi feelings unwittingly. We felt secure in knowing that as well as our own kaumatua, we also had a kaumatua from the area where the workshop was being delivered.

This is an interesting example. In one of those sessions, the feedback she gave was where the two - all of these presenters were Maori - but two of their younger staff in one setting were just a little reticent about having started a mihimihi process to get people to introduce themselves individually. Once the process got going, I think they thought it may have taken too long. So they kind of cut in on that mihi process and suggested an alternative, a more Pakeha type activity for introducing your neighbour, the person sitting next to you. Now while that didn't create any particular waves at the time, (although there were a few surprised looks), interestingly, at the end of the day, Te Rangiwhakaehu took them back to that and pointed out to them that Kaupapa Maori really required that that mihimihi process should have gone right round the full circle and that what they had asked the people to say about themselves was not necessarily what the kuia wanted to hear. She wanted to know "no hea koe? Ko wai to iwi?" (Where are you from? Who are your people?) and Maori information that she needed to locate these people on her map, as it were. What the presenters had started to do was to introduce people in more Pakeha terms. And so that was later pointed out to them gently.

Russell And she said, "It doesn't matter how long it takes." So she talked - she pointed out the fact that time wasn't of the essence didn't she.

Ted That's right. And that particularly if you started it you can't cut in on it. You let it go.

Russell Right. So the message from Auntie Nan is that if you're going to instigate a Kaupapa Maori method, then you've got to go with it.

Ted Yes. That's right. That's clearly one message. There was another message too which I was really interested in. One of the reasons why these two - I
don't want this to sound critical of these two young women who ran this workshop because it was an excellent workshop - we're just picking on one little point here. One of the reasons they thought that with several senior men who were attending, I believe they suspected that to go around and mihimihii might have put on the spot one or two of the Maori women participants; younger ones, who didn't have very strong reo and I thought they were thinking to protect them or to not put them on a spot, they would cut to this other process. And I saw that and understood that, but at the end of the day Auntie Nan pointed out that if it was Kaupapa Maori then that was something that those people needed to learn to do and so it was a lesson that they should have had. That was how she saw it. She felt that she did not get all the things that she wanted to know about the people who were there, from the way the introductions went.

Russell Right. So that Kaupapa Maori is not just a nice way of doing things, it's actually a very important way of sharing information?

Ted Yes. It's not just icing on the cake.

Russell Yes, yes. So that's - right. That's really an important point: it's not just a ceremonial function is it? It is actually an information sharing and a consultative process isn't it? And there's a power. What I like about it all is that there's a power sharing process being enacted in those hui isn't there: all the time.

Ted Yes, and modelling for the participants that the kaumatua contribution is not purely a ceremonial one. It is a ceremonial one but it's not just that. Indeed Auntie Nan in particular is so familiar with the TTT procedures and she's been with the group to Australia, that she is able to stand up and does stand up and answer questions from participants who are not familiar with it or have some concerns about the appropriateness of these procedures, for instance people from Kohanga Reo and people from other Maori organisations who might come along. She has sufficient standing and she's one of the national trainers for Kohanga Reo. When she speaks about the programme and how it fits in, her voice carries a message that ours can't.

Russell But there's two very important points you've raised there if I can go back to them. One is that there are some criticisms and they're handled in a Maori way and secondly that the whole process has meaning, each activity in the
process has meaning. You know, the whole process of mihimihi has a meaning, the whole process of karakia has a meaning. The fact is that it has meaning for you when you as a researcher grasp the meaning. This means that you are able to participate in those things. They want you to participate; to continue to participate and you're having trouble going off in other directions because they're saying, no, you're an integral part of this team.

Discussion

TTT goes from strength to strength. There has now been a series of training workshops run by the TTT trainers, of which Ted was an integral part, but training programmes which were conducted within the controls of a Kaupapa Maori system. There have been numerous developments within the project that would require a further chapter in this thesis to elaborate upon. Nevertheless, this story about the initiation and establishment of TTT has identified many issues that other researchers may like to reflect on.

In response to my presenting him with a series of ideas about the benefits of research, Ted reflected on his experiences with TTT in order to identify what for him was the best way of addressing these issues.

Overall he identified that to work within the existing socio-political structures of Maori people was the best and most beneficial means of participating in such a research project. He has perhaps 'confounded the experts' by not addressing one of the most controversial and conventional considerations of the current research debate by participating in 'paradigm shifting' but rather identifying that issues of power and control over the methods of research are more important than the methods themselves. To him, behavioural techniques have much to offer, and when it was suggested to him, by a leading Maori kuia that he should offer his ideas as a koha to other Maori people, he gladly did so, but in such a way that ensured the other Maori people had the power over whether to take up the offer or not. In this manner Ted participated within an existing Maori socio-political institution that facilitated tino Rangatiratanga on the part of the group who in traditional research terms would have been termed 'the researched' with all the concomitant considerations and terminologies of powerlessness; subjects, others, studied group, data providers, and informants to identify a few terms that reduce participants to powerlessness.

The offer of TTT as koha ensured that the participants who took up the idea kept the process within Maori systems of control where how, when and where they went from there was governed and controlled by the emerging research whanau. Such a practice could be considered 'risky' in traditional research terms, for he may have been totally rejected, or he may have worked for a while and got nothing out of the project if the research whanau decided that the material was not to be distributed beyond their
group. However, this is perhaps, in Ted's terms, a 'mana' test for the researcher, for if the research is not beneficial to the participants in the project it will not go ahead. Perhaps it is a test that needs to be applied to more of what constitutes 'research' in a modern sense.

A further concern that keeps arising is that the research whanau were not capable of understanding the cultural baggage that went with Ted's positivistic, behavioural processes and indeed the hidden hegemony of such 'cultural baggage' is so pervasive that paradigm dominance is an inevitable outcome. Further, despite the trappings of this being a project conducted within a Maori kaupapa, what is really taking place is that Maori children are further being Europeanised, with the unknowing acquiescence of their parents and teachers. However, because the whanau of interest has access to traditional means of addressing issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability in their own terms and using their own socio-political systems, far from becoming unwitting victims of hegemony or 'sufferers of false consciousness', they, like our ancestors in the 1850s, borrow what they want, and use it to their advantage. In the 1850s our ancestors were so successful at borrowing the techniques of writing, agriculture and commerce, while continuing to be socially and politically organised within Maori systems of whanau, hapu and iwi, that it took nearly fifty years of armed intervention to almost destroy them, and enormous violations of human rights were necessary in order for the settlers to gain dominance. The question that arises is not whether Maori people can and should take advantage of and incorporate ideas from other cultures into their cultural domain, but whether the dominant culture will be able to cope with the successfulness of Maori children and adults who benefit from such measures. The focus is really on the dominant culture. The only difference now from the 1850s is that there is no way such cultural genocide or diaspora will again be tolerated by the national or the international communities.

Coda

However, as in all whanau, there are births and deaths. Earlier this year, Pomare Sullivan, the kaumatua who had identified himself very closely with the project from its first arrival at Hairini marae, who had overseen the hui, the development of the video tape and had travelled to Australia with the whanau, passed away early in 1994.

No reira, e te Rangatira. Moe mai i te rangimarie. Moe mai i to moenga roa.
Chapter 6: Two Stories of Institutional Change

Introduction

Alva Kapa is a Ngai Tahu woman. She is currently employed as a Senior Lecturer at the Dunedin College of Education: Te Kura Akau Taitoka i Otepoti. She also has a temporary position working for her iwi. She is a foundation member of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua, a National Board member of the New Zealand Special Education Service, and a member of the Council of the University of Otago. Alva is currently a graduate student within the Education Department of the University of Otago.

Constructing the Account

This account was constructed from a series of formal interviews and informal 'interviews as chat' which took place between 1991 and 1994, within the context of a long term collegial relationship and friendship between the researcher and the interviewee. Alva and I have conversed continually about a myriad of topics to do with Maori education in Otago and Southland, but this account focusses in particular on two participatory research projects that Alva instigated. One was instigated from her position as senior lecturer at the College of Education's Southland campus, the other from her position as Board member of the New Zealand Special Education Service. Both of these projects were conducted as 'part of her job'. My specific involvement in these two projects has been long-term; as a supervisor within the Education Department of the University of Otago, and as a colleague in Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. Alva and I have also written and presented papers together to the joint New Zealand and Australian Associations for Research in Education (NZARE/AARE) conference at Deakin University (1992), to the inaugural Special Education Service (SES) conference in Dunedin (1993), and as participants in a joint symposium on Maori Education in Otago and Southland at the 13th NZARE conference held at Knox College, Dunedin (1991).

Alva is very familiar with the discursive practice of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. Hers has been a leading 'voice' in the development of the approach that insists that Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices be addressed within both mainstream and Maori controlled institutions in Otago and Southland. For example, her appointment as National Board member of the Special Education Service and University of Otago Council member were made with the support of her iwi, for they were confident that she will articulate their cultural aspirations in a clear, unequivocal voice.

'Embodied knowing'

Alva found the whole idea of a 'formal' discussion about her research interests to be rather strange, yet she was willing to participate when the benefits of the exercise were made clear to her. Alva saw nothing unusual with an approach that instigates and
implements research and action projects that aimed to promote and improve the life chances of Maori people. Initially, when I suggested that she tell the story of the two projects, she was hesitant, not because she did not appreciate the value of the projects, but simply because she had become so immersed within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori that she now takes it for granted. Indeed Kaupapa Maori thinking and language has become commonplace for her. The way that she knows and talks of these projects is through intense participation. As Ballard (1994c) suggests, the language she uses is of involvement, of intuition and a familiarity with the mauri of the projects and the process. She is a participant through what Berman (1992, in Ballard, 1994c) calls 'embodied knowing', that is knowing in a way that is more than intellectual knowing. Alva participates in and is an exponent of this way of knowing, for she has lived 'Kaupapa Maori' all her life.

Despite her hesitancy, I persisted with the idea that others might benefit from reflecting upon the meaning that she might construct from her experiences of trying to institute change within mainstream institutions. I was convinced that Alva's experiences were those that others could well reflect on.

Taonga tuku iho - tikanga the tika way

During the interviews, we negotiated a number of issues; What was the purpose of my research? What were suitable topics for narration? Who was the audience? Why did I have to tape the interview? Who would do the transcription? Indeed, this latter concern provided a very valuable learning experience for me.

Alva asked who would be privy to the tape, and indeed who was the transcriber? Alva was the first of the researchers I spoke to who raised this issue. It was one that I had overlooked completely, although I had been alerted to it once by Sheila Te Hennepe (1993), who described problems that she encountered with one of the people whom she employed to transcribe her tapes. Te Hennepe had been horrified when the transcriber, far from giving a true transcript of the interview on the tape, had 'edited' the tape and had added their own comments to the transcript! 1

Alva's comments and the caution from Te Hennepe reminded me of a number of procedural matters that need constant attention in qualitative research. Firstly I needed to scrutinise the transcripts myself by going over the tapes and transcript. Secondly I needed to allow the identity of the transcriber to be known to the interviewee. In other words, the transcriber, too, became part of the whanau of interest of the project. Thirdly, the interviewee needs to be assured that the transcriber could be trusted to treat the interview as confidential, because the interview had an integrity that was not to be belittled. I suppose that subconsciously I had been aware of this need, for I had sought out a Maori person to transcribe the tapes, and I had spent time talking to her about the content and ideas included in the tapes.
However, these reminders about procedure were not given to me in a prescriptive manner by Alva, but rather were given to me in the manner of a tuakana (the older, person with knowledge) advising a teina (younger, less knowing) rather than in the manner of an explicit challenge to my research procedure. Alva stated that she wanted to mihi to the transcriber. Her message was a reminder of the tika (correct) way to proceed in a Maori context. The tuakana is reminding the teina that in the procedure as laid down by our ancestors (taonga tuku iho) there are messages for how we should conduct ourselves in today's world (Henare and Douglas, 1988; Royal, 1992; Smith, 1993). It is the function of the tuakana to identify the kawa and the tikanga principles. It is the function of the teina to learn from these situations. The tika way of conducting research interviews is no different from the way other human interactions are conducted. Human interactions must follow the correct kawa, a set of protocols that protect the tapu of the people involved, and the tapu of the enterprise itself.

Through this gentle insistence on Maori protocol, I was reminded that the correct way of proceeding involved identification of and negotiation with all members of the research whanau. This insistence on addressing kawa in order to acknowledge the tapu of the people and the situation in turn addressed the issues of confidentiality, reliability, scrutiny and integrity. At a further level, this was a reminder for me not to control the research exercise.

We turned to the first of the two projects under consideration.

Southland Campus research project

In 1992, Alva was located as a staff member at the Southland campus of the Dunedin College of Education. The Maori population in Murihiku (Southland) is heterogeneous and fast-growing. It is also a politically and educationally pro-active group. There are in Southland a significant and politically emergent minority of mana whenua, that is of Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha people interspersed among the more recent and more numerous migrants from the North Island. The prosperity of Southland, especially during the 1950s and the 1960s, attracted many Maori people from the North Island to seek work. Initially these workers were seasonal migrants but gradually they began to settle. Many of the families now resident are the second and sometimes third generation of this southwards migrant group (Kapa, 1991). As their initial concerns for employment, housing and shelter have been met, now the need for better and more equitable representation in the powerful decision making positions in society are being felt. Maori in Southland are aware that they are carrying the burden of the current economic downturn unequally. Spiralling unemployment is but one indicator of this problem. A major concern is the inability of the mainstream educational institutions to meet the educational needs of their children, thus perpetuating Maori under-achievement and impoverishment.
Part of the response of Maori parents has been to establish their own Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori. Many of these Maori parents are also actively seeking higher educational qualifications for themselves.

In response to this demand I was encouraged to make available my stage three education paper for students at the Southland Campus of the Dunedin College of Education in 1992. Presently in Southland two 100 level courses and a 200 level Education papers are available. The offering of a 300 level paper was seen as very important in allowing Maori students an opportunity to improve their qualifications while still resident in Southland. A survey undertaken as a student practicum in 1992 (Thompson, 1991) ascertained that a paper on Maori education was the preferred option, and the preferred method of instruction was video presentations facilitated by a local tutor, supplemented by regular (once a term) visits by the course lecturers. The local tutor suggested that further refinement of this method could include tele-conferencing, but student feedback emphasised the importance of face to face interaction with tutors and lecturers.

Twenty students enrolled in the course in Invercargill. The Dunedin College of Education's Southland Campus was the chosen location for delivery. Other education papers were already being offered there and there was a tutor available. The group who enrolled consisted of thirteen Maori and seven Pakeha (seventeen women and three men). Their schooling backgrounds reflect the total range available in New Zealand during the period 1950 to 1970; from small, rural, totally-Pakeha schools to predominantly-Maori rural schools, some single sex and others large co-educational urban secondary schools. Thirteen members of the group either worked in or were training to work in education. The other seven were in social work. Seven were studying for a graduate diploma and towards a Bachelor of Education, and three hoped to complete a Master of Education in the future. Six identified their backgrounds as middle class Pakeha, and 14 said they were from working class or lower socio-economic backgrounds. Alva was a member of this group.

The idea that research could initiate an intervention strategy for alleviating the education crises facing Maori people today was introduced to the group through the 300-level course early in the year. This idea served as the organising framework for a practicum assignment that was to be an on-going, year-long investigation. The students were challenged to attempt research that was participatory—in fact participant-driven rather than researcher-driven. This approach was explained to the students in terms of their participating in research that could be beneficial to those participating. Most students quickly identified a general area they wished to investigate. Some decided to work on their own, others in groups with similar interests.
Maori students tended to prefer the co-operative shared learning environment and this preference began to filter through into the general conducting of the class. The initial research kaupapa was well received, although as it transpired the finer points of the assignment needed further elaboration.

The group reported to Alva that they felt freed from rules and regulations and the mysteries of the institution and they shared with great enthusiasm a feeling of being empowered to change some negatives into positives for Maori in Education, Social Welfare and in society in general. Their pre-conceptions about the academic inertia and the 'gate-keeping' functions of higher education and traditional research were removed by the presentation of the potential of this exercise.

Alva

We all plunged into the deep end!

Alva spoke with other members of the class later in the year in order to ascertain their impressions of conducting research in this manner. She reported that the enthusiasm to undertake research that could potentially be empowering and useful was so exciting that they 'took off' without sufficiently considering procedural matters. One student reported to Alva that:

Alva

I don't recall our reading carefully and/or analytically the assignment guide and requirements in our course booklet at that early stage. We were all too busy doing our practicums. The initial response to the idea that we could do our own research was magic.

The initial enthusiasm was great but the first of many considerations that arose was one of ethics. As the students were writing up their proposals it was suggested that they consider how to approach people and how to protect their fellow participants. This led us them to question 'whose ethics?, what ethics?' It was suggested that these ethical questions may be answered by the very framework within which the students were working. This was generally agreed to.

Communication within the group was a problem. As one student reported to Alva:

Alva

Our enthusiasm to immediately engage in this research exercise was tempered by other commitments. All of us were in full employment or are full-time students, many having families and community commitments.

The tutorial in term two involved offering oral progress reports for consideration by others. These reports revealed the diversity of responses possible under the umbrella of
this assignment, and also reflected the diversity of the group. Positive responses to each other were another part of the empowering process, in this Maori preferred context. All efforts were valued and acknowledged as useful.

However, by this stage some students reported that they were encountering problems that they had not foreseen in their enthusiasm to commence. They felt that this was due to a number of factors; the naivety of those new to research, the difficulty of coping with a methodological framework different from previous experiences, and confusion arising from loss of focus.

*Alva* We were lost in the freedom of empowering research and were carried away on a mission of passion to enhance Maori life chances.

However, on the positive side, Alva emphasised that the enhancement of students' self-esteem resulted from acknowledging their ako Maori (Maori preferred systems of teaching and learning) and from working in a preferred Maori manner. This was an important outcome despite their not understanding the full ramifications of the process.

*Alva* Our self-esteem remained intact or was enhanced. Our ways of expressing and conducting ourselves and our contributions to group discussion was validated. No one in our group had to compromise their tikanga. The co-operative, supportive way in which we have worked together has been empowering, enhancing and exciting.

**Specific Example of a Practicum**

As a Senior Lecturer at the Dunedin College of Education's Southland Campus, Alva was concerned that the College develop and that she be engaged in programmes to address the needs of Maori students in schools in Southland. In 1991, she became the kaiako (~fan induction course for potential College of Education trainees. This job involved introducing Maori people without traditional qualifications into the requirements for and routines of formal study at the College of Education.

*Alva* In July 1991, a Foundation Course for ten people committed to bilingual and Kaupapa Maori principles and programmes was funded by the Ministry of Education's Contestable Equity Fund, and run at the Southland campus. This course prepared the students for the standard College of Education qualification, the three-year Diploma Course for Teachers. This Diploma course includes four joint papers with Otago University, one of these papers being Education 320.
As a result of this induction course, these students entered the College's regular three year training programme the following year.

Alva At the beginning of 1992 these students were mainstreamed, but by the end of term one it was obvious that there were problems. These problems manifested themselves as absenteeism, lateness to class, late assignments, 'changes' in attitude, conflict of tikanga, questioning of course content and delivery, feelings of being unable to communicate freely and frankly, feelings of conflict over beliefs and values and overall negativism. These symptoms even spilled over into some conflict and confrontations between students and also between staff and students. These problems brought into sharp relief the problems experienced by other Maori students on campus who had always been part of the mainstream training programme. Many of them also expressed having felt in similar ways, but being in a minority they had felt intimidated and unable to rectify the situation. With the arrival of a large group of Maori students on campus (in 1991) they recognised many of their own feelings being manifested within this group.

Therefore, in 1992, Alva, along with other Maori on campus, turned her attention to how the very structure of the institution could address the needs of these students and also the needs of Maori children in Southland. Alva and the students used the practicum assignment as a vehicle for this project.

Alva I worked with three final-year Maori Diploma of Teaching students for we shared a concern about the paucity of Maori teachers in Murihiku, especially in the face of a large and rapidly growing Maori population (Kapa, 1991).

They shared the convictions of Ohia (1989), Smith (1990), Irwin (1989) and Walker (1990), that more Maori teachers are necessary to provide appropriate positive achievement-oriented role models for Maori children, and to challenge the control and domination of school structures, curricula and decision making processes by the Pakeha majority.

Alva We felt that the College of Education should be more pro-active in it's policies, procedures and practices in order to ensure that more Maori are recruited and appropriately trained to address Maori Education needs. (The emphasis of the practicum was to identify how, once Maori were recruited,
they could be retained in training and trained in culturally appropriate and culturally preferred contexts.)

The practicum assignment was a useful framework for us to identify these problems and to plan how to work towards solutions. After a few false starts we realised that this would involve working with all staff and students, for it was a campus-wide problem. Working within the kaupapa of Education 320, we realised the futility and erroneous nature of 'deficit theory' orientations to problem solving which would have blamed the symptoms on the Maori students' inability to work within the present campus structure. We were convinced that this paper's orientation towards promoting tino rangatiratanga (self-determination to realise Maori cultural aspirations) as a means of identifying methods and processes of institutional structural reform was a more realistic approach to problem solving. The practicum was proposed to us as a means of implementing this structural reform within this agenda by using a methodological framework of participant-driven empowering research.

The project challenged the current systemic arrangements at the College of Education.

Alva
We identified four strands to our project, i.e. four areas that needed to be worked on if structural reform was to be instigated on our campus:

1. Identification of the welfare and academic success of these ten students, now in their first year of training.
2. Identification of the policies, practices and procedures on campus in relationship to the College charter and philosophy.
3. The professional development of the staff in relationship to understanding the cultural learning preferences, understandings and aspirations of the Maori community.
4. Empowerment of the final-year students to cater for their own needs within the kaupapa of Maori education.

After identification of the problems, we attempted to work on all these fronts to promote reform. It was not easy. There were times when misunderstandings of an appropriate method to bring about change created some chaos. But by revisiting the kaupapa of the research project it was clarified that the participants in the change process were in fact the staff and the students involved, not just the researchers. Indeed all students needed to be brought into the dialogue in order to reduce resistance and possible misunderstandings of the aspirations of the Maori students. Our initial puzzlement over who were the actual participants could have created a conflict.
situation that would have got us nowhere. It was the process of clarifying the conflict areas that enabled us to identify the participants in our research project. It was because of utilising the power of this wide group of participants in the problem solving process that we were able to work towards solutions. We were really surprised at the speed with which structural reform was able to be accomplished by using this method.

The process invoked by Alva and the research team was one of spiralling discourse, a weaving together of those people able to effect systematic change. As Alva identifies, the key to the process was identifying who the participants in this project should be. As long as they focussed on the participants as the original research team, they were frustrated because all they could do was identify problems, structural limitations and barriers. However, on reflection, they realised the necessity of widening the participant groups to include those who were seen as barriers to change.

Initially other students were 'brought on board' in order to reduce misunderstandings that distance creates. Much talking about the aspirations of the Maori students eventually resulted in the other students joining with and supporting the objectives of the Maori students.

The next group to approach was the staff. Once this group were adequately appraised of the objectives of the Maori group and these objectives were explained in terms of meeting the Charter obligations of the institution, changes took place to programmes. It is naive to suggest that such a process did not have problems. There is still resistance encountered, and this reinforces the need for ongoing discourse between the interested parties. One interesting observation is that where the conflict/problem is identified, therein also lies the solution. In other words, there is no point in identifying a problem and leaving it there. The only way to solve a problem in such an institution is to work through it. Sometimes at great personal cost, and at what sometimes seems an inordinately slow pace, never-the-less persistence pays off.

Some of the specific outcomes of the research into promoting change to enhance Maori students' opportunities at the Southland Campus have seen an extension of the weekly te reo Maori classes for staff to include discussions of issues. Proposals for independent programmes for third-year students were written up and implemented, and two of these students became Learning Assistance Tutors for the ten foundation students (a tuakana-teina principle in practice). Perhaps most significantly, instead of mainstreaming the ten foundation course students as had been done in the past, a three-day total immersion Maori language within a Kaupapa Maori programme was initiated for them. In addition, it was argued that their final two years of teacher training would be delivered bilingually.
Reflections on the practicum process

Alva reflected that many students felt that because of their participation in their research projects, they had been empowered through having time to reflect on memories, to speak freely and frankly, to point out negatives without fear, to develop awareness of rights, to improve articulation skills and generally to share knowledge, ideas and issues. Effecting change in Maori education in some small way gave a feeling of success to these students. Some felt the practicum gave them opportunities to learn to deal with institutional racism, to develop a better understanding of their own or their parents' pasts, to develop and understand a variety of research and interview skills, to respect differences and diversity, and to work co-operatively and collaboratively through consultation. Students engaged in reflection, thought and discussion about their own lives, schooling and wider life chances in a critical, reflexive and analytical manner. They conferred, compared and confirmed. For some this was a painful experience, because engaging in research with a wider interest group than just themselves involved asking questions from a different perspective than the one they have taken for granted all their lives. A process of conscientisation is typically painful.

Alva reflected that their enthusiasm and potential empowerment was often blunted by the realities encountered. These included, for example, the pain of remembering and the intransigence of powerful decision makers. For example, one practicum project focussed on two students who were confused about why their parents were reluctant to talk about the decisions made early in their lives not to teach the students the Maori language. They were able to identify the situation of concern, make a statement about the concern, but then they encountered conflict with their own parents. The solution lay in examining the questions they were asking. It was suggested that instead of asking why the parents had chosen to follow a certain action it would be more profitable to examine why the parents themselves were concerned by their situation. Indeed, when they were able to include their parents in questioning the systemic prohibitions on Maori language and cultural transmission, progress was made. Two other students were not able to resolve the conflict they encountered with one school Principal and chairperson of the Board of Trustees of a large co-educational secondary school, because the Principal refused to participate in the desired change process.

By the third term some students still expressed dismay and misunderstanding of the kaupapa of the research project. Many did not understand the full implications of the notion of participant-driven research, specifically the need to address the questions, 'Who were the participants, and who would benefit?' Reference was drawn to the organising framework once again and then many began to realise that the changes they had set out to implement or effect were indeed long-term changes needing an enormous amount of consultation and collaboration. As this became clear, many became more confident about the tikanga and the kaupapa in which it was suggested that they work. Methods and
processes varied considerably, as did the identification of the specific issues, concerns or problems. A combination of hui, interviews and questionnaires were used to engage with participants.

**Empowerment of students?**

To Alva, the experiences of this group of students in Murihiku demonstrated clearly that they felt personally empowered by this assignment. She considered what empowerment meant in terms of what Kataraina Mataira (1980) identified as a learning process appropriate to Maori. Mataira suggested that:

1) The student is able to take responsibility for their own learning, the tutor facilitates. Teaching is subordinate to learning.

2) A feeling of personal control and self-freedom is facilitated and the process is biculturally appropriate and comfortable for the student, as opposed to the emphasis being on conformity to the rules and regulations imposed by the institution.

3) A real excitement is experienced by the opportunity to examine one's self-worth.

4) Critical assessment acknowledges and validates prior knowledge and experiences.

5) Opportunities are given to explore options and build confidence.

6) Competence to plan a course of action to effect change in one's area of passion—Maori educational success, is developed.

7) Individual and group development caters for Maori learning needs. Learners are treated as partners in the whole process and are able to create a relevant dialogical context with participants.

8) The relationships between the tutor and the students is horizontal and equal, not as embodied in the 'missionary position'.

9) The learning is problem centred, process orientated, self-directed, highly interactive and often informal and choice-oriented. Constant re-approval, critical reflecting of one's own learning experiences happens especially when faced with the threats to ones mana.

For Alva, the practicum assignment for this group of students at the Southland Campus in 1992 matched the criteria that Kataraina Mataira established for an empowering learning experience within a Maori preferred context. For the whole group, a critical consciousness and awareness became apparent when students realised that the system failed to cater for them and their learning needs. The shared co-operative learning and dialogue developed as Maori in the group in Southland helped individuals to articulate ways in which they could empower other Maori. Reliable, realistic goals set in a self-determining manner directed efforts to achieving the goals established by the participants. Also:
The realisation that we were on a continuum of research and change, provided a reassessment of the power of the research process for Maori themselves, and a different perspective for those enskilled into research methods. It is the means whereby we initiate, instigate and include participants that will enable Maori to control the research process.

The SES Project: initiation of the project

Alva was appointed to the National Board of the Special Education Service (SES) in 1993. One of the major functions of the Board is to establish policy for the Special Education Service regarding service delivery to potential and actual clients. In her capacity as the Maori representative on this Board she was approached to initiate the development of policy for service delivery to tangata whenua. At her very first Board meeting she was asked to prepare a draft for the next Board meeting.

Alva

I came back home, thought about it, talked to a couple of people about it and I thought, 'A week to go, I'd better write that (report)'. I just sat and wrote it. I mean, I had talked to Matewai about it, I think we spent a wee bit of time on the phone. I wrote it, checked with her what she thought. She thought it was okay and that was it! And it's still the basis of what was written, those major points. The first (for example) is the genuine commitment to things Maori and that the Maori have actually got to do things in a Maori-preferred way and that Pakeha staff need to do things in a certain way, too, and that's it!

Russell

How did you research it? How did you write it up?

Alva

(It was) my perception and Matewai's perception of needs! I think we'd been around Maori enough to know!

I reminded Alva of a similar situation when she was a student of Education 320 in Southland in 1992. She had had to write an essay on the history of the educational crisis facing Maori people in New Zealand, and her response had been, 'I've read all these books (and heard all these arguments) but I read them all ages ago. I can't remember where I put them down now.'

Alva

I couldn't reference an essay because I'd got so much information all my life, I mean, how would I know which book and who said what?
Now isn't that research? I mean isn't that a reference to others in the attempt to create new knowledge?

Yes. But it's not documented research, is it? I didn't keep a log of every book I've read and when it was published and I mean, to satisfy academic (requirements).

But that's one style of research, isn't it?

Well, it's certainly on-going.

Exactly. But what I'm trying to get at is that you have been involved in something all your life.

I've been researching all my life, probably, if that's what you'd call it. Yes.

Yes. So that when Ross Wilson (the CEO of SES) turned to you as an authentic voice ...

I think he just assumed that! He just said, "Would you write a policy for Service Delivery to Maori by the next Board meeting." And I never thought that was such a big deal.

This example of 'embodied knowing', of someone being so immersed in research that they are part of it and it is part of them, stresses the importance of identifying the position of the researcher vis-a-vis the knowledge. It also emphasises the importance of acknowledging the participation of the researcher in the production of knowledge, and it raises critical questions about the nature of research. Who gets to define what is research? What counts as knowledge? What is acceptable as research practice? Why has there developed one dominant approach to research? How is it that this approach is so dominant that someone immersed in an alternative approach is 'persuaded' that her approach is not research?

The components of the policy

The policy that Alva and Matewai introduced at the next Board meeting emphasised that there needed to be a genuine commitment from all staff to affect positive change.
I mean if there wasn't the genuine commitment by all staff. I mean, I don't know how you measure it but in other words - they would never ever employ any more people who weren't genuinely committed to effect positive change toward Maori achievement and delivery to Maori, especially the ones who are being employed to do that.

So it's got to be positive delivery for Maori?

Oh yes. It's got to be positive. And the right to be educated by our own; in our language if that's what we choose. That's the tino rangatiratanga. Another issue was accessibility. A lot of our kohanga are rural, and the SES were urban, and there had to be a genuine attempt to get the services out to the people, not the people having to come in. I mean, I think it's really sad that rural people have to come in for hospital and for all those sort of things when there's easy ways of doing it, for example, mobile caravans. Those sorts of things.

That's how MIHI (Multiple Intervention Hearing Impairment), (McCudden, Mohi and Glynn, 1993) has done it, hasn't it? Going out to the areas.

Yes. Exactly. And training. There's a very Maori way of doing things. You train six people who go and train another six people who go and it just is that lovely way of doing things. Also, every hui I go to is representative of Maori at all levels of the decision making. I mean, we don't want them just as field workers, each working in a half-time position, we want them in management. I guess that did effect a change. We only had one Maori manager, we now have five. We didn't get one woman however. And we have two women in the top jobs (Matewai McCudden and Wai Harawira, the two National Kairaranga). I believe Maori women are doing a lot and paving the way. But we must take our men with us because of the complimentary roles and things we have, so we don't want to compromise that.

The process of consultation

The draft policy was presented at the next SES Board meeting. There was some discussion about some of the terms used in the proposed policy statement, but by and large the policy was accepted at that point and then they said, "Yes, now you can do the consultation thing".
Alva

I used their fax system but I believe the control of information was rather captured by the managers. Because, when I asked Maori staff at flax roots "Have you seen the policy yet?" They'd say, "No."

I sent it to trust boards, runanga, etc, with a covering letter to say I was charged with the responsibility of doing this, "If you had anything to delete/change, please write to me." I sent it out as widely as possible. Matewai took it and sent it out as widely as possible as well. Now that took a year. At every Board meeting they'd say, "Where is it at?" I wouldn't know where it was. We'd faxed it out, sent it out and we didn't get it back. You know how long it takes sometimes for these things to get to the top of the pile. So then I made sure our own Runanga throughout Otago and Southland and Canterbury were aware of it.

Russell

How did you do that?

Alva

I actually went along to the meetings and talked it through with them.

Russell

Yes. Yes. So 'kanohi ki te kanohi' (face to face); 'if you want it done you go and do it'. Right.

Alva

Definitely. And Uncle George (Ngai Tahu kaumatua in Southland) was very interested in SES, and because I had insisted that the local managers also do the right thing—because they were starting to establish positions for Maori, only .3 or .5 (part-time positions). It doesn't matter, I said, they had to do it through the mana whenua and tangata whenua and so they were taking notice of that and so we talked it through. And a lot of our people down in Southland knew about the old Ed. Psych. Service (the former Government Department of Education's Psychological Service), what the old job was; knew a wee bit about SES so that was good. And none of them had problems with the policy, they thought it was great! The only fear they had was that it would be watered down, because, you know, it was actually saying what we did want and need, but we were a bit sceptical about whether any Crown Agency would ever actually deliver that. And of course I was a bit excited and said, "Yes, I think this one will".

We then addressed some of the developments from this point. During this year of consultation, a second Kairaranga was appointed. Wai Harawira, of the Tuhoe people, was appointed at a hui for Maori staff at Hamilton. The three Maori women; Alva as
Board member and the two Kairaranga, then approached the development of the policy initiative together.

Alva  The feedback started to come in. We'd sent out letters saying 'Have you seen the policy yet?' And we'd send another policy: 'please delete, change, do what you like'. And it came back with all the words 'Maori' changed to 'tangata whenua' on heaps and heaps of them, and very little else changed. Then Matewai and I got together and she wrote a whole lot of extensive stuff about the Treaty, and then I wrote the background. Then when Wai was appointed she gave us Tawhiao's whakatauki about the Three Threads and then she layered it with the three I'd written. So she, being a real kairaranga, wove it with that whakatauki.

The whakatauki referred to is that created by the second Maori king, Tawhiao, in 1858. It reads, Kotahi te kohao o te ngira, E Kuhuna te miro whero, te miro ma, te miro pango. Its message for us all is that there are many ways to make progress to the future. As such, this proverb is a challenge to assimilation policies and impositional tendencies of research practices toward monocultural thinking. This proverb promotes the value of cultural diversity and the integrity of a path determined by the aspirations, preferences and practices of a people to determine their own destiny while being within a nation made up of many cultures (threads).

Alva  Matewai spelt out the Treaty bit for the tauiwi strand, which coincidentally was Te Miro Ma. It wasn't meant to be that way, and Te Miro Pango was for the Maori initiative. It was just quite coincidental.

Russell Ko wai te miro whero? (Who are the red threads?)

Alva  The bicultural one, but it wasn't meant to be about the bloodshed. There has been a wee bit of blood shed and tears and often that has to be, unfortunately. And so things moved and we had this souped-up policy but we had some airy-fairy words and goodness, it was hard to find the right words sometimes. And then when it came to a matter of syntax and semantics and what the Board thought and what we thought. The SES Board chairperson at this time was Anne Meade, wonderful woman. And I have to pay tribute to her because she would never allow that policy to be discussed without Maori being present and I think that was brilliant. That was a very strong message she gave. If Matewai and I were not at the meeting or, you know, if we weren't able to be there, it was not discussed.
Was Matewai there as a matter of course?

We had to invite her into the Board meetings because she’s not a Board member. I often would say, “I would like Matewai here as my support” because I felt it was me against the others some of the time. And it was good for Matewai because they got to know her better, because she didn’t have actual national-line management power at this stage. She was still only an adviser to a consultant, a ‘taniwha without teeth’ (mythical monster).

That was the role of Kairaranga at that point?

Yes. It was just an adviser at National office. I think National office thought she was to be their slave about things Maori. But that’s not how we saw the role. We had to get wordsmiths and goodness knows what and that’s when I should have really run it through you - you’d have had it fixed up in no time. Finally, when all the little bits and pieces were fixed up and we approved of them - because sometimes we disagreed with what some of the Board members were trying to get us to change the words to or say, what - Whose grammar? and Whose syntax? Because we wanted it to be able to read, to be Maori-friendly in its reading and interpretation, not to be written in academic language that gave an invisible message that, you know, this is just a piece of policy. We wanted it to be a working document. And we kept asking questions like: Is this really the parameter in which all the staff will have to work? Because I actually couldn’t believe that and I was told, ‘Yes.’

Who said, ‘Yes’?

Ross Wilson, the Chief Executive Officer and the Chair of the Board. So then at the end of the year, I think at the December meeting, it was finally approved and given the official seal and stamp. And then it was launched in that February hui at Waitangi, the hui that was called ‘Hui Maori 4’.

Reflections on the process of Power Sharing

Alva saw clearly the process of developing the policy in terms of power sharing.

There was a whole total power sharing, I believe. There was no interference that ‘thou shalt do this, this, and the next thing’. It was ‘What do you want? Spell it out! Tell us!’ And immediately the next meeting we had was ‘What do
you think Maori need? ... We needed the power to develop more initiatives for Maori to address Maori needs that Maori could then deliver. All we were reliant on them (SES) for was the resourcing, and there was a commitment there would be a sharing of resources. We were also concerned about the one Maori woman they had in Head Office in Wellington. I said "Well the one we've got's flogged!" She was! She was exhausted!

Russell  Matewai?

Alva  Yes. And I said, "Well, we need another person". And I didn't want the second appointment to be full-time, because I felt the work that she did in the field was just as important. Because putting them into an office in Wellington can be very isolating and demoralising, and they're being pulled away from their people with whom they work. So we didn't want that, we wanted another person working half-time to complement her, complement her skills, too. And he said, "Right." We said, "Can we have another person working half-time in National office?" "Yes." And I said, "Can we decide how we will find that person and appoint that person?" "Yes."

Ross Wilson gave the whole power of the process, you know, recruitment, selection, appointment to us, and so we did that at the next Hui Maori. I mean, that to me was power sharing: trusting us. And his actions demonstrated a commitment to the whole kaupapa. He can speak a reasonable amount (of Maori). He's taken the time in his own way, not expecting others to deliver it to him, to learn Maori. His pronunciation and knowledge of things is good. When we speak, he never said, "What do you mean?" He knew! And so he'd made that commitment and that's the sort of thing; that cultural competency, I think, that they didn't expect us to provide the vehicle for it. They took responsibility for their own learning.

Russell  That's crucial, isn't it?

Alva  That is crucial, for leadership. He was genuine and sincere and I got good vibes. I think when we've been victims of racism we know immediately without people even being racist whether they are racist or what - how - we feel with them. And I only had good feelings for him. I respected his intelligence and many other things too. I really felt that. And we were away! And very fast, things happened, like changing the criteria for entry for training for educational psychologists and speech and language therapists, right throughout the whole organisation. Visiting teachers, for an example,
didn't have to be trained teachers. If you had a person who had been a teacher's aide maybe, but had the reo then an appointment could be made.

**Policy into action in a power sharing way**

We went on to recall the incident that led to the change in the criteria for entry for candidates into the training programmes for educational psychologists. Alva was at a meeting with the Tumuaki (leader) of SES and in the next room was the person who was arranging the consultation process for addressing changes in procedures for selection of trainees. The two groups met. Alva knew the other person, for she had been part of a network of interest with him in Otago for a number of years. Consultation took place. Negotiations followed, and solutions were found to perceived problems with the existing policy.

_Alva_ In the next room ... was the Otago manager who had been given a brief to work (on) the whole recruitment for people for educational psychologist training, and looking at the sponsorship of SES for these people. Because the Minister of Education had cut the funding, they'd cut the number of people that were going to be sponsored, but they wanted to decide how many were going to be trained and how many will be sponsored each year, and he said, "They're meeting in the next room." And I said, "Well, can we meet with them?"

"Yes." And it was morning tea time and we all met together over morning tea and then we all barged into their meeting and told them we need Maori psychologists and we need Maori psychologists who know about Maori psychology, too—not Maori psychologists who are just Maori who go through a psychology course. We need fluent speakers who can go into Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori. We need these people who are going to be multi-talented, but we haven't got super-Maori and/or super-psychologists who are Maori, so what are we going to do about it? We've got to do something. And when I used words like, 'Has the powers-that-be used some of the criteria as a gate-keeping policy? He admitted that he thought it had, and I think that was wonderful. And I don't know if Ross had spoken to him first or not, because I mean that blew me away a little bit because I didn't actually expect him to understand what we were asking. And so he agreed, yes, we did need different people.

And immediately they sat down and wrote some new criteria, and by lunchtime we said, "That was wonderful", and then we started racking our brains for names .... And we thought, well, it's all very well getting the criteria changed, where are we going to go now to test this criteria?
You had to bend the rules. You had to change the criteria.

I don't see it as bending the rules. I see it as celebrating that diversity and difference. Well otherwise you can just change the rules for everybody and say, 'Right-oh, not only do you have to have that, you have to be bilingual'. And I don't believe that they would've got anyone if that had been the criteria, that you had to be bilingual Maori-English. I don't believe we'd have got anyone. No one would have got in! But you can bet your bottom dollar in five years time people would have taken some responsibility for their own learning, if they really wanted to get in. They'd be bilingual, wouldn't they? But we couldn't wait five years.

Are you working towards that sort of criteria in the future, do you think?

I'd love to. Love to, but I think we need to look at the other criteria, too, because, I mean, for a speech/language therapist, for example. I don't believe you have to be a teacher who has gone through a four-year degree first and then do another three-year degree course! I mean, I just see busy young people. I just don't believe that you need to do that.

Alva then described the type of person who was necessary in a Maori context by challenging the notion of specialisation that distinguishes the current approach to training. Her opinion comes from an alternative world-view that does not use separate strategies, separate thinking or the separate language of the 'special education' approach (Ballard, 1994a, p. 4), but rather Alva comes from a world that values a holistic, face to face approach.

She described the approach of one of SES's Maori 'speech therapists' in Gisborne who said that 'I am the educational psychologist when I go into Kohanga, and I am the speech/language therapist, and I am the visiting teacher.'

The child needs all these things and rather than getting a whole lot of specialists in, you get a competent person.

Much better for the whanau ... dealing with one person. And a person they already know and trust.
Reflections on the benefits of the research

Our 'conversation' about the initiation of the project meant that Alva was able to consider what the project meant in terms of benefits and who would receive these benefits.

Alva  I mean we always believe it will benefit both peoples. These things are to benefit all people eventually.

Russell  Right.

Alva  Because I mean we have the theory that if the tax payer's money is used efficiently and effectively—and we do have good things for Maori as well as good things for non-Maori—eventually it is going to save us all. But some people can't see that, can they?

Russell  Well, generally there are many politicians who don't tend to agree with that because it is a sort of welfare-ish type of philosophy, isn't it?

Alva  We come from a socialist background. A communal background.

Russell  Yes. Well, it's a communal welfare-ish type of approach.

Alva  It's the way we do things.

Russell  Yes. Communalistic, isn't it? Where you look after somebody in this area and it will pay off in another area, whereas some politicians say you should look after yourself in that area and then that area, you know.

Alva  It's not conducive to things Maori.

Russell  Not particularly - no, it's not particularly Maori-friendly, is it?

Reflections on the problems that arose during the project

The conversation turned to consider some of the problems that had arisen and the particular conflict resolution procedures that Alva intended to instigate.

Alva  As I shared with you, we've got a policy, we've got an implementation strategy, but I'm not sure, because of the change in resourcing and management structure, if in actual fact it's being effective because, as I say, I
haven't heard anything for a while. I mean the things I've heard are things I didn't want to hear like 'Maori staff being cut'. I mean, it's meant to be the opposite is happening. So I'll be asking a few questions. I don't know that I can do a lot more! I think the commitment from the manager at the top was there but I'm not sure about the District managers. Just last week it was brought to my notice that a Maori person (a half-time position had been vacated at the end of 1993) hadn't been replaced in one SES office. Here's a whole term down the track!

Russell: Yes.

Alva: But they're replaced this week.

Russell: That's interesting, isn't it.

Alva: We had lunch last Thursday with the manager and said, "It's not good enough. I can take it to combined Runanga and we can have it in place", so they're in place by Tuesday, I believe. What took us a weekend took a whole term because ... I don't know if it was a game they're trying to play or not. I mean, when it's a relieving position it's only part-time. I mean why muck around?

In 1994, Alva taught three sessions on the University paper; Education 223: The Treaty of Waitangi and Education. One of the sessions that Alva took with the class was on her experiences in developing policy in the Special Education Services for tangata whenua. Alva spoke about the development of the policy and some of the problems they were experiencing with resourcing. During this particular part of the session, a Maori member of the class who had been active in the Social Welfare Department's deliberations over their delivery of services to Maori in the late 1980s (Ministerial Inquiry Committee, 1986) suggested that perhaps these problems were similar to those that had been encountered by Social Welfare following the development of their own policy for service delivery to tangata whenua. In the Social Welfare context, the policy development had gone fine, but then institutional impediments, for example limited resourcing and institutional restructuring, had been encountered that had effectively blocked progress in implementation of the policy. This session provided an opportunity for this student to critically reflect on his own experiences in the light of Alva's narrative of her experiences. What was really interesting about this process of reflection was that it gave Alva an idea of why she was confused about the hesitations in implementation of the SES policy. She realised that she may have been too close to see clearly what was going on. She realised
how useful and necessary it is to have another person to reflect your own ideas in order to give them shape.

_Russell_  
I found it interesting the other day when you were talking to the class in Education 223 about it and Shane Walker, I think, brought up the point that you sound like you're in the same situation that Social Welfare were in with their Puao te Ata Tu Project.

_Alva_  
Yes. Yes.

_Russell_  
And you sort of ... I could see the penny dropping...

_Alva_  
Yes!

_Russell_  
Remember you said to me as you went out the door, "My God. I wonder if he's right?"

_Alva_  
Yes. Yes. "It's drying up." That's what he said and I thought, my God! You know, the information backward/forwards dried up. Yes.

_Russell_  
So where do you go from there? What do you do next?

_Alva_  
Well, I'll be asking lots of questions.

_Russell_  
Yes.

_Alva_  
Not necessarily at the meeting. I mean, if I get there early enough I will just go straight to the manager, the chief executive officer, and say, "I've heard this, this and this; what's happening? What's happening to the policy?" And if I don't like the reaction I get, I'll then ask more questions. I'll just keep asking the questions, you know, the questions that will be wrong for them but right for what I think.

_Russell_  
But these are the research questions that you want answered, right?

_Alva_  
Because you know, what's happened? Where are we at? What got in the way? Because there was a time-line, and you see at the moment they're doing the new - what's called the Document of Accountability and that was meant to be written into the Document of Accountability: delivery to Maori through it. I
went through it and I can ask questions through that. I can't just go and bowl in and ask questions. I've got to make sure it's within the right framework of the meeting. And so I guess that's how I'll do it. I'm disappointed in things I've heard like: in a predominantly Maori area, one Maori member who is multi-talented being sidelined. I'll perhaps go to the Kairaranga to find out if they know anything first: check my facts out before I ask other questions. Yes. And I guess, sometimes by asking questions I am raising the issues because I know lots of other issues have taken over, I mean this isn't in the forefront of their minds all the time, but it's in the forefront of our minds but not necessarily the managers' minds. Lots of other things happen and it gets put to the bottom of the pile.

Discussion

Alva's approach to research exemplifies the position identified as defining knowledge in an 'embodied' manner, that is knowledge gained from long-term immersion and participation within a particular 'voice' or position. Alva knew what was needed in order to construct the tangata whenua policy for SES because she had been immersed in the context for a significant enough time to understand the 'voices', indeed to become one of these 'voices', and to be able to portray these herself with authenticity and authority. Similarly, her approach to developing relationships and addressing systemic change within the College of Education was based on similar principles. Donmeyer (1990) identifies this as the development of wisdom, that is as knowledge that one gains from intense participation. Donmeyer emphasises the important role of personal knowledge in all professional practice and the importance of personal experience in the application of new knowledge and/or working in new settings. The application of research findings (new knowledge) is filtered through the prior knowledge, feelings and intuitions we already have. Knowledge gained in one setting and applied to another setting is subject to a complex process of understanding. Donmeyer suggests that experience compounds, and this compounded knowledge/experience when brought to a new task provides an even more complex process of understandings to occur. Experience builds on and compounds experience and, as Ballard (1994a) suggests, "hence the value placed on 'colleagues with experience' in the Pakeha world and kaumatua in the Maori".

The two projects described here were initiated and developed in response to concerns that were already being voiced in the Maori community. Alva was able to identify these problems and situations of interest and concern to Maori community groups because she was conscious of the aspirations and needs of the members of the group affected by these problems. She was a 'kanohi kitea', a familiar face, known to other Maori people and known to be part of the concerns and interests of the community and
therefore someone to be trusted. She was already part of established networks, not coming from a supposedly neutral stance from outside the community. She had long been part of the Maori communities' attempts to speak for themselves. Alva's 'embodied' knowledge and intense participation in Maori affairs made her the ideal pivot around which the discourse could develop.

These stories demonstrate a Maori cultural means of problem solving, in this case, addressing the need for systemic change in action. The process can be described as **spiral discourse**, where over a long period of time the research process involves bringing 'on board' those people who are able to address the concerns of the research group. This process operates in such a way that people are incorporated into the problem solving team. The research process incorporates into the process of change those people necessary to address change and challenge policy makers. In this manner, those powerful people who are normally beyond the solution seeking realm of research are brought on board the kaupapa of the research.

Within feminist scholarship (Meade, 1991) discussions of 'cumulative discourse' move toward the notion of spiralling discourse. The concept of the spiral is offered here, for not only does it speak in culturally preferred terms (the koru) but it also indicates that the accumulation is always reflexive, in that the discourse is always returning to the original controlling initiators. Spiralling and reflexive discourse ensures that the control of the agenda of the research is not usurped by the interests and concerns of those brought 'on board', but that the entire group focusses on the agenda of the research as defined by Maori people. Unless such a process is an integral part of the discursive practice, there is a danger that the accumulation of discourses may wrest control away Maori people.

---

1 I did not have this experience but it's certainly something to take note of.

2 These are three functions, normally undertaken by different people trained in different institutions and by different processes.
Chapter 7: The story of the Otago Maori Education Plan

Introduction
This is the story of the development of the Otago Maori Education Plan as experienced and understood by the two Resource Teachers of Maori (RTMs) for Otago and myself. The RTMs have taken a leading role in initiating and developing the Education Plan. I was involved as an education provider and researcher. We together are members of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. The narrative presented here is a record of our interactions, reflections and critical appraisals as the project developed. It is more complex than just a record of a series of conversations, albeit constituted as such. This narrative is collaboratively constructed through a series of in-depth interviews as 'conversations', through on-going informal interviews as 'chat' and through our common desire to address Maori people's concerns about research into their/our lives. The narrative focusses on what understanding the researchers construct about their positioning within the discursive practice that is kaupapa Maori in order for them to participate in an exercise of self-determination.

The Background to the Plan
Monty Montgomery and Marie Joyce are Resource Teachers of Maori (RTMs) in Otago. They are both non-Maori people, but their experiences with Maori people and participation in Maori contexts in Otago enabled them, in 1991, to be successful applicants for the positions of RTMs in Otago. Monty came to the position of RTM from the New Zealand 'Commission for 1990' where he had been co-ordinator for planning events to celebrate New Zealand's sesquicentennial year of 1990. Marie came from within the Education Service, where she had been an Itinerant Teacher of Maori for four years prior to helping to establish the bilingual class at Brockville school. Their work as RTMs involved them visiting schools to help teachers understand and implement Maori programmes within their classrooms. They were also responsible for the production of resources, for consultation with schools and for initiating projects to promote Maori education both within mainstream and Kaupapa Maori institutions.

Problem identification
At our initial interview they spoke about some of the problems and contradictions they noticed soon after they commenced their RTM positions.

a) The relationship between the home and the school
As is customary for RTMs, initially they spent most of their time within primary schools. They heard frequently of the problems and dilemmas that these schools faced when dealing with Maori children and Maori initiatives. However, they also began to...
get involved in promoting Maori parental participation on Boards of Trustees, and as a result, another set of opinions were opened up to them. They began to hear from parents of Maori children about their aspirations for the education of their children. For example, in 1992, just before the Board of Trustee elections, as part of a team of five comprising themselves, a mana whenua Kaumatua, a Maori National Trustees Association member, and the national councillor for School Trustees, Monty and Marie undertook a series of visits to Maori community groups in Otago; Oamaru, Dunedin, South Dunedin, Balclutha, Alexandra, Cromwell, and Wanaka to promote Maori membership on Boards of Trustees. While talking with members of the Maori communities they noticed that there were significantly different perceptions between what parents and teachers were saying about the relationship between the schools and the Maori community.

Marie One of the things that struck us was the difference in stories that we were hearing between what the community were saying of their relationship to schools and what the schools were telling us when we visited them. A school would say ‘Look, we get on really well with our community and they feel at home here and we’d got this program initiated and they were really happy’, and you’d talk to someone from the parents and it was a different story.

Monty The schools were saying they had a good relationship with the Maori community, they came and did a hangi for us. The Maori community were saying ‘Yes, but that was on the day of the ERO (Education Review Office) visit’. The schools saw it as a positive relationship with the Maori community, the Maori community saw it as being used.

The Education Act 1989, together with 'Tomorrow's Schools' impelled schools to consult with their Maori communities. The object of this imperative was to get Maori parents involved in educational decision making for their own children and to get schools to recognise the need for consultation with tangata whenua in the education process. The mismatch in understanding between schools and Maori parents extended to this area of mandated responsibility.

Monty When we were talking about policies and charter statements, the school was saying ‘But there was no Maori to consult with’, and the Maori community were saying ‘But they never ask us’.
The imperatives in the 'Tomorrow's Schools' process for consultation with Maori communities also produced so many requests for help that the local runanga could not meet with every Board of Trustees that approached them. A further problem, unique to Otago, is that local Maori holding mana whenua status are vastly out-numbered by those Maori people and children descended from Maori people (mata waka) from other places in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In terms of the provisions of the Education Act 1989, mana whenua people are the primary referents for consultation.

Marie

With 'Tomorrow Schools', schools had been told that they had to consult. They didn’t really know who to consult with. They couldn’t sort out the difference between the local people and the ones that had come from other areas. So a lot of schools wrote letters to adjacent marae and said “Well, here we are, what are you going to do for us?” and when we went to Hurirapa they produced a folder this thick (she indicated a couple of inches) that was letters and requests from schools and they didn’t know what to do with them so they just filed them ... When we arrived to show them the syllabus stuff their faces lit up and they rushed off and got this folder and said, “Look, what are we going to do?”

It was clear that many schools did not know how to consult with their Maori community. Also, the concern of Maori parents to be involved in the decision making process of the schools was often thwarted by 'gate-keeping' activities on the part of some schools.

Marie

One group said they’d had a little meeting and selected the person they felt would represent them best and thought that now they’d let the school know. "We went to the school and said this is the person that we want to have seconded onto your board" and they said "Well, sorry, but you can’t tell us what to do".

Monty

So they got a 'safe' Maori who wouldn’t rock the boat and the community wanted the Maori person on who would actually get the Maori policies into place.

It seemed evident that the Pakeha community was setting the agenda and determining the pace at which Maori community members could be involved in educational decisions and achieve their own aspirations. There was also an evident difference between what many Maori parents wanted for their children and what they felt was safe for them to ask for or to participate in. Many of the parents were keen to
promote more Maori language and tikanga in the schools, but they felt that it might not be treated with the respect it deserved. As a consequence, there was concern voiced about whether their children would be singled out for special attention, whether it be positive or negative.

**Monty**
You’d talk to the Maori community and you’d say ‘Well okay, you’re not getting what you want. What do you want?’ and at that stage they really felt all that they wanted was to feel safe.

**Marie**
They wanted their kids to come out of school as good as the Pakeha ones.

**Monty**
They wanted equity of outcomes for their kids in terms of Pakeha learning, but they didn’t want Maori knowledge and Maori kura (schools) and all the rest of it, because that would single them out in a predominantly Pakeha community as, you know, ‘square pegs in round holes’, and that wouldn’t be safe for their kids and they didn’t want their kids to be exposed to danger. At the moment they were sort of under the cover of the Pakeha whatever and their kids felt safe and that was okay, but it wasn’t what they wanted, it wasn’t really what they wanted but that was all they were prepared to accept. So clearly if Maori programmes, language and so on were going to take place in schools, then the Pakeha community had to understand it and support it and agree to it and the Maori community was only prepared to go as fast as the Pakeha community was prepared to move. So in Otago it was clear that Maori programmes in the mainstream depended on Pakeha support which in a way, that’s probably not true of any other place in New Zealand.

**b) Maori leaders aspirations and schools' potential for delivery**

While parents experienced conflicting aspirations, Monty and Marie found that Maori leaders were excited by the release of the new national Maori language syllabus for schools, Tihe Mauriora, which became available in July 1991.

**Marie**
Remember that first meeting with that Otago Maori Council? We took everything we had on ‘Tihe Mauriora’. There was quite a big group round that table and it went all round. I actually didn’t think we were going to get it back. They were absolutely rapt, weren’t they? You could see they weren’t just flicking it, people would open it and then they’d start reading it. This was in our very first contact with the Otago Maori Council, the very first meeting we fronted up to. We were last on the agenda and we sat there
for about two hours and thought we were never going to get across to all these people who were getting tired. It was after 10 and we just said, “These are our names and this is our job and here’s this material”. And they just sort of picked it up, you know, being very polite and the next thing somehow that material caught them, you know. I felt there was something in that syllabus ... that drew them.

Tihe Mauriora had been long-awaited. Many drafts of the syllabus had been circulated and consultation had been wide and spread over a number of years. However, schools had problems implementing the suggestions for Maori programmes that were part of the new syllabus.

Monty One of the first things that Marie and I did when we started this job was to survey all the primary schools. That was just after Tihe Mauriora, the new Maori language syllabus, came out and we said “Which schools want to implement this?” and “How many will?” Eighty-seven percent said “Yes, we want to” and 14% said “Yes, we can”. The fact that they were not delivering didn’t mean that they didn’t want to deliver, it meant that they just didn’t have the skills to do it. They needed training, they needed support. There was Marie and I for all of Otago and there was no way that two people, however brilliant, were going to meet that need.

Marie An example of that was funding for the implementation of the new syllabus. The funding for Otago allowed us to train six teachers between us, for 12 months. It was a drop in the bucket.

Monty So we decided that we had to get schools to start to work with their communities, and we had to get communities to start to work with their schools so that the help for schools actually came from their local environment.

c) Education service agencies

Another situation exacerbating the problems schools were experiencing in implementing programmes, was the lack of Maori people employed in the education service agencies in Otago; Ministry of Education, Quest-Rapuara (the vocational training agency of the Labour Department) and ERO, who could be called on for advice. There had been some Maori people appointed during the first restructuring of these educational agencies that had heralded in the reforms under Tomorrow’s Schools, but since 1990 there had been further restructuring and numerous redundancies in the
education service sector.\(^3\) The numbers of people employed in these agencies in total had declined and the number of Maori had similarly declined to a very small number.

\(\text{Monty}\) In 1991 we actually lost five full-time Maori people from those agencies; now there’s no full-time Maori employees. So those agencies were not delivering. Maori was not a priority with them, again they didn’t have the skill level. Otago in terms of Maori education was in dire straits. There was a good baseline of goodwill there but nothing to feed it.

\(\text{d) National versus regional interests}\)

Another problem that was clouding the picture was that much of the policy on Maori issues was being made in the central office of the Ministry of Education with little, if any, consultation with or consideration of, the special nature of problems facing Maori people in Otago. One major example was the 'Bold Report' (subsequently gazetted in mid-1994 (Ministry of Education, 1994) which gave considerable lead to the policy initiatives that were to be expected from the Ministry of Education regarding the degree of immersion teaching required of an institution in order to qualify it for Maori-targetted funding. This draft document was 'leaked' to the RTMs at a national RTM conference, and certain of the policy suggestions within the document caused concern to the Otago RTMs. For example, they felt that policy outlines for Maori Language Factor funding and Kaiarakah i te Reo (Maori language support assistants) positions were favouring North Island contexts. They were also concerned that many North Island Maori communities were pushing the Ministry to finance Kaupapa Maori initiatives to the exclusion of all other Maori education initiatives and pushing the idea that as the majority of Maori were in the North island, that is where most of the funding should go. At the time that this document was circulated there were no Kaupapa Maori institutions in Otago. The Otago RTMs were concerned that the Maori community in Otago was too small and too geographically dispersed to support Maori language programmes at the level suggested in the 'Bold Report' and by the Runanganui o Kura Kaupapa Maori.\(^4\) The 'Bold Report' stipulated that there needed to be a Maori language use level of 80% in these institutions.

A further policy initiative of the 'Bold Report', that all RTM positions be located within Kaupapa Maori institutions also meant that the Otago RTM positions were probably 'on the line'. This may have been difficult for the RTMs in the short term, although personally they could have applied for and won other employment. But the RTMs’ felt that the long-term losers were going to be Otago Maori people who would lose access to resources and funding that went with the RTM positions.
Monty  We could clearly see that Otago was about to lose all their resourcing for Maori, all their Maori Language Factor funding, all their Resource Teachers of Maori. Yet we knew that the need and the will out there was actually great, but we already had a need that was greater than the resource we had and the resource we had was under threat.

The RTMs appreciated the benefits for Maori children that Kura Kaupapa Maori had to offer, but they were also mindful that there had been numerous attempts to establish such an institution here in Otago in recent times, and so far none had been successful. They believed, as Smith (1989), Sharples (1989) and Rata (1989) have suggested, that Kura initiatives worked best when a whanau of parents were the driving force. They were concerned that kura developed as a result of Ministry-driven initiatives might not gain the level of whanau support needed, and if the kura were to fail, then subsequent attempts would be further jeopardised. Above all, they felt that the Ministry of Education should listen to the voice of the community and hear what the people actually wanted for their children rather than issuing 'top-down' decisions. They were concerned that whenever they conferred with Ministry of Education personnel from local or national office, either as RTMs or as part of the Maori Training and Education Association of Otago (META), they received a stock answer, 'support and establish Kura Kaupapa Maori'. They agreed with this idea but were concerned that the Otago Maori people had not been involved in arriving at this decision and that this decision was not one that addressed the aspirations of all Otago Maori people.

Monty  But no one (from the Ministry) was going to take Marie and I, two RTMs, seriously. They were only going to listen to the community and there was nobody in the community who was going to make that voice heard.

The problems of funding, resources, achievement, implementation and staffing that were facing Maori people in the South Island were every bit as real as those facing the Maori people in the North Island, except that South Island Maori people are more spread out. The RTMs thought that South Island Maori should have a chance to express the extent of their own problems as had happened in the North. The problem they were really concerned about was the imposition of ideas from the North Island, a context that was very different from that pertaining in the South Island.

The Plan

Monty and Marie both felt that all these problems were actually interwoven and were not going to be solved by tackling one aspect at a time. However, despite their
preference for a holistic solution, initially they engaged in some interim solution seeking by offering to help schools with charter writing.\footnote{5}

*Monty* We wrote a paper about ‘Achieving Charter Curriculum Objectives’. We wrote this four-page paper to help the schools on that and we sat down with the Runanga. That was the first time we really pulled together any statement about the elements of the basic relationship between the Maori Community and the school.

*Marie* And that’s when the Runanga gave us what they felt their objectives actually were as far as schools were concerned.

*Monty* And they wrote down 11 objectives of things they wanted schools to achieve and it was the first time that schools had (material from local mana whenua Maori people) in front of them.

However, the problems of the mismatch between home and school perceptions, Maori leaders' aspirations, schools' concerns about delivery, lack of specialist Maori advisors in service agencies, and national versus regional interests, were intertwined. It was therefore very difficult to solve one of these problems without the influence of the others limiting its success. Therefore:

*Monty* Looking at all these things, we felt what we really needed was a coordinated plan to draw all these threads together and to partly put Maori education on the agenda of everybody. By putting it into a plan you somehow make it real ‘cause ... for Pakehas, if you go round and korero, korero (talk talk). I mean that’s only a korero, it doesn’t actually mean anything. But for Maori people the korero is it. But unless it was in a plan, the Pakeha side wouldn’t pick it up and take it seriously. And simply the process of talking though to get a plan together would mean by the time we got to the plan and we got people who agreed to the plan, the process would have meant that people would’ve been more together than they were at the beginning, hopefully.

*Marie* And we feel that actual process might even be more important than the plan.

Monty and Marie felt that they might facilitate the development of networks of interested parents and education providers to educate parents about the educational services available beyond the school level and above all to get people thinking and talking 'as to the type of issues they wanted to deal with', all within a process that would
gather the collective voice of Otago Maori in order to speak to the decision makers at the national level.

The RTMs felt that Otago parents of Maori children, having never been consulted on the future they wanted for their children, were being sold a package that was not going to meet their needs. They felt that the needs of these parents and children, along with the aspirations of Otago's Maori leaders, had never been clearly identified and presented in such a way that policy makers in Wellington could comprehend and use as a basis for policy determination. They thus turned to consider how they might represent the 'voice' of the Maori community of Otago to the Ministry in a form that people in the Ministry would understand and could readily assimilate.

Similarly, the RTMs were concerned that because of the recent 'restructuring' of the Education system in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Maori parents were unsure of what actually constituted the education scene under the new system of 'Tomorrow's Schools', and what education service agencies were able to provide.

Monty So part of those meetings was to bring representatives of the 16 educational service agencies in Otago and Southland to the community so that they could hear from those people exactly what those agencies were about.

Marie It was useless to say to people 'What do you want for your children in the future or schools or whatever' and they don't know what's offered now

Some concerns were raised during the consultation phase about the manner in which the Plan was presented, in 'Ministry Speak', as it were. However, we all felt that it was necessary to present it in this form in order that the Ministry of Education Policy makers could pick up the message and incorporate it into their existing policies. As it so happened, when the report was presented unofficially to the Ministry of Education in early in 1993, their response was very positive. Later, following the official presentation in September 1993, the Plan was taken on board by local Ministry of Education officials to use and incorporate into their policy developments.

Colleen Haig-Brown (1992, p. 101) a Canadian researcher working with First Nation Canadians on similar 'life chances' enhancing research projects, reports having similar experiences. The research participants collaborated to create the kind of knowledge recognised as valid by people in research institutions and governments while at the same time working within knowledge definition processes recognised as valid and authoritative within the culture of the research participants. They did not feel that reporting the research in such a manner compromised the cultural integrity or cultural preferences of the participants. It was a necessary step to gather the collective voice of Otago Maori communities and to present this in a way that would speak to the national
decision makers and thereby incorporate them into the whanau of interest. What was most important was that the process was valid. That is, the process had authority in Maori terms, and was conducted within Maori cultural practices. Monty and Marie described some of the considerations they undertook when making these decisions.

Monty Once we got all the information, simply looking at it and deciding and finding a formula for putting it down took us ages. We did not know how to deal with all the information and bring it together to a coherent and sensible document that people would actually be able to read. If we wrote it as a book it would be useless. It had to be done in such a way that people could follow.

Marie It was a tricky one but we wanted the Maori community to understand it, but it had to be in a format that when it goes in to the schools the schools can say 'Yes that suits the way we plan the way we think' as well.

Monty To write it in such a way that it would useful to both parties and really the key to it was the format that the Ministry used for its Education in the 21st Century document, that was really helpful to us as a model.

Marie We took that model because we felt that whichever Government does eventually get in, that model will stand and that schools will fall into place within that model, so that if our plan was along a similar lines we are not going on some divisive track that no one could follow.

Monty So the format came from the Ministry document but the content came from the Otago community. I think that's how we married those two things and solved our problem of drawing all this information together. It was a lot easier to write once we used that format. It was clear that when we went through our draft consultations that people could head up, open it up at a page that they could relate to and go 'Wow, that's exactly right; yeah, that's exactly right; that's great'.

We spoke about how a text produced by Maori preferred processes yet speaking to a national organisation could also be useful to an individual.

Russell You remember the example about the one woman who was then the sole Maori family in the community?
Marie  Oh that’s right, that was just the other night. She felt she would have something to say to the school and feared that her own ideas would be redefined and she wondered what would happen if she went. How could she be sure that her lone voice would be taken notice of?

Russell  Because she now had a document of the collective voice?

Marie  Well it helped her to work out what it was she was actually going to be looking for from the school, but at the same time she wasn’t sure how to make sure that her voice was heard.

Monty  And she felt that the plan clarified in her mind what she wanted to say. It gave her the words to say what she wanted to say but it also gave her the support that what she was asking for wasn’t just ‘Mrs Brown’s’ point of view. It was actually a statement of what the Maori community throughout Otago was looking for, and so this school now can fit in to part of an overall programme.

Gathering a collective voice

In attempting to gather a collective voice, Marie and Monty were particular to acknowledge the principle of recognising tino Rangatiratanga, the right of people to speak for themselves. This principle is fundamental to the Treaty of Waitangi where the right of self-determination was guaranteed to Maori signatories and their descendants. Similarly, this gathering of a collective voice was not a random collection of voices assigned authority by the researchers. The means of gathering the voice was also governed by the guarantee in article two of the Treaty that the tangata whenua status of Maori would be protected, and Maori taonga, in this case Maori culturally preferred decision making and research processes, would be protected. Monty explained his position in relationship to Maori people as a RTM researcher, recognising and implementing this principle of the Treaty of Waitangi in the following terms:

Monty  We as Pakeha have absolutely no right to speak on behalf of Maori, no right at all. We couldn’t speak on behalf of Maori so we needed a plan which said what Maori wanted. Because we’re in Otago and because Ngai Tahu are mana whenua in this area we had to talk to them first.

The first six months of the plan was simply talking, and getting the fact that we got the money and what we were doing, the plan, onto their Runanga agendas. It took six months before the Runanga were happy with what we were doing, and we were asking for two things, the permission to
do it and somebody from their Runanga to work with us on it. The next thing was to go round the whole of Otago and to meet with Mata waka and get their input.

Consultation began with the three mana whenua runanga in Otago; Otakou, Huirapa and Moeraki. Otakou came first because Monty is a member of that runanga and it was logical to start there. Because of his obvious commitment to Maori concerns and to the future of his own children, the idea of an education initiative was strongly supported by the Runanga. Monty and Marie then went to another mana whenua marae, Huirapa ki Puketeraki. Here again they laid out their ideas for a co-ordinated approach to Maori education issues, asked for Runanga support and what was the best way to initiate the whole project. Huirapa Runanga co-ordinator, David Ellison, suggested a strategy for meeting with tangatawhenua. The strategy involved the three local mana whenua runanga appointing a member to join a working party that was to steer the education initiative.

To the RTMs, this not only meant that they had gained initial support, but it also meant that authority in decision making was now located with the local mana whenua people. It further meant that there was a means of keeping the lines of communication open in order to facilitate progress, for the Runanga representatives were able to keep their respective Runanga up to date with progress.

Marie They (the Runanga representatives) were our open line because any time we wanted to report back we couldn’t afford to take another three to six months if we had something to ask or get okayed. Those people were our direct links back. 7

The initial meeting of the working party determined how the next step in the process should proceed. This meeting suggested that education service providers in Otago needed to be involved and that the Otago community needed to be consulted at a series of regional hui to be held in Oamaru, Balclutha, Alexandra and Dunedin.

Work The working party was the group designing the work that needed to be done. Immediate decision making control lay within this group. Here all could contribute, yet there was a clear understanding of where ultimate responsibility lay and where true authority lay. The work was designed by reference to the original problem, and then underwent a long involved process of hui organisation, task allocations, consultation, further negotiation and strategising and report writing. All these tasks were subject to
negotiation, reporting back and scrutiny by this group, and by wider bodies as they became incorporated into the kaupapa of the study.

For example, the task of collating the material gathered at the regional hui was allocated to the RTMs as a subset of the working party, by the working party itself, of which the RTMs were an integral part, yet not the controllers. Therefore they were not in control of the flow of the research. The design of the work and the allocation of the tasks was made by those who did the work. The control over the work that was done to this stage remained with the working party which was answerable to the mana whenua runangas at each stage.

It is also very clear that the other members of the working party felt that they were vital parts of the decision making process, that they were co-researchers and co-workers. There was no 'top-down' hierarchy which 'dished out' work tasks and there appeared to be a feeling of great respect for the various rights and responsibilities of the members of the working party. It is also clear that there is no way that the agenda of this project could be pushed on by the designs of the RTMs. There was no suggestion that there was any imposition of agenda, or strategies or ideologies on the part of the Pakeha researchers. The agendas of the parties involved coincided. They agreed to work together toward realisation of mutual goals in a power sharing manner.

However, rather that this being a 'collective' of equals, as is suggested in some of the feminist literature (Fonow and Cook, 1991), it was situation where a hierarchy of responsibility existed which mirrors the reality of the Maori social context in Otago today. For example, mana whenua runanga do have the responsibility to scrutinise projects that will affect them and other people.

Following the negotiation with the mana whenua runangas, gaining of their approval, support and participation and establishing the working party, the gathering of significant people proceeded. The working party called a series of meetings early in 1993 of as many representatives of the Education Service providers in Otago (and some who also worked in Southland) as could attend. At these meeting, as with as many subsequent meetings as possible, the kaupapa of the research was explained. The idea that there was a need to gather the collective voice and aspirations of Maori parents in Otago was presented. Also presented was the idea that education service providers might like to participate in order to facilitate the voicing of these aspirations and responding to concerns and ideas as and when they arose. At the meetings the kaupapa of analysing the research process by this author was also explained. These ideas all received warm support.

A major topic of discussion at the meetings between the education service providers and the working party was how to proceed from this point. In other words, the education service provider representatives were incorporated into the research team in a decision making role. They were not presented with decisions already made by another
smaller group as fait accompli. One of the early topics of discussion was the preferred means of approaching the communities. It was agreed that Maori protocol should be used, in that the communities be contacted, an offer to visit made and left to them to take up the idea and arrange venues in their own way.

The four communities were approached by the RTMs who by this time were taking on more of an administrative and facilitatory role within this by now large group. The RTMs wrote to the leaders of the four communities, whom they already knew well through their RTM work, to lay out the idea of a Maori community meeting to address Maori education in Otago. All of the community leaders approached responded to this request positively, and proceeded to arrange for a community hui to address Maori education aspirations and needs in their own communities. They all insisted that Maori protocol would be followed at the hui. It was offered and agreed that costs were to be covered by an appropriate koha from the guests. The community leaders arranged for the best location for the hui to be held, and in consultation with the RTMs organised transport and food. It was then up to the guests, that is the education provider representatives and the working party, to respond to them in a Maori manner. This involved powhiri, hui a iwi, kai and poroporoaki (formal farewells).

Following negotiations between the groups, local communities on one side and the visitors on the other, the series of hui proceeded. Visitors, by this stage, included the two RTMs plus the representatives from the three runanga; representatives of the education service providers, Ministry of Education, Quest, ERO, SES plus members of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. The visitors gathered in Dunedin and travelled as an ope whakaeke to the various venues that had been chosen by the local communities for the hui. We travelled to Moeraki on the 27th April, Otakou on the 28th April, Balclutha on the 4th of May and Alexandra on the 5th of May, 1993.

The four hui followed a similar pattern. Powhiri, haruru, kai (formal welcome, greeting and food). Then a chance was given to the visitors to lay down their 'take', that is, what they had to offer, what they had to say. Then the host people spoke, asked questions and made their aspirations and needs known very clearly. The hui generally lasted four to five hours and concluded with a formal whakakapa (a Maori way of summing up which attempts to provide a consensual view of the proceedings) by kaumatua present and poroporoaki (formal farewell speeches) by the visitors. During the hui, full minutes were taken by the RTMs to document the voices of the community.

The next six months

Following this series of hui, there were many opportunities to continue the process of negotiation, to talk with people, both those who had attended the initial round of hui as well as other interested parties.
Between April 1993 and October 1993, over that six months, through the course of our work we talked to a whole range of people, schools, and Maori communities. We built on what the first hui had given us. Then it was a matter of writing the plan. At each hui there was a list of names circulated in order that we have a record of who attended the hui to help establish the fact that we actually had one, so its part of the record of the research. It also provided a database so that we could make sure that in future consultation those people would be contacted personally by mail by us, as well as through their own community networks.

Some consultation went even wider, for as well as this particular initiative in education there were other things happening on a wider front that needed to be addressed. Ngai Tahu iwi were beginning to develop an education plan for their own people and it was essential that these two plans worked in together. In order to facilitate this process as well as being in constant contact with local Ngai Tahu runanga and individuals, they went the Runanganui (Grand Council) o Tahu hui at Otakou Marae in September of 1993. This hui was a gathering of representatives from Ngai Tahu iwi throughout the South Island. Here the RTMs asked for a short time to explain the plan process to Ngai Tahu in hui. They were well received and it was suggested that they continue to liaise with Ngai Tahu education spokespeople. They also received much positive feedback following this meeting and encouragement to carry on.

They also returned to the Otago Maori Council to report progress of this initiative and for further consultation. Support from this grouping was crucial for it could be up to them to drive the plan if it was acceptable because they are the group that is able to deal with 'Article Three' issues for local and migrant Maori people.

Consultation was even extended to the national level. This level was addressed through consultation about the 'Education for the 21st century' booklet (Ministry of Education, 1993). This document, which is the National Government's education blueprint for the future, was sent out to all interested parties for comment. Te Puni Kokiri (the Ministry of Maori Development) sent out a companion booklet in order to facilitate Maori comment (Te Puni Kokiri, 1993b). Further negotiation about the Plan and its implications for Otago, at the national level will be conducted following the submission of the Plan to the funding agency, the Ministry of Education.

It was intended that the next step in the consultation process would be to further extend the number and range of people involved in the information/consultation spiral by introducing the plan to Otago schools. Monty demonstrated how his own theory drives the means of consultation:
Once we get the Maori community reasonably well informed about the document and supportive of it then we will give it to schools. That won’t happen till next year now and once all the educational organisations, preschool, primary, secondary, tertiary institutions have looked at it and support it then it really is a plan that Otago can live with. We reckoned it would take us two years to get to this stage of having a document that Maori people could live with and we are going to come close to that. We’re not far off that. I think the plan as it goes to Wellington will be a plan embargoed from publication outside of Otago, until we’ve had a little bit more time to work on it. I don’t think anybody in any other organisation should have it until the schools have had a look at it in Otago because they’re the Treaty partner. If the whole thing comes out of Article 3 of the Treaty and it’s the partnership under Article 3 of the Treaty and at the moment we’ve only dealt with one of the treaty partners, the Maori. We’ve had the educational agencies involved at the first part and we have dealt with the Maori partner now, but we do have to look at the Pakeha partner of the Treaty, because if that plan is going to go any where it needs the Pakeha support and those schools need the right to have that document before everyone else gets a hold of it. The Plan says this is what Otago’s doing and the principals from Otago will go ‘What the hell’s that; we’ve never seen that’.

So those were some of the threads that we’ve worked on pulling together.

The means they described of working toward a solution was spoken of in the same terms as they had described the matrix of problems. Their approach was one of weaving together a collective voice of those who could aid solution seeking. This process can be described as whitiwhiti korero, of spiralling discourse, that weaves together a whanau of interest through negotiation.

Another part of the whanau of interest was our University-based research group. This group was able to provide support when applying for funding and supervision of the project and through regular research group meetings in order that progress could be reported and discussed with like-minded colleagues. The RTMs also felt that the group, Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua, was able to lend credibility to the project.

The large membership of this metaphoric whanau demonstrated how differing rights and responsibilities being met by appropriate individuals provides a synergy and how this process is empowering. The synergistic role of the whanau of interest enables individual to contribute to the group product which is greater than the sum of the individual contributions. This raises the issue of how they saw their positions in the project.
Monty We were the ones that asked the questions. We were the ones that got it going. Our role has been as a teina.

Marie Well if you look at the Maori concept of education like the tuakana/teina. It is up to the teina to ask the questions of the older one. They won’t get any answers until they do ask the questions so we just played that role of asking the questions and hoped they are the right ones.

Monty We had questions ... and we tried to write down the answers as best we ... we heard them ... This next round of consultation is really 'Did we hear? Is what we heard what you said?'

The collective voice heard at the hui was heard by some school administrators who were also present. The concerns and aspirations voiced by the parents of Maori children challenged the common assumption that many schools held about Maori parents; namely that the parents are apathetic, not concerned about achievement and don’t want to participate in the education of their children. The very process of gathering this collective voice was empowering for these school administrators and teachers for they were able to hear, often for the first time, how strongly Maori parents did care about their children's educational futures.

It led some school administrators and teachers to openly question, at the hui, their assumptions about Maori parental aspirations, and perhaps to question why they considered the parents in such a negative light. This process of conscientisation through discourse will be enhanced when the plan is returned to schools. As the document is subject to critique from within these institutions, the process of whitiwhiti korero will continue as a process of spiralling discourse and a powerful means of challenging stereotypes and negative assumptions. This is an important step in the process of challenging systemic limitations on the achievement Maori students in mainstream schools.

Russell You remember down in Balclutha, and Central as well, at those four initial meetings there were some principals and DPs from local primary schools who were fired up by those meetings. One of them I remember getting up and saying “I’ve never heard this sort of thing before from Maori parents”. Exactly what you are saying there. That if the schools want to talk to parents they have to go to the parents and talk to them in a Maori context. Not necessarily in the Maori language if they can’t do that, but in a Maori context and in a Maori way. Because those principals were fired up, weren’t
they, and I remember them saying they had never heard this sort of thing before.

*Monty* And that’s made a huge difference in South Otago. More schools now are prepared to pay more members of Maori communities to deliver Maori projects in schools than was ever the case before. I mean there’s lots and lots of things happening out there now that would’ve never happened before. People are talking, beginning to talk in a shared way and they are starting to actually communicate.

*Marie* Think they are starting to listen to each other.

*Monty* And to find common ground.

*Monty* Dunstan High School now are looking at employing a Maori teacher and putting Maori on the curricula for next year.

*Russell* And you can relate that back to those meetings.

*Monty* Absolutely.

The process of research itself was a catalyst for change as Maori parents and teachers were brought together in a safe context where the Maori voice was heard and teachers’ perceptions were challenged.

**The collective voice**

After the first round of hui and the gathering of the many and varied voices, the RTMs were allocated the task of drawing out the recurring aspirations and needs as voiced by the community members.

*Monty* There were three things. One was the mainstream school, but all the way through there was a theme of Maori delivery, of Maori education and that theme came through ... not strongly but: consistently, time after time after time. There wasn’t ever much said about it cos ... perhaps they didn’t have a confidence about it, but it was certainly playing on their minds. From Kohanga Reo what happens next? What happens next? What happens next? What happens next? And "My child’s been at school for 18 months and they have lost their Reo".
Monty: Yeah. "What can we do, what can we do?"

Marie: We can't do it at home because we can't speak it ourselves.

Monty: It was always niggling along and it came up time after time after time. There would be side comments in the midst of another thing, but they were always there and so we dragged them all out and eventually it was enough to make a Maori delivery statement.

Marie: When it all boiled down there are two things that people wanted. One was Te Reo and one was achievement. And I suppose the third one, if there is a third one is participation, they wanted to be involved. They want to be involved.

He Kanohi Kitea; A face seen is an argument understood

The RTMs described how important it was for them to be culturally competent enough to be able to participate in Maori preferred methods of problem solving. It was important to be able to front up in a hui situation in order to debate the issues 'face to face' (kanohi ki kanohi), where all involved are able to give voice to their concerns, emotionally and spiritually. They felt that it was important that they were able to participate in these activities, culturally and politically, in order that the other research participants felt that they have a chance to contribute to the debate.

Monty also emphasised that a 'known face', suggesting participation in research, is more likely to elicit a positive response and a 'known face' also enabled people to speak their mind. Monty and Marie both considered that a 'mailed-out' questionnaire would only receive 'safe' answers, if any at all. Similarly, they felt that it was important to realise that establishing relationships over a period of time was an essential element in the development of trust between participants in research of this type, simply abandoning the method (for example questionnaires) was insufficient.

Marie: They had to look at our faces and hear what we had to say. I mean you're not going to spill your heart out to someone about what you want for your kids, something really precious to you, to just any old person.

Russell: Why would they do that in a Maori context?

Monty: Because at those first hui we said, "This is what we are doing. How do you want us to do it?" They were in charge of the venue, they chose the venue, they chose the agenda, they chose the invitation, the process of having
people turn up. The other thing is, if it's set correctly then the kaupapa will follow. You use the wrong kaupapa and you kill it dead.

And the kaupapa feeds on itself at a hui, doesn’t it? It goes around and people get up and say, 'Yeah, I want to support that', and 'I don’t agree with that bit but I totally support this bit', and people get worked up more, don’t they?

It is also important that this process of being a known face, extends beyond the particular project that is underway. Monty and Marie have been involved in Maori and related activities in the wider community for a long time and they feel that not only does this aid their credibility as RTMs but also their ability to undertake this type of research project. Marie considered this credibility important for it aids the researcher to gain acceptability, to understand the subtleties of the situation and to gather the collective voice accurately.

I was well-known around the schools and he was well-known...

Monty... around the communities. So that’s the partnership that we had. I’d worked with a lot of community people, Pakeha and Maori community people, through two years of quite intensive involvement during 1990 and that was all about empowering people to do things which were beyond what they thought they imagined they could do and in a way this is the same kind of thing.

Marie’s contribution was in the school context and in her networks. She did her training in Dunedin, she was an ITM (Itinerant Teacher of Maori-, the forerunner of the RTM positions) here over a long period of time.

I don’t think they look on us as flashes in the pan. We’re in it for the long haul. We’ve got credibility over a long haul.

That's a point, I've never thought of that before... the community interschool links that you and I both have. Not in that way.

Evaluation and outcomes of the Plan

Research is often a catalyst for change in ways not expected by the researcher. It is a challenge to the researchers to be able to participate in a research project where they may feel they are losing control. However, research where control lies in the hands of
the whanau rather than in the hands of the researcher, means that the direction that the change takes and indeed what changes are promoted and fostered is up to the whanau. A good example from this case was the growth of a 'Kura for Dunedin' initiative out of the initial Otago Maori Plan hui held in Dunedin. A number of attempts had been made to develop a Kura in Dunedin over the years, yet none had born fruit. However, it seems that this hui that was called in April at Otakou Marae to discuss the Otago Maori Education Plan brought together the right set of people at the right time and place to set the spark.

Monty

There was some really good Maori role-models there and they were able to say what their grievances were as a Maori working within those institutions and they gave a few clues to the community as to what might be acceptable.

Marie

Or what may be needed. Some Maori parents, it was so remote to them that they didn't want to ask for anything because they just couldn't. But when someone like Ani speaks up and they think 'Gee it's not that remote. It is possible'.

We were initially concerned because the Dunedin meeting in comparison to the meetings in the other smaller centres which hosted 60 or more people, was relatively poorly attended. However, there were a number of kohanga reo parents present who were very concerned about the future education for their Maori-speaking children. Ani Wainui spoke about how they had started their kura in Invercargill. There was such a lot of interest expressed at that meeting, that she invited a group to go down to Invercargill to have a look.

Monty

So out of that came a group that was prepared to go down. We went down and spent a day down there. In the van on the way down and in the van on the way back we talked about forming a group and since then we have formed a group. We've decided to open. We've had a hui on the marae, we've talked through the charter, we've agreed to the charter statements, we've applied to go under the charter of Invercargill of Arowhenua in the meantime to bridge the gap between us and so on. So that's been a huge amount of work which we hadn't expected to come out of the planning meetings, but it has been a direct consequence. We are now at this stage. We've got permission to proceed, we've got the kids, we've got two possibilities for kaiako, we've got to look at buildings next week and once we've got the buildings we'll have a goer for next year.
Russell  You make it sound easy, but I remember being at that meeting and it seemed to me that everybody was sort of talking away and we all presented our own particular take then as you say people said 'Let's get back to basics'. It was Ani Wainui who really got going. I mean she was there for 'Quest' and people said, “Well Korero mai ki a matou o te take o Kaupapa Maori”. So she spoke away to everybody about that and it seemed to me that it sort of hit a nail on the head, it hit a nerve. There was some Kohunga Reo parents there and I remember seeing their eyes sort of light up. We were talking about all sorts of stuff. We were talking about College and that sort of stuff but this particular group, they just sort of sat there and said, “Well, why don’t we do it? We can do it can’t we?” and Ani was saying, “Of course you can do it” and she was sort of standing up you know with her arms going like this “Well, look, don’t sit around and wait for anybody else. Get in it yourself.” Wonderful, isn’t she? So they did and they just sort of sat there and said, “Well, okay. Maybe we better.” And it was just what they needed. So it seems to me quite inspirational that that meeting shot off on a tangent out the side and established a group for a kura. Amazing!

When the Plan was presented to the funding agency, the Ministry of Education, in September of 1994, it was presented at Huirapa Marae, by two of the oldest kaumatua of Huirapa, thus reinforcing where the ownership of the Plan really lay. The timing was opportune for it was just at this time that the parents of the kura had made application to open their own kura in Dunedin. They had been denied permission by the Ministry of Education. Naturally this was a common topic of contention at the Plan presentation hui. There was much heated debate about this topic in the presence of the Ministry of Education officials from Dunedin and two from Wellington. Two days later the denial of permission was reversed.

The response to the second round of hui

Between the first round of hui in April and May 1993 and the second in October, the two documents associated with the Government's education plans for the future were released in conjunction with Te Puni Kokiri. The RTMs agreed to present the Ministry of Education's discussion document (Ministry of Education, 1993), and the companion document, produced by Te Puni Kokiri for members of the Maori community (Te Puni Kokiri, 1993b), along with the draft of the Otago Maori plan to the community groups identified and consulted with during the first round of hui for the Otago Maori Plan. It was felt that the plan might help members of the community make 'more effective responses' to the discussion documents at the same time giving them an
idea of the context beyond Otago that the plan was going to have to address. In reference to the Plan, Marie explained that they invited people to

Marie have a look at it, dip in where your interest lies because people haven’t got knowledge all the way through. Have we written down what you said, is it what you are looking for for your children or are there changes that you feel should be made?

The number of people who came to the second round of hui was smaller than the number who attended the initial round. While this could have been attributed to apathy, it was more likely that many of those who had attended the first meetings were satisfied that they had had their chance to speak their mind, and that they were satisfied that there were that others capable of carrying on, once they had seen that they were being listened to carefully and that their voice would be recorded faithfully. However, a major consideration and of great consolation to the RTMs was that the people who attended the second round of hui were by and large representative of those people who had attended the first.

Validation Processes

Just as the membership of the research group is fluid, expanding and contracting as situations and time demands, there are flexible and effective validation processes involved. These validation processes are different from what is traditionally considered under the heading of validation from a Western European perspective. These processes may be invisible to the 'uncultured' eye, yet present nonetheless. The second hui at Dunedin in October illustrates one way in which Maori preferred validation processes work.

The response to the call for the first hui in Dunedin was limited. The second meeting was also small in number. The reasons for the limited response were varied and beyond the control of the RTMs. However, in order to produce a wider collective voice, a solution to the limited response by the Dunedin community was offered by those who attended the second hui. The suggestion was that negotiation and consultation should be carried out within the sub-groups of the community. The RTMs should go to the kohangas, to the parent groups, to the individual mata waka ropu and to the maraes in the area, to negotiate and consult at that level.

Marie Well so far I’ve been to a whanau support meeting here at Kenmure with the bilingual class to get back to some other parents who couldn’t come to that meeting. We were going to go and meet up with the kohanga group and present to them directly at their next whanau meeting.
Monty I think the key element in the Dunedin situation is that if you go to the community and ask them to call a hui, there is no one group who has the mana to call a hui which is representational of Dunedin Maori groups and interests, so we are going to have to go round each group separately and we just do not have the time to do that before the end of the year. They’ve also got their own commitments coming up to Christmas so it will be the first term of next year when we will visit each of the mata waka groups separately so that they can say we have consulted with them. People were saying the Dunedin group wasn’t representative, you can’t put the plan forward without having gone to these other groups. There was support at the second Dunedin meeting for people to help us to do that, they were going to lead us.

Where does the plan go from here? Responding to community needs

During the consultation following and during the first round of hui, numerous concerns were voiced about what would happen to all these ideas. Was this just to be another 'talk feast' with no action?

Monty It became clear that there needs to be some ongoing umbrella group looking at Maori education with a brief over the whole region from preschool to tertiary (just as the Ngai Tahu is overlooking that iwi). The idea of an Educational Authority came up. We needed to front up to Otago Maori Council (OMC) and Te Puni Kokiri and say 'Look, this is where we want to go and do you people support it' and 'Who are the groups that this initiative can be taken up by and worked through?' There was no point putting it in the plan if there was going to be no support from groups like OMC and Te Puni Kokiri to make this happen. So it took us a while. We had to put the proposal on the table, let them go away have a look at it then come back. To decide whether they support it or not.

Before the end of this month we will be going to Christchurch to the Ngai Tahu education hui, the second of their education hui, and we’ll be asking at that hui for support for that particular initiative. I think there are clandestine groups within the Ministry still beavering away on Maori education initiatives without consultation outside their own little groups. They’re going to make policy for the nation without consultation and I think we might have to pre-empt some of their discussions by informing them of where we are going in spite of the fact that we haven’t completed our consultation.
It would be the Educational Authority's job to be responsible for the plan, to nurture it, but it's not the Authority's job to take it away from the community, it's simply to be the conduit for the community to keep the plan balanced and updated on behalf of the community, not to actually take the plan on as their own.

Benefits: Who is going to benefit from the project?

*Monty* Before the project was even finished I think the benefits started to come through. Maori communities are now a lot more focussed, a lot more up-skilled in education, they're a lot more confident about what they want, they're not so backward about asking. Their conversation with schools is a lot more direct, they are taking more initiatives themselves and there's also a lot better understanding between communities about what is happening in other communities and people saying 'Oh, well, if they're going to do that we are not going to allow them to go too far ahead of us. We're going to have a go ourselves'. So there's just that little bit of rivalry that's coming out of shared knowledge which is actually driving these initiatives forward as well. But there's particular ones like the payment for a full-time person in Central Otago and a Maori community person to work in schools. There's also the Kura for Dunedin

And there's generally more effective communication between the Maori community and the schools. Clearly what's happened is that the Maori community and the schools are starting to work together whereas at the beginning of the project the agendas were totally different and there was very little shared communication. Now there is a joint understanding. In some of those original consultation hui there were members of schools or Boards of Trustees who were present amongst the crowd and when they heard what was being said (it was a Maori hui, on Maori terms with a Maori agenda) they heard it in its own context. They realised that they were way out of line and that they have been instrumental in having brought the schools communities on-side with what Maori communities want and can support.

This comment on the power of individuals to bring about change tends to challenge notions about systemic inertia, as well as ideas that resistance is the only alternative to monolithic structural limitations on individual initiatives. There is power in spiralling discourse as a process of research because it is aimed at ever-expanding the research group/whanau of interest in order to take on board those in powerful positions who have the means of implementing systemic change in their hands. As Robinson
(1993) points out, to ignore these people is to ignore some very important barriers and potential carriers of the new ideas. Monty and Marie were at pains to acknowledge that the schools they dealt with were staffed by well-meaning people. There are a number who do say they are limited by resources and time constraints. While this could be seen as avoiding the issue there are a significant number who want to participate in meaningful intervention strategies.

Monty I think people in schools are now beginning to look to the ultimate answer as to what a school can realistically provide in terms of Maori education. Some schools are actually trying to achieve that now in the mainstream. They are looking at Maori across the curriculum. They are looking at a fuller use of Maori tikanga and language within the school environment within the mainstream setting.

Russell Do you think that this process is going to affect children's educational attainment in schools?

Marie We would like to think so. I mean you can't tell at this stage but well for a Maori child going into school, if the atmosphere is positive and supportive of them and their background, then surely they'll do better.

Monty We've got a number of occasions now that Maori programmes are coming into schools and there's a better relationship with the community. Staff were saying "that initiative that we put in place has brought these kids to the fore. They always use to sit at the back of the room, they never use to take part in what was happening. Now they feel confident, they've got a place, they've got a contribution to make that is valued". The staff are valuing it, other kids are valuing it and they're valuing themselves more. So yeah, it is making a difference.

Marie What was that comment at Clinton the other day, remember? I was taking the bunch of little ones and there was a wee girl from the Kohanga Reo and she had really neat language and she was getting closer and closer in there and the teacher said later that she just latched on to you and she was delightful, but she was a delightful child anyway. The teacher could have that relationship, too, once she sort of builds up that understanding and appreciation of what this kid had to offer. She just stood out, didn't she?

Russell Why did she warm to you?
Monty  I don’t think she warmed to Marie so much as to what Marie was doing. The fact that the content was Maori and the fact that the kid could identify and relate to what was being done and had a part to play.

Marie  It was just a bunch of kids but suddenly I was aware of this little face, it lit up and the oral language started to fire back at me. Then I said to her in Maori, "Have you been to Kohanga?". The teacher hadn’t seen the kid react in that way.

Russell  Marie, you are saying there that you did something that turned that wee girl on, that the other teacher hadn’t been able to do. It was your knowledge of Maori and your knowledge of her what she could actually do. You had an understanding of her background, didn’t you?

Marie  I suppose, it was probably I mean it was self conscious but it was something that the teacher could actually do herself

Russell  What would the teacher have to do?

Marie  Well it's really just make an effort, isn’t it, and to really become aware. I mean it's a lot of work.

Russell  What do you mean make an effort? What sort of effort?

Marie  Well, she's got to make an effort perhaps language-wise and to actually bring some of the Maori tikanga and that into the classroom programme so that’s a natural part of that child’s everyday experience, so it’s not just something she gets at home. It’s here, part of her schooling.

What are the power relations between the members of the research whanau?

Monty  We never saw ourselves having any power at all.

Russell  But you must have power though, you’ve had a lot of power really.

Monty  No, I think the word is empowering not power. Power is doing the talking, empowering is doing the listening and I actually think they’re two different processes. I think what we tried to do in this project is empower others by listening and then reporting back to them for simply by having their words
in a document like that empowers people, gives their point of view credibility. I think we made the point before that while korero is fine for Maori it's only when it gets written down that it has that credibility for Pakeha. Having it written down is helping Maori communicate more effectively with Pakeha because Pakeha are taking it for real. It isn't necessary for Maori, but it is helpful in empowering Maori towards schools because the schools start to take them seriously. But it's not our views, it is really the views of what we heard. If you look at the plan there's very little in it that relates to resource teachers in Maori or their role in the future of this thing. We have really understated our role in the future of this. It will be up to the communities to call on us if they feel so inclined.

Accountability

We then turned to the issue of the accountability of the researcher. Who the researcher is accountable to is a very contentious issue. The arguments range from limited to total. The location of the accountability ranges from University Ethics committees to iwi/hapu groups. This conversation is a good example of the nature of dialogic reflectivity, where two researchers, by comparing similar experiences, can work towards mutually constructing understandings.

Russell

In terms of your location within this large network, the community of interest that you're part of, who are you accountable to? What are the lines of accountability?

Monty

Going back to the beginning of this project, we went to Ngai Tahu first. It's Ngai Tahu's patch and we can we have no mandate to work in any areas of Maori in Otago without reference to mana whenua first. It took six months for that relationship to be established with respect to this plan, but until that was established there was really no point in going any further. We then had to go to Mata Waka and we let Mata Waka identify itself. Clearly there's more work that needs to be done in Dunedin, but in the other areas they are prepared to work together. We met with them, and it's to them that we reported back. In writing the document with the knowledge that it was going to go into schools and using our knowledge of schools and what they are looking for, we realised it would have to be written in a form that schools could identify with and pick it up. That's why we took each sector of education separately, pre-school, primary, secondary and so on, so that each sector group could pick up the statement that related to their area. I think the bottom line is that we communicated with tangata whenua first, then mata
waka, and then we are reporting back to those same groups. The plan will have credibility if the Otago Maori Council (OMC), the Runangas, the various communities actually pick the document up and make it happen and there's every evidence that its having that effect already before the draft is final.

Russell I think that’s very clear, that’s very much a part of this whole sort of research. When I do my own family research, I have to be really clear that who I am doing it for, for example my one of our Kaumatua said to me when he was down here, "Now be careful of what you are doing. Don’t pollute your whakapapa". He was saying to me 'Don’t just give it out to anybody, don’t just start thrashing it around, don’t just share everything'. In other words what he was saying to me was, if you are doing this sort of work it’s to be for the betterment of your family, it has to be for the benefit of everybody in the family, not just yourself. If you’re just doing this to get yourself a degree or write a book or something like that, well, you’re actually not doing it properly, you are defiling the tapu of your whakapapa. But if you are rediscovering all that whakapapa for the benefit of your family and your children that’s better. I think that’s the same sort of thing, isn’t it, that we’re working with, I think it’s very clear, I think as researchers we have to watch this whole accountability thing, don’t we. Who are we accountable to, why are we accountable to these people and what are the channels of accountability. I know you work in that situation all the time. It’s just that’s it's one of those unstated things.

Monty It's very, very clear that a lot of research that has been done on Maori has been done to the benefit of the researcher and information has been manipulated by the researcher for their own political ends. We have no intention of gaining any political capital out of it. I mean if people want to look at what we have done and acknowledge it and acknowledge us for it that’s entirely up to them. But if they pick it up and use it then I think our programme has been justified. And we don’t see ourselves as having control of it, just drawing it together to empower others.

Part of this issue of accountability has to do with the use of names. I asked Monty and Marie if they wanted to be anonymous or if it was alright to use their names. Our conversation on this topic ranged from this question of anonymity to power relations to accountability once again.
Monty: In the old days you kept the informant's name anonymous. That then gave the researcher power because he or she could massage that information, nobody could ever challenge it. But if you actually keep our names in this document as Marie and Monty, resource teachers for Maori in Otago, then those statements are labelled to us.

Marie: So we stand by them.

Monty: And we're also going to check you to make sure you don't change things. So the thing is, it's a more honest, open and useful report. Because people who read the document use their knowledge of the situation to bring to bear on what is actually said in the report. Whereas in the old days, when the informant was anonymous, they could only guess, and you didn't have the immediacy that this new process has.

Russell: I couldn't agree with you more. That's what the members of my family said when I asked them if I could use their name. And they just said "Do whatever you need to to get this information out to the rest of the family. The process is more important than our names, than whether we're anonymous or not". The process is more important than finding out the family links. Reasserting the 'familyness' is more important. And I think you're quite right. It's a much more powerful process having names.

Monty: I think it's more powerful, I think it's more honest, I think that more resolution takes place because people are committed to what they said. There's a sense of ownership, and you're not going to take cheap swipes at people behind the cloak of anonymity. You're going to have to deal with it and to be accountable.

Russell: I understand that you've been involved in another type of research project that you weren't particularly happy with. Could you just briefly tell me about that?

Monty: Are you talking about when they interviewed my wife and I for a book?

Russell: Yeah, I enjoyed that story.

Monty: God, that story ... It is the pits as far as my family's concerned!! We were asked if we would be the subjects of a book about multi-cultural marriages.
And we said, "Fine, that's no problem". And they came out to our place for an 'exploratory interview'. We were told that it was just an interview to see whether we were in fact suitable subjects for the book. We happened to know the interviewer, so as the tape rolled we just talked like a family. That was the last time that we had contact with the project. That interviewer subsequently left the project, our tape got transcribed and published. I heard that it was being published and tried to contact my mother and my parents in Auckland. But I was too late. My mother had heard of our involvement in the project on talk-back radio and had gone down to the book-shop to sight the transcript. It was done in the '70s when Pakehas were struggling with the beginnings of biculturalism. The editors had cut out all of the things that my wife's Polynesian family had contributed to the marriage that had made it difficult. The only things that had remained were the difficulties that had come from my side of the family. So it was totally biased and my parents came out as evil and villains. My parents didn't talk to me for three years as a result of that book. And I just think that it was absolutely horrific. As a process it had just about every fault in it. And it created havoc in our family. It took us three years, not until we got involved in a family counselling situation related to someone outside of our family that I took advantage of the counselling process to confront this issue with a third party as it just wasn't possible to resolve it on a one-on-one with our parents. It was absolutely horrific.

Russell Thank you, I do remember you telling me about that story. I thought that was a wee beaut.

Monty Do you wanna know the name of the book?

Russell Yeah. No, not really.

Discussion

The four hui that were held throughout Otago in April of 1992 were in response to concerns that were already being voiced in the Maori community. The RTMs were able to identify these problems and situations of interest and concern to Maori community groups because they were conscious of the aspirations and needs of the members of the group affected by these problems. They were both 'kanohi kitea', familiar faces, known to Maori people and known to be part of the concerns and interests of the community and therefore someone to be trusted. They were already part of established networks, they were not coming from a supposedly neutral stance from
outside the community. They were already part of the Maori communities' attempts to speak for themselves.

The initiation of the project was more by way of the stimulation of an already existing interest/concern within the Maori community. Stimulation of interest as an initiation strategy in this case means the researchers were able to identify an incipient interest or concern that existed within the research community and were able to offer means to facilitate the development of this interest or to address the concern.

The language used by Monty and Marie also indicates that they were seeking to facilitate an approach to research that was working within Maori preferred references. Their language focussed on weaving together the ideas, concerns, misapprehensions and strengths of the Maori communities with those of the schools. These concepts of identification, stimulation, negotiation as part of the methodological framework is part of the whakapapa of the weaving. The process is whakawhanaungatanga, that process of finding links, this time using the Maori metaphor of creating familiness, support and shared concern.

This story also demonstrates an existing Maori cultural means of problem solving, of addressing the need for systemic change in action. The process has been described as spiral discourse, where over a long period of time the research process involves not only the bringing 'on board' those people who are able to address the concerns of the research group in a manner designed to gather opinions, but bringing them on board in such a way they are incorporated into the problem solving team. The research process incorporates into the process of change those people who are necessary to address change and to challenge policy-makers. In this manner those powerful people who are normally beyond the solution seeking realm of research can be brought on board the kaupapa of the research.

The concept of the spiral not only speaks in culturally preferred terms (the koru) but it also indicates that the accumulation is always reflexive, in that the discourse is always returning to the original controlling initiators where control lies, in this case the mana whenua runanga. Spiralling and reflexive discourse ensures that the control of the agenda of the research is not usurped by the interests and concerns of those brought 'on board'. Spiralling discourse ensures that the group focuses on the agenda of the research as defined by Maori people. Unless such a process is an integral part of the discursive practice, the accumulation of discourses may wrest control away from that which would benefit Maori people.

The research process began with Monty and Marie's recognition of the concerns that were existing and unaddressed within the Maori communities and within schools. They also identified the mismatches between local aspirations and national trends in Maori education. This was also done within a context of their being known as active participants in local Maori social and political groups. The next step was the formation
of a working party to steer the research, a working party that located the authority and
control of the initiation of the project with local mana whenua Maori people. At this
time I became incorporated into the project. The next step was to involve the Maori
communities on an ongoing reflexive basis. The period of discussion with community
representatives described as whitiwhiti korero, culminated with the development of a
Plan written in 'Ministry Speak' that was then presented to the representatives of the
Ministry of Education at Huirapa Marae, by two elders of Ngai Tahu in Otago.

This spiral discourse, so described because it is constantly coming back on
itself, yet at the same time moving forward, brings powerful people 'on board'. For
example, educators in the schools who were at the first hui were able to hear the
aspirations of Maori parents, often for the first time, and importantly it was in a Maori
controlled and organised context. This ensured that the needs of the Maori parents were
paramount, not those of the school administrators and teachers. A second issue is that
the delivery of the Plan in 1995 will enable schools to hear the collective voices of their
Maori communities in a way they cannot at present because of the cultural distance
between those who run the schools and the preferred 'voice' that is Maori, as well as the
Maori preferred means of establishing that 'voice'. In this context there are a number of
people who are very willing to address discrepancies in achievement and attainment,
given some idea of how to go about this process. This positive attitude can be easily
dismissed by those who claim that systemic inertia may be ideologically driven and thus
no manner of 'good intentions' will address structural change. However, when the
research process addresses, challenges and brings on board a further level of powerful
people, in this case the policy makers at Ministry of Education, then there is more likely
to be systemic change at school level.

1 In 1991, Monty and Marie began a process of informing and consulting with local mana whenua
runanga and mata waka ropu and associated Maori groups.

2 Otago Maori Council. OMC. A council of representatives from mana whenua runanga, that is local
Maori runanga (councils based at local marae) and mata waka ropu (groups of Maori people resident in
Otago but descended from migrants from another tribal area.) For example there are Ngati Kahungunu,
Mataatua and Ngati Porou ropu in Dunedin. This council was constructed in 1990 under the auspices of
the now-defunct Runanga Iwi Act, an Act that attempted to devolve decision making and control to local
level. The Otago Maori council was a local initiative to facilitate a common purpose and consultation at
the highest level between mana whenua and mata waka Maori people.

3 Five full-time Maori positions were lost during this time; one from Quest Rapuara, two from ERO and
two from the Ministry of Education.
4 This refers to the body established by constituent Kura Kaupapa Maori to oversee the development of these institutions along the lines agree to in their joint philosophy statement, 'Te Aho Matua'.

5 The Education Act 1989 requires all schools to create a charter for the institution. This charter should include a mission statement for the school and a series of policy statements to guide the development of school practice.

6 Funding for the project came from the Ministry of Education through Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua of the Department of Education, University of Otago.

7 Tino Rangatiratanga and mana whenua status were issues that determined the progress and the process of this project. One example was when an interchange took place between mana whenua & mata waka people in South Otago after the initial round of hui had been undertaken. Monty and Marie facilitated the meeting and ‘insisted that Ngai Tahu be involved all the way through’ because

Monty
they are the mana whenua and everybody else, if its going to work properly are going to come under the mana of mana whenua in this area. Everyone has to have to say ‘we are not doing it on our own’. But you see if mata waka come in and do it, it's only mata waka from the point of view of that individual person. Ngai Tahu are the ones that carry the can from generation to generation. Any mata waka input is only as good as the individual mata waka people who are here. They can come and go, they can be good today and bad tomorrow. They can be here today and gone tomorrow. But Ngai Tahu is going to be here tomorrow and today and the day after and everything that happens that's good or bad is their problem. In the end they inherit the good and the bad. And therefore they need to be involved.

8 The Education Service providers who participated in one or more of these meetings included: Ministry of Education, Education Review Office, Special Education Service, Quest Rapuara, ETSA, National Library Service, Kura Kaupapa Maori, University of Otago, Dunedin College of Education, Otago Polytechnic, REAP, Te Puni Kokiri, NZSTA.

9 Article three issues are those pertaining to Maori rights, as British subjects, to equal access to resources for education, health and welfare.

10 Whanau is used here in a metaphorical sense (Metge, 1990a) which has developed from Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori initiatives, in that kinship is not the only structure within which to form a
It is now seen as relevant and appropriate for whanau to form under the auspices of a common goal or local residence (pp. 73-74).

11 At Alexandra in Central Otago, a Maori elder from Cromwell explained that he attended the meeting because of who was on the agenda, rather than what, albeit he was very interested in the topic.

12 Ani Wainui stood and spoke at the four hui about her experiences as a member of a whanau establishing a Kura Kaupapa Maori in Invercargill.

13 Oamaru, 27th April at Moeraki Marae, 60 people
   Dunedin, 28th April at Otakou Marae, 20 people
   Balclutha, 4th May at Old Boys Rugby club, 50 people
   Alexandra, 5th May at Camping Ground Recreation Rooms. Room, 60 people.

14 The group included Monty for he is a parent of a Maori-speaking child. In fact he commented that at one stage this offshoot of the 'Plan' threatened to take over his time and energy from the original take. However, there was enough interest and energy from others involved to ensure they continued to undertake plan negotiations.
Chapter 8: Whakawhanaungatanga as participant-driven research

Introduction

This chapter seeks to create a text/examine a way of knowing that reflects what meanings I can construct from my positioning within an experiential Kaupapa Maori research matrix. This matrix consists of my being a participant in a research group with an agreed-to agenda, of my being a participant within the projects considered in the narratives in this thesis, from my talking with other research participants in the form termed 'interviews as chat', and from constructing joint narratives about these events with other researchers. This chapter is an attempt to reflect on what I learnt from my position within this matrix in order to identify a way of constructing meanings about such experiences and to investigate a methodological framework for a Kaupapa Maori approach to research. This does not mean that mine is the only possible approach to interpreting events. Indeed it is possible for a researcher to speak to others in such a way as to allow them to reflect on their own practice and develop their own understandings, interpretations and applications for practice.

This position challenges the traditional agonistic position of 'researcher' as tuakana (the older, leader, wiser, knower) which is where I stood when I commenced my University appointment in 1990. This thesis is the story of my development as a researcher, moving from an agonistic position within the research community to a position as teina, a learner. I became a participant in a context where power and control are located within the collective and where knowledge is created, gathered and processed for the benefit of the collective.

It is significant that this movement has not been a shift from paradigm to paradigm within the Western epistemological and cosmological domain, but rather the movement has been from within the world-view of Western thought to another world-view. Such a narrative challenges others to reflect on their positions in the research process. Researchers who position themselves as engaging in empowering research may be challenged to question the assumptions on which they predicate their research so that they may reorient their research to benefit all participants.

My own position is congruent with those of the other researchers in these narratives. This position involves connectedness, engagement, and involvement with the other research participants within their own cultural world-view. This chapter seeks to identify what constitutes this notion of engagement and what implications this has for promoting self-determination, of agency and voice among the research participants.

Such positionings address the concerns and principles of a Kaupapa Maori approach. How does the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori position the researcher in order to address issues of power and control within the research process? Other key questions include; How cultural aspirations of Maori people can be
operationalised within the research process? and What cultural preferences and practices might guide research practice? How are the issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability (as detailed in chapter 1) addressed in practice by practitioners of Kaupapa Maori research?

Noddings (1986) and Davies (1990) suggest that such questions are best addressed by those who position themselves within empowering relationships. This suggests that the position of the researcher within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Maori is a crucial ingredient in operationalising agentic positioning and behaviour by the research participants. Chapter 3 discussed methods of addressing these concerns, along with the need for a collaborative approach to research. Authors such as Oakley (1981), Tripp (1983), Burgess (1984), Lather (1986, 1991), Patton (1990), Delamont (1992), Reinharz (1992) and Eisner (1992) suggest that an 'empowering' relationship could be attained by developing an *enhanced research relationship*, where there occurs a long-term development of mutual purpose and intent between the researcher and the researched. In order to facilitate this development of mutuality there was also recognition of the need for personal investment in the form of self-disclosure and openness on the part of the researcher.

Reflection on the Kaupapa Maori research matrix that constitutes the body of this thesis identified that, as well as the above conditions, there developed a degree of involvement on the part of the researcher, constituted by a different way of knowing, that moves beyond the concept of personal investment. While it appears that personal investment is essential, this personal investment is not just on terms determined by the 'investor'. The investment is on terms mutually understandable and controllable by all participants, so that the investment is reciprocated. Lather (1991) identifies the importance of such a process of reciprocity, and terms it 'symmetrical dialogue'. However, as identified in chapter three, differential power relations among participants may still enable researcher concerns and interests to dominate how understandings are constituted. This can happen even within relations constructed as symmetrical, if the research outcome remains one determined solely by the researcher. The narratives in this thesis demonstrate that where attempts at developing symmetrical dialogue move beyond efforts to gather 'data', and move towards toward mutual, symmetrical, dialogic construction of meaning, within appropriate culturally constituted contexts, then the voice and agency of the research participants is heard.

The narratives demonstrate also how the researchers know when such a situation exists. Traditional conceptualisations of knowing do not adequately explain this understanding. Elbow (1986, in Connelly and Clandinin, 1990) identifies a different form of reciprocity, one he terms 'connected knowing' where the "knower is attached to the known" (p. 4). In other words, where there is common understanding and a common basis for such an understanding. Hogan (1988, in Connelly and Clandenin, 1990) refers
to this as a "feeling of connectedness". Heshusius (1994) takes this notion a step further by addressing the context within which knowing can exist by suggesting the concept of "participatory consciousness". This addresses a reordering of the relationship between self and other (p. 15), "and indeed between self and the world, in a manner where such a reordering, not only includes connectedness, but necessitates letting go of the focus on self" (p. 15).

Heshusius (1994), identifies this form of knowing as that which Polyani (1966, p.4) calls "tacit learning", Harman (1988, p. 15) calls "compassionate consciousness", and Berman (1981; 1990) calls "somatic" or "bodily" knowing. Each of these authors is referring to a non-accountable, non-describable way of knowing. Heshusius (1994) suggests that "the act of coming to know is not a subjectivity that one can explicitly account for" but rather it is of a "direct participatory nature one cannot account for". She identifies the ground from which participatory knowing (which she terms a pervasive affirmative quality) emerges as "the recognition of the deeper kinship between ourselves and other" (p. 17).

This notion of knowing within a participatory context-driven domain characterises the concepts of connectedness, engagement and participatory consciousness. Such a domain speaks in a very real sense to Maori contexts, for the Maori term for connectedness and engagement, whanaungatanga, is one of the most fundamental concepts within Maori culture, both as a value and as a social process. Whanaungatanga consists literally of kin relationships between ourselves and others, and is constituted in ways determined by the Maori cultural context. A key element however, is that it is not just a matter of kin connectedness and task engagement but it is also a matter of there being a focus on the group rather than on the self. This cultural value is so important that it is suggested there needs to be recognition of the cultural dimension within these concepts of connectedness, engagement and participatory consciousness. In Bishop and Glynn (1992a), the term "cultural competency" was suggested following Banks (1988). However, because this term has limitations in a political sense, in that it need not promote power sharing (as discussed in chapter 2), it therefore has limitations in terms of knowing in a participatory sense. For example, in order to know what is happening within a particular Maori cultural event or context, the participant not only needs to be able to participate in culturally competent terms, but also needs to be able to participate in cultural practices in the ways that others use to construct meaning, in other words, the participant needs to know the culture. Therefore, just as 'cultural competency' in a non-power sharing position may be problematic, not knowing how cultural participants construct meaning of their world is also highly problematic. A non-culturally conscious position may serve to perpetuate researcher imposition of their concerns, interests, methodologies and ways of knowing by denying the validity of the ways of knowing of the other research participants.
Because of these considerations, a new term, *cultural consciousness*, which is a development of the concepts that address 'positional consciousness, is suggested. This term attempts to speak to the conditions necessary for a participatory, connected type of positioning for researchers within culturally constructed and socially responsive contexts. Cultural consciousness speaks to the interconnected matrix of concepts and conditions within which the researchers participated in the studies discussed in this thesis. Cultural consciousness is a way of knowing that results from a position taken in reference to the matrix of cultural aspirations, preferences and practices that constitute a Maori world-view.

**Distance**

Heshusius (1994) cites Berman (1981, p. 23) who suggested that "before the scientific revolution (and presumably the enlightenment) the act of knowing had always been understood as a form of participation and enchantment". Berman's idea is that "for most of human history, man (sic) saw himself as an integral part of it". The very act of participation was knowing. Participation was direct, somatic, (bodily) psychic, spiritual and emotional involvement. "The belief that one can actually distance oneself, and then regulate that distance in order to come to know ... has ... left us alienated from each other, from nature and from ourselves" (p. 16).

Distance between researcher and researched as a measure of empowerment is of much concern to post-positivist researchers. The operational question for Troyna (1992) for example, becomes that of finding ways to reduce the power and control differentials between researcher and researched. Acker, Barry and Esseveld (1991) claim that this is impossible. Stacey (1991) warns that it is not just a matter of choosing correct or preferred methods, for example ethnography. Indeed, Stacey (1991) suggests that on reflection, she has realised that the "greater the intimacy - the greater the apparent mutuality of the researcher/researched relationship - the greater is the danger "(p. 114). In other words, simply orientating the research to address the notion of distance, or 'decreasing distance', may still mask the real power dichotomy between researcher and researched.

Further, Heshusius (1994) offers a different way of understanding the nature of participation that goes beyond the preoccupation of traditional researchers with objectivity and the qualitative rejoinder of subjectivity. Both of these notions focus on the concept of distance. She suggests that managing subjectivity is just as problematic for qualitative researchers as managing objectivity is for the positivists. The problem is epistemic in that the development of objectivity, through borrowing methodology from the natural sciences, introduced the concept of distance into the research relationship. Heshusius argues that the displacement of 'objective positivism' by qualitative concerns about subjectivity perpetuates the fundamental notion that knowing is possible through...
constructing and regulating distance, that is, that the knower is separate from the
known. Heshusius suggests that the preoccupation with 'managing subjectivity' is a
"subtle form of empiricist thought" (p. 16) in that it assumes that if one can know
subjectivity then one can control it. Intellectualising "the other's impact on self"
perpetuates the notion of distance, validates the notion of 'false consciousness' in others
and reduces the self-other relationship to one that is mechanistic and methodological.

The narratives in the present thesis suggest, as do Connelly and Clandinin
(1990) and Heshusius (1994), that 'distance', 'detachment' and 'separation' do not
characterise these research relationships in any way. Rather, the narratives insist that the
focus on 'self' is blurred and the focus turns to "a way of knowing that involves a
process of self-insertion in the other's story as a way of coming to know the other's story
and as giving the other voice" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 4). In an operational
sense, the narratives reveal that crucial to these researcher positionings is that the
researchers are setting aside the agonistic epistemological and methodological concerns
that researchers spend much time on. Instead, researchers in these narratives are
participating in addressing the concerns and issues of the participants, in ways that are
understandable and able to be controlled by the research participants.

Such practices stand in contrast to those of researchers who escape into
objectivism, "that pathology of cognition that entails silence about the speaker, about
(their) interests and (their) desires, and how these are socially situated and structurally
maintained" (Gouldner, 1976, in Tripp, 1983). Such agonistic positionings ignore the
need to attain an awareness of connectedness. They persist in developing detachment,
remain concerned to address 'meaningful' epistemological and methodological questions
of their own choosing, rather than those questions that Heshusius (1994) suggests would
address moral issues, such as "what kind of society do we have or are we constructing?"
(p. 20) or, as in this thesis, questions of who will benefit from the research project?

The examples of Kaupapa Maori research in the narratives are oriented toward
addressing these latter issues. They ask questions in terms of the benefits of the research
process. Two critical questions are; How can political, social and economic
marginalisation, caused by colonisation, be addressed unless those who perpetuate it
become aware through a participatory cultural consciousness of the lived reality of
those who suffer? How can researchers become aware of the meaning of racism if they
perpetuate an artificial 'distance' and objectify the 'subject,' by dealing with issues in a
manner that is of interest to the researcher, rather than of concern to the subject? Each
of these questions is concerned with the notion of empowerment. Kaupapa Maori also
addresses notions of empowerment in research and as was suggested in chapter two, the
key to empowerment is not the imposition of a concern for 'emancipatory' research, but
is rather positioning oneself in such a way that moral issues as defined by the
participants are addressed by all participants. Such positioning by the researchers will

more likely result in outcomes which will address the needs of all the research participants and not just the needs of the researchers or indeed the needs of the researched. Research positioned within Western concerns and constructs typically establishes an artificial distinction between the researcher and the researched. This can lead to 'evangelical' research replacing 'positivistic' research, rather than research being positioned within the world-view of the research community, for the benefit of the research community.

**Whanaungatanga explored**

Whanau is a primary concept (a cultural preference) that underlies these narratives of Kaupapa Maori research practice. This concept contains both values (cultural aspirations) and social processes (cultural practices). The root word of whanau literally means family in its broad 'extended' sense. However the word 'whanau' is increasingly being used in a metaphoric sense (Metge, 1990a). This generic concept of whanau subsumes other related concepts; whanaunga (relatives), whanaungatanga (relationships), whakawhanaungatanga (the process of establishing relationships) and whakapapa (literally, the means of establishing relationships). The term whanau, which is constantly used in the narratives, is as Metge (1990a) explains, a term that Maori people can, and do, apply to a variety of categories and groups.

The first use of the term is a cognatic descent category of limited depth (that is all people descended from a known ancestor), through both male and female lines regardless of where they are living or the quality of their interaction. For example, the whanau of Irihapeti Hahau, the ancestor of the Mackay/Joyce family, the focus of my family study, now numbers over 6,500 known descendants.

A second use of the term whanau is in reference to a set of siblings exclusive of their parents. Best (1924a, p. 343 in Metge, 1990a) noted this use among fluent native speakers. It is not commonly used now. What is commonly used is the meaning of whanau as applied to those members of a cognatic descent group of limited depth who participate in an ongoing but occasional basis in activities of a corporate nature; land, marae, knowledge. They will usually identify themselves as members of a whanau bearing the name of the founding ancestor. Membership is flexible and the collectivity can survive membership change. For example, in order to facilitate the reunion of the descendants of Irihapeti Hahau, a family reunion committee/whanau was constituted from within the wider family. Similarly, when engaging in the research about the family of Irihapeti Hahau, I became a member of the historians' group, another 'whanau'.

Another common use of the term whanau is to refer to an extended family group consisting of a married couple of kaumatua status and their children and spouses and children. This is a collection of individuals and nuclear families, distributed over
several households, yet focussing on the kaumatua and their home for group activities, for example Christmas and marriages.

Metge (1990a) types these above as standard uses of the term whanau, which are regarded as 'tuku iho noo nga tipuna' and were commonly used between the 1950s and the 1980s. These different uses of whanau vary as to relative importance. For example, there is often debate as to whether the term whanau includes spouses.

Nowadays, the term whanau is used more widely. It can cover a 'kin cluster', a group of kin who regularly co-operate for common ends and accept a variety of kin or quasi-kin limits as the basis for recruitment. Metge explains that this type of whanau has developed as a response to the disruption of life usually found as a response to migration. Often a kaumatua couple living in a city will form the nucleus for all kin-related people to gather round.

Whanau is sometimes used in an 'elastic band' manner, that is, the term gets used to incorporate all those present at an event who may be remotely blood connected. It can also be used to designate an action group of kinsfolk recruited from the kin universe of a particular person to support him or her in a crisis or in a critical incident in their life such as a job interview, taking up a new appointment or making a court appearance.

However, above all, the most rapid growth in the application of the term whanau has been in the metaphorical use of the term to refer to collectives of people working for a common end, who are not connected by kinship, let alone descent. Examples include:
   a) Whanau system in schools. 250 students from form 3-7 work within a self-contained unit within a school. In order to develop a 'family atmosphere', mixed age and ability groups are established and these groups, or whanau, attempt to develop 'whanau features'; shared teaching, close, personalised interactions, flexibility, self-directed and co-operative learning, integration of studies.
   b) The Kohanga Reo movement early in its inception adopted the term 'whanau' for the collectivity of children and adults associated with and participating in Kohanga Reo. In rural areas blood ties may be significant but in the urban context, "kohanga reo whanau typically comprise members from a variety of backgrounds, Maori and Pakeha" (Metge, 1990a, p. 94).

Following on from Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori have developed the whanau approach to refer to Maori preferred approaches to institutional development.
   c) In the urban context, as an identifying locative for people associated, not with an area, but with a common reference point, e.g., Te whanau o Te Herenga Waka o Victoria University of Wellington, Te whanau o Ako Pai, at Wellington College of Education.
   d) Sports teams and clubs often refer to themselves as whanau, and support engendered in these activities as indicative of whanau support.
These metaphoric whanau attempt to develop relationships and organisations based on similar principles to those which order a traditional whanau. Metge (1990a) explains that to use the term is to identify a series of rights and responsibilities, commitments and obligations, and supports that are fundamental to the collectivity. These are the tikanga of the whanau: warm interpersonal interactions, group solidarity, shared responsibility for one another, cheerful co-operation for group ends, corporate responsibility for group property, material or non-material (e.g. knowledge) items and issues. These attributes can be summed up in the words aroha (love in the broadest sense), awhi (helpfulness), manaaki (hospitality), tiaki (guidance).

The whanau is a location for communication, for sharing outcomes and for constructing shared common understandings and meanings. Individuals have responsibilities to care for and to nurture other members of the group, while still adhering to the kaupapa of the group. The group will operate to avoid singling out particular individuals for comment and attention, and to avoid embarrassing individuals who are not yet succeeding within the group. Group products and achievement frequently take the form of group performances, not individual performances. (This poses major challenges for assessment, for example in tertiary education settings.) The group will typically begin and end each session with prayer, and will also typically share food together. The group will always make major decisions as a group and then refer those decisions to kaumatua for approval, and will seek to operate with the support and encouragement of kaumatua. This feature acknowledges the multi-generational composition of a whanau with associated hierarchically determined rights, responsibilities and obligations.

The structure and function of a whanau are used in the narratives in this thesis, to describe and explain the relationship among research participants; (in traditional research terminology, between the researcher and the researched). The narratives indicate that the research could not proceed unless whanau support was obtained, kaumatua provided guidance and unless there was aroha between the participants. The narratives indicated also that there was an overriding feeling of tolerance, hospitality and respect for others, their ideas and their opinions. The research process was participatory, which in this thesis is further focussed and termed participant-driven because it was the concerns, interests and preferences of the whanau that guided and drove the research processes. The initiation of the research itself was participatory in terms of setting the research questions, the design of the work, undertaking the work that had to be done, the distribution of rewards, the access to research findings, accountability, and the control over the distribution of the knowledge.

In each of the narratives, the research participants developed a working research whanau that were in Metge's terms either literal whanau or metaphoric whanau. These whanau researched and functioned according to whanau principles and practices and
worked toward a common interest. To describe these research groups the concept of a *whanau of interest* is suggested. This operational concept of 'whanau of interest' is a socially responsive context for learning (Glynn, 1985; 1987), where the key to the researcher learning about the preferred mechanisms, aspirations and problem solving procedures of Maori culture is through participation in the form described as cultural consciousness. Researcher participation is used here not in the sense of the method of participant observation, as used in agonistic ethnography, nor in the sense of feminist 'collective' participation, but rather in the sense of being positioned within the preferred cultural mechanisms of Maori culture.

**Whakawhanaungatanga: the culturally constituted metaphor for establishing and maintaining relationships**

Whanau means family, or metaphorically, a connected, committed and culturally conscious, and culturally positioned group, constituted by a common interest or goal, hence, the new term 'whanau of interest'. Whanaunga are relatives/relations with whom one has an inextricable, bodily link. *Whakapapa* is the mechanism used by Maori people to establish familial relationships, with whom one has these inescapable, bodily links. *Whanaungatanga* literally means relationship by whakapapa, that is blood-linked relationships (The suffix 'tanga' has a naming function.).

*Whakawhanaungatanga* is the process of establishing relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness, and therefore (unspoken) commitment to other people. For example, a mihimihi at a hui involves stating your own whakapapa in order to establish relationships with the hosts/others/visitors. A mihimihi does not identify you in terms of your work, your academic rank or title (for example). Rather, a mihimihi is a statement of where you are from, and how you can be related to these other people, past and present.

For Maori people, the process of whakawhanaungatanga identifies how our identity comes from our whakapapa and how our whakapapa and its associated raranga korero (stories) link us to all other living and inanimate creatures and to the very earth we inhabit. Identity is part of us. Our mountain, our river, our island are us. We are part of them and they are part of us. We know this in a bodily way, more than in a recitation of names. More than in the actual linking of names, we know it because we are blood, bodily related. We are of the same bones (iwi), of the same people (iwi). We are from the same pregnancies (hapu), and are of the same sub-tribe (hapu). We are of the same family (whanau), the family into which we were born (whanau). We were nurtured by the same land (whenua), by the same placenta (whenua). In this way the language reminds us that we are part of each other. So when we introduce ourselves as whanaunga, we are introducing part of one to another part of the same oneness.
Therefore, rediscovery of a family is more than just a genealogical exercise. Knowing who we are is a somatic quest for connectedness with our surroundings. It would be very difficult to study Maori kinship in a 'non-somatic' distanced manner. To invoke 'distance' in a Maori kinship research project is to deny that it is a Maori kinship project. It would have different goals, not Maori goals.

The process of colonisation removed us from understanding this fundamental principle of life; that we do not objectify nature, nor do we subjectify nature either (after Heshusius, 1994, p. 17), for as we learn our whakapapa, we learn of our total integration, connectedness and commitment to the world and the need to let go of the focus on self. We also learn that there is another way of knowing, different from that which was taught those of us colonised into the western way of thought. We learnt about a way that is born of time, connectedness, commitment and participation. My family study, as outlined in chapter two, taught me of the value and pervasiveness of this form of knowing. This form of knowing is found also in the experiences of the other researchers in the narratives in this thesis.

The narratives demonstrate that the process of establishing relationships, whakawhanaungatanga, a process predicated on the establishment of interconnectedness, commitment and engagement, within culturally constituted research practices, is the constitutive metaphor within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Maori research. This metaphor reorders the relationship of the researcher from one which focusses on researcher as 'self', and on the researched as 'other', to one of collaborative research participants. In other words, as a research process, whakawhanaungatanga uses Maori cultural practices to set the pattern for research. Whakawhanaungatanga as a research process uses methods and principles similar to those used to establish relationships among Maori people. These principles are invoked to address the means of research initiation, the establishment of the research questions, to facilitate participation in the work of the project, to address issues of representation and accountability, and to legitimate the ownership of knowledge defined and created.

**Representation**

The notion of whakawhanaungatanga as a research metaphor also addresses contemporary concerns about representation. Representation questions what it is that constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality, and what it is that constitutes notions of 'self' and 'other'. This thesis has examined how researchers reposition themselves in the research process in order to stop trying to give voice to others, to empower others, to emancipate others, but rather to listen and to participate with those traditionally 'othered' as constructors of meanings of their own experiences and agents of knowledge.

This thesis speaks to the colonial and neocolonial discourses that inscribe 'otherness'. Much quantitative research has dismissed, marginalised or maintained
control over the voice of others by insistence on the imposition of researcher-determined positivist evaluatory criteria; internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity. Further, much qualitative research has maintained a colonising discourse of the 'other' by seeking to hide the researcher/writer under a veil of neutrality or of objectivity, a situation where the interests, concerns, and power of the researcher to determine the outcome of the research remains hidden in the text. Such qualitative research has been identified by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) as post-positivist and constructivist. Examples include Patton's (1990) concern for neutrality, and Strauss and Corbin's (1994) development of Glaser and Strauss's (1967) 'grounded theory' approach.

This thesis has sought to examine the self/other relationship by examining how researchers shift themselves from a 'speaking for' position to a situation Michelle Fine (1994) describes as obtaining "when we construct texts collaboratively, self-consciously examining our relations with/for/despite those who have been contained as Others, we move against, we enable resistance to, Othering" (p. 74). This thesis has sought to follow Fine (1994) who attempts to "unravel, critically, the blurred boundaries in our relation, and in our texts; to understand the political work of our narratives; to decipher how the traditions of social science serve to inscribe; and to imagine how our practice can be transformed to resist, self-consciously, acts of othering" (p. 57).

Heshusius (1994) addresses this issue by choosing to use the term 'selfother' as coined by Berman. While this term challenges the dominance of Cartesian dualism, it offers an understanding of the concept of participatory consciousness as meaning to be and to know, in terms of how we understand our consciousness.

Such understandings speak to the participants in the Kaupapa Maori research matrix that constitutes this thesis. For these participants in research, objectivity is impossible and further, it is a denial of identity. Just as identity to Maori people is tied up with being part of a whanau, a hapu, an iwi, in the research relationship, membership of a metaphoric whanau of interest also provides its members with identity and hence the ability to participate. For Maori researchers to stand aside from involvement in such socio-political organisation is to stand aside from one's identity. This would signal the ultimate victory of colonisation. To the non-Maori researchers in this thesis, denial of membership of the research whanau of interest is similarly to be denied means of identification and hence full participation within the projects. For non-Maori researchers to stand aside from participation in these terms is to further promote colonisation. Shifting one's position within the Western dominated research domain in the form described as paradigm shifting need not address questions of interest to Maori people, because paradigm shifting is really a concern from another world-view. Non-Maori researchers in this thesis sought inclusion on Maori terms, in terms of kin/metaphoric kin relationships and obligations, that is, within Maori constituted
practices and control mechanisms in order to establish their identity within the research projects.

**Whakawhanaungatanga as a research process**

There are three major interconnected implications of whakawhanaungatanga as a research strategy:

a) **Relationships among research participants.** Establishing and maintaining relationships is a fundamental, often extensive and ongoing part of the research process. Researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in the research process; that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually and not just as a 'researcher' concerned with methodology. Such positionings are demonstrated in the language/metaphor used by the researchers in their stories described in this thesis.

b) **Researcher involvement.** Researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in the research process; that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually and not just as a 'researcher' concerned with methodology. Such positionings are demonstrated in the language/metaphor used by the researchers in their stories described in this thesis.

c) **Addressing power and control issues through participant-driven research.** Establishing relationships addresses the power and control issues fundamental to research, because it involves participatory research practices, in this context, termed 'participant-driven research'.

a. **Relationships among research participants**

Establishing and maintaining relationships within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori, is an integral and ongoing constitutive element of the research process. Establishing a research group, a whanau of interest, is one form of embodying the process of whakawhanaungatanga.

In my family study (Bishop, 1991a), a whanau of interest of about ten to fifteen people was established from within the wider family. This whanau comprised those who were already 'interested' in pursuing the family story, notably the 'established' family historians.

Ted Glynn discovered that the process of establishing the whanau of interest commenced with the laying down of a koha at Poho Rawiri marae and the picking up of this koha by Kathryn Atvars from Tauranga. The expansion of this whanau of interest followed Maori culturally appropriate practices.

Huata Holmes explained that the means of approaching the schools for his study elicited an interest group at first, but what turned it into a whanau of interest was Huata's insistence on working in a Maori way for the benefit of the Maori children. The development of his second project provided a way in which all the interested parties could begin to work toward meeting these needs, drawing on Huata's expertise as a tohunga.

Monty Montgomery and Marie Joyce explained that establishing relationships in their work on the Otago Maori Plan project was long-term. It consisted of the two
initiators establishing themselves within the region as people worth listening to. Following this, the runanga took up the challenge and formed the kernal working group, which then proceeded to gather members by means of hui.

This pattern was also followed by Alva Kapa. In both the projects she was involved in, there was a spiral growth of these whanau of interest which were able to address systemic change while also addressing the specific kaupapa of each group.

Establishing relationships within a whanau of interest by using whanau processes within Maori cultural practices addresses the concerns about initiation, representation, legitimation, accountability, ownership of knowledge and benefits of the projects. This is achieved by the very constitution of the whanau, and because of the control mechanisms that are extant in the whanau.

What non-Maori people would refer to as control mechanisms are traditionally constituted in a whanau as taonga tuku iho, and consist of different individuals taking on differing positionings within the collective. These positionings fulfill different functions oriented towards the collaborative concerns, interests and benefits of the whanau as a group, rather than towards the benefit of any one member. Such positionings are constituted in ways that are generated by Maori cultural practices. For example, the leader of a whanau of interest will not necessarily be the researcher. Kaumatua, which is a Maori defined and apportioned position, will be the leaders. However, leadership in a whanau of interest is not in the sense of making all the decisions, but in the sense of being a guide to culturally appropriate procedures and a listener to the voices of all members of the whanau. The kaumatua are the consensus seekers from the collective and producers of the collaborative voice of the members. It is by developing research within such Maori culturally constituted practices that concerns of enabling voice/agency to be heard can be addressed.

This emphasis on positionings within a group constituted as a whanau addresses concerns about accountability and control. In a Maori collective whanau there are a variety of hierarchically determined positions, some of which are open to the researcher, some of which are not. The extent to which researchers can position themselves within a whanau of interest is therefore tied very closely to who they are, often more so than what they are. Therefore, it is important to emphasise that positioning is not simply a matter of researchers' choice, because this could again become researcher imposition. That is, the researchers are not free to assume any position that they think the whanau of interest needs in order for it to function. The researchers' choice of positions are proscribed by the structure of the whanau and the control mechanisms constituted within the whanau. This very fundamental understanding is clearly evident in the narratives where the researchers take positions within the various whanau of interest that have as much to do with who they are as with what they are.
For example, Marie Joyce drew attention to the role that she and Monty Montgomery played within the project as being of a teina to the tuakana role of the researched. Ted Glynn in the TTT whanau described his role in terms of being teina within the working group. In my whanau project, my role was that of a teina, partly as a function of age, being as I am the potiki (the youngest child of the youngest child) of that third generation from Peti, but also because I was in that questioning relationship with other people. I was desirous of the knowledge they had, and wished it to be shared with me. Huata Holmes on the other hand did not so obviously fit into the teina role because his role is that of tuakana. He selected his teina to be taught the knowledge. Never-the-less, he is still teina to his tupuna.

This experience is found in other situations in other countries.

Ethnography allows for the negotiation of cross-cultural realities between the sensitive interviewer and the interested eo-investigator. While there are clearly limits to this analogy, the behaviour of the trained ethnographer, watching and listening to learn, replicates the traditional role of learner in many First Nation cultures. Simultaneously, in this border world non-Natives feel the ever-present tension between being useful and being undesirable. (Haig-Brown, 1992, p. 97)

Such understandings exhibited by the researchers in the present research illustrated that they were involved 'somatically or bodily' in the research process. This involvement was consistent with who they are, and with their ability to participate in Maori cultural practices in culturally conscious ways.

One concern with the operational functioning of a whanau of interest is that it may be seen as a limiting and controlling institution on the behaviour of the individual. Can the individual exist as a member of the collective and have individual freedom as well? Are the actions of the members of a whanau of interest so prescribed as to proscribe individual action? What is the relationship of the individual to the collective when working within a whanau of interest research model? Does the individual (researcher or researched?) have the opportunity, once constituted as part of a whanau of interest, to participate in critical discourse that will continually question the conversational and textual practices being undertaken by the group?

The question is not then whether individuals can be said in any absolute sense to have or not to have agency, but whether or not there is an awareness of the constitutive force of discursive practices and the means of resisting or changing unacceptable practices. It also depends on whether there is a choice amongst discursive practices and whether amongst these
are practices which provide the possibility of that individual positioning themselves as agent—as one who chooses and carries through the chosen line of action. Further the taking up of agentic lines of action depends on whether or not the individual person has available to them the knowledge resources to recognise the choices that are available and to carry through the line of action chosen. (Davies, 1990, p. 359)

The stories that the researchers tell in this thesis demonstrate how they have located themselves within new 'story-lines' that address the contradictory nature of the traditional researcher/researched relationship. The language used by the researchers contains the key to the new story-lines; the metaphor and imagery are those located within the research participant's domain and the researchers either were or have moved to become part of this domain. The researchers have positioned themselves by the use of contextually constituted metaphor within the domain where others can constitute themselves as agentic. Within this domain there are discursive practices which provide the researchers with positions that enable them to carry through their negotiated lines of action.

b) Researcher involvement

Within whakawhanaungatanga as a research process, researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically; that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually, and not just as a 'researcher' concerned with gaining knowledge and with knowing through the intellect only. Reflections on my own participation in the collaborative construction of the narratives in this thesis is illustrative of somatic connectedness within the research process termed whakawhanaungatanga. Involvement between myself and the co-joint narrative constructors consisted of the following:

1. We were part of a group with an agreed-to agenda (kaupapa). In this case we were all members of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua, which was in turn representative of researchers and others; educators, activists, social workers and politicians. All of this wider group were working for political, social and economic decolonisation within the wider ethnic revitalisation of Maori people within Aotearoa/New Zealand. The agenda of this movement is the promotion of self-determination (relative autonomy) for Maori people through a process of power sharing based on the promises, guarantees and spiritually covenantal agreements of the Treaty of Waitangi.

2. We were engaged in/participated in the research project(s) under consideration. I was involved in the work of the project. In the projects under consideration in this thesis, I undertook many different work positions; family member, consultant, participant, supervisor, financial organiser, an education service provider, informant and supporter. This participation facilitated my being a 'known face' to the
other participants in the research projects. Where appropriate, I participated in powhiri, mihimihī and whitiwhiti korero.

3. We were involved in 'interviews as chat' as co-participants on an ongoing basis. This condition removed the danger of interview research being parasitic and helped orientate the research toward the goals established by the research group rather than that of the researcher.

4. We participated in constructing narratives by means of sequential, in-depth, 'conversational' interviews within the context established by the other three criteria above.

The 'reality' of such criteria for establishing collaborative research in this meta-analysis can be made 'known' to the researcher when a different researcher/project is considered. Can my involvement be operationalised in another context? An example may illustrate such knowing. Keith Ballard is also a member of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. He has been, and still is, currently involved in participatory collaborative research with Māori people in Dunedin and in the Bay of Plenty. In reference to the conditions above, we are both part of the group with the agreed-to-agenda, that is Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua. We have spoken about these projects often, but we have not been able to participate in 'interviews as chat' about the projects, nor have we participated in creating co-structured stories because I am not a participant in the research projects that he is involved with. I have not been to the other people's marae. I have not been through a literal powhiri or any metaphoric form of this ritual of introduction, eaten with the other participants or spoken with them about my position in the project. Participation in some form of ritual of encounter, involving acknowledging and respecting the tapu of the other people, is crucial in a Māori context. Such concepts are guides to appropriate behaviour and also set minimum standards of acceptability and participation. Therefore I know that I have no position within Keith's project. I am not a participant. I could have been, but timing was against me and I needed to have been involved with the project if I was to be able to participate with Keith in narrative construction. This position locates the power of definition of access with the research participants and addresses the concept of somatically knowing when participation is acceptable.

Although able to identify criteria that describe how I knew and was able to fully engage in narrative construction with the researchers, this ability to know is not as quantifiable, or as measurable a commodity as it might seem from this discussion. It is knowing in the sense as described by Berman (in Heshusius, 1994) as 'somatic' or 'bodily' knowing. Perhaps it could be described in terms of the concept of 'cultural consciousness' as 'cultural knowing'. Understanding of the context within which the projects exists alerts the participant to the conditions under which participation can take place.
Such somatic understandings are often spoken about by Maori people at hui, and have become available to a wider audience through Maori authors like Rangihau (1975), McCudden (1990) and Pere (1982, 1988, 1991, 1994). Pere's exposition of 'te Wheke' as an interlocking matrix of culturally constituted concepts addresses the visible and invisible elements of a Tuhoe Potiki world-view. Te Wheke reveals what constitutes knowing within such a culturally conscious position. For example, Rose Pere (1994) speaks about the concept of pumanawa, which to her means the natural way of knowing.

The positionings of the other researchers

Most of the projects discussed in the narratives address the educational crisis facing Maori people today, either within mainstream schools, or within the rapidly developing alternative Kaupapa Maori educational initiatives. Mainstream education is of great concern to the geographically dispersed Maori communities of Otago. It is felt that it is here that Maori must gain more control and where culturally preferred methods need to be implemented in order to realise Maori cultural aspirations. It is this location where improvements in Maori students' life styles (as guaranteed in Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi) and life chances' development (as guaranteed in Article Three of the Treaty) must take place. Holmes, Bishop and Glynn (1993) identified that while it may be a positive benefit that mainstream schools have concentrated on providing bicultural education for non-Maori pupils, and thus raised the status of Maori culture in the eyes of non-Maori people, mainstream schools have not addressed how to adequately meet Maori pupils' needs. Furthermore, this concentration on providing bicultural education for non-Maori has diverted scarce Maori teaching and community resources from meeting the more urgent language and cultural needs of Maori students.

Focus on this location also illustrates that non-Maori resources, and specifically non-Maori educational researchers, can become research participants, working to improve the achievement of Maori students within mainstream and Maori kaupapa institutions/schools. For example, in this thesis, non-Maori educational researchers contribute their knowledge and resources (e.g. research technology as well as personal strengths) to identify ways of modifying mainstream educational practices so that the achievement of Maori students is enhanced. Non-Maori educational researchers have worked on community wide projects to promote systemic change desired by both Maori and non-Maori in New Zealand.

Similarly, experiences of Maori researchers in this thesis speak of contributing their knowledge and understanding of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices to address the need for systemic change, cultural identification processes, decolonisation and ethnic revitalisation.
An examination of the language/metaphors used by the researchers in the construction of meaning in the narratives demonstrates researcher reflection on their somatic involvement in the research process. The narratives also demonstrate how such somatic positioning enables Kaupapa Maori concerns about initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability/control to be addressed from within Maori cultural contexts by Maori preferred practices.

The method of story telling and narrative construction was particularly suitable for such a meta-analysis for it facilitated participants being able to choose the language including the metaphors within which they tell their story and with which they describe their position within the development of Kaupapa Maori initiatives. The language chosen, and the concerns identified, indicates how they understood their positionings within the research process.

**Addressing research issues of concern to Maori**

All the researchers literally and figuratively addressed the central Maori aspirations affecting education of *Tino Rangatiratanga* (the principle of relative autonomy and control over Maori education) and were positioned in such as way to facilitate realisation of this aspiration. Such autonomy was clearly guaranteed to Maori people in the Treaty of Waitangi, the foundation document of nationhood in New Zealand. The Treaty as constituted attained its own intrinsic tapu, this being as Shirres (1982) explains, its potentiality for power. For example, Article Two of the Treaty guarantees Maori and their descendants the 'rangatiratanga', that is chiefly control, over their treasures (taonga). This chiefly control includes the power to define what is meant by treasures (Jackson, 1993). In the education sphere, Maori have maintained that the Maori language is such a treasure, and needs protection. The Waitangi Tribunal hearing into the Maori language validated this stance, again from within the framework of Maori culture (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 1986). Pakeha people (Renwick, 1986) have argued for the retention of Maori language because of its uniqueness to New Zealand, in relationship to the other minority languages in New Zealand. Maori people however, argue that Maori people need to regain the power to protect their own language, a power they had before the Treaty was signed, a power guaranteed by the Treaty, and a power abrogated by the hegemonic domination of colonialism. It is not an argument stating that others need to do something, it is an argument relocating power and control of self-determination within the cultural context of Maori people. As is demonstrated in Holmes, Bishop and Glynn (1993), this position is often misunderstood by non-Maori in mainstream school contexts. It is a value frequently cited by non-Maori, but one which has yet to be addressed at the level of management by school Boards of Trustees. It is a value yet to be considered at the level of selecting teaching strategies and curriculum materials and implementing curriculum which integrate, for example,
wairua, hinengaro and tinana, (a Maori preferred holistic pedagogy incorporating education of the spirit, the mind and the body, in a sense a somatic/holistic approach to pedagogy).

Revitalisation of *te reo Maori* is of paramount importance in Maori education. That this is not a priority in mainstream educational settings indicates that, despite the growth in goodwill toward Maori people symbolised by the sesquicentennial celebrations in 1990, disparity of objectives between Kaupapa Maori and Kaupapa Pakeha in New Zealand educational institutions remains. The prioritisation of *te reo* in all the projects in this thesis served to guide researchers in setting priorities for their own learning, for positioning themselves about priorities of a Kaupapa Maori agenda beyond their own research agendas. The emphasis on *te reo* also identifies how research, in the interests of Maori people, can address issues of power and control in such a way that we researchers can serve needs beyond our own narrow epistemological or methodological concerns. Such issues include those of a moral nature, addressing issues of vital importance to a people, and issues which concern the type of world being created by our actions.

The narratives in this thesis speak of understanding *mana whenua and mata waka* locational rights and responsibilities affecting research. Such voice involved understanding the iwi structure within Maori society and the desire for autonomy by iwi that is fundamental to tino rangatiratanga. This fundamentally different political structure that Maori prefer to work within has never been fully grasped by Pakeha since the Treaty (King, 1994; Ritchie, 1992). Clear lines of negotiation and of initiating, controlling and implementing educational research are identified in each case study in this thesis in reference to Maori preferred socio-political organisation and institutions.

Experiences also suggested that *nga mahi a nga tipuna/taonga tuku iho* is a central Maori value that is difficult to fully appreciate from a non-somatic, that is 'distanced', stance. It is not that it is difficult to understand intellectually that the aspirations and achievements of the ancestors are still driving the people today. It is not difficult to study in what ways the legacy of song, oratory, oral history and hospitality that Maori constantly resort to can establish educational priorities and goals. What is difficult is knowing that this is the right (tika) way to do things. Such understanding and knowledge only comes from participation within Maori decision making processes, from connectedness to the outcomes of the research, and from developing a different form of cultural consciousness. This form of cultural consciousness speaks of inseparability of the researcher into various forms of consciousness, and that speaks of a way of knowing that is consciously holistic, involving the whole person. This way of knowing is evident in the narratives of all the researchers in this thesis. This is a dramatically different world-view. The proof that it functions is found in the narratives
The validity of the process is found within the narratives and the legitimation of the process is in the eyes of Maori people involved in the projects.

The participant researchers in these studies demonstrated that to understand and participate in Maori perspectives on knowledge, as described and explained in Marsden (1975), Rangihau (1975), King (1978), Pere (1982) and Metge (1984), reflects a radical difference in values and world-views from agonistic perspectives. Maori do not necessarily pass on knowledge and information universally. Some knowledge and expertise belongs only to certain people. Knowledge is passed on personally and the specific social contexts of transmission are critical. Orally-acquired and transmitted knowledge, so frequently devalued and belittled by non-Maori educational researchers, is highly valued by Maori. Waiata and moteatea are valued not just for their entertainment value, but also because they are preferred means of transmitting culture and information. Knowledge is a taonga handed down as 'taonga tuku iho', that is, from the ancestors, and as such is tapu. Knowledge enhances such power, and is expressed in the form of personal power known as mana. How it is used is crucial. Again, reference to such a model as that proposed by Rose Pere is necessary if researchers are to understand the foundation principles of a Maori world-view.

To Maori people, knowledge gathering and processing is not just an epistemological nor a methodological issue to be debated by academics. It is an issue so fundamental to Maori society that there are existing and long standing, strong prohibitions and cultural benefits ascribed to the research processes of knowledge production and definition. Knowledge is powerful and is to be treasured and protected for the benefit of the group, and not for the individual. Knowledge is not just to enable the researcher to collect data and publish an account of the new knowledge. Rather, the gaining of new knowledge in a Maori context is in order that the lives of the participants may be enhanced by the actions of the researcher. In other words, there is a strong cultural preference for research to be conducted in a participatory manner, in a manner where the researcher is inextricably and consciously connected to the processes and outcomes of the research. This position is based upon the need to recognise the tapu of knowledge. Tapu, a generic, somatic concept, fundamental to Maori society, guided the researchers in this thesis in their endeavours.

The researchers also used Maori concepts figuratively in their narratives. They used the language and metaphor of the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori. This language, imagery, metaphor, allegory and allusions all indicate understanding of the concerns about research being located within Maori culturally preferred practices. This degree of understanding indicates the somatic positioning of the research participants. The next section specifically examines how the language used by the researchers further addressed the concerns about initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy, and accountability/control of the research projects/process.
Initiation

Initiation of the research projects discussed in the narratives was often described in terms of 'laying down a koha', or laying down a 'take'. For example, in his story, Huata Holmes tells of how he was approached by numerous schools to respond to their concerns about Taha Maori in schools. They laid out their take. He then engaged in a series of visits to lay out his take, and to ascertain the extent of the concerns. He then responded by working on a video/compendium of information and training package that directly spoke to their concerns. This will be offered as a koha to interested parties. Ted Glynn and his daughter Monnie Glynn offered the idea of TTT as a koha, laid down for those interested to pick up. Monty Montgomery and Marie Joyce laid out their concerns as take for others to participate in providing solutions. Alva Kapa laid out a take of concern for others in SES to consider, and her group of students laid down a take for other participants in the Southland College of Education to consider.

Both 'take' and 'koha' as literal phenomena are concepts usually associated with hui, formal Maori gatherings. The hui is a location where the tapu of the different people involved in the hui come together. Each group has its own tapu and the first recognition of this tapu is the first karanga of welcome. Similarly, the reciprocal karanga acknowledges the mana of the hosts. At this point the two parties, hosts and guests, are at their most distant. The visitors move in response to the karanga, acknowledging those who have gone before as they proceed to the appointed position as proscribed by the hosts. Once seated, but still apart, the parties participate in reciprocal whaikorero, which as a discourse is oriented at reinforcing the mana of one's own side and acknowledging that of the 'others'. During the speeches, it is usual for one of the speakers to 'lay down' a general topic or reason for the hui. It may be a very obvious topic such as a wedding, a 21st or a tangi, but it also may be a less obvious agenda the two sides have agreed to meet over.

The koha is a gift laid down at the hui, generally laid down by the last speaker of the visitors' side. In the past, this koha was often a gift of food to contribute to the running of the hui; however nowadays it is usually money. Nevertheless the koha today remains an important ritualised part of a ceremony that generally proceeds without too much trouble. However, what must not be forgotten is that the reception of the koha is up to the hosts.

In the metaphoric sense, then, koha as a gi't or an offering of assistance goes with the full mana of the group so offering. It is placed in such a position as to be able to be considered by the host. It is not often (except in some parts of Taranaki) given into the hands of the hosts. Whatever the specific details of the protocol, the process of 'laying down' is a very powerful recognition of the right of others to self-determination.
The koha generally precedes the final coming together of the two sides. The placing of the koha comes at a crucial stage in the ceremony, where the hosts can refuse to accept the mana of the visitors, where the hosts can display their ultimate control over events, where the hosts can choose whether they want to become one with the manuhiri by the process of the hongi and haruru. Symbolically, the hosts are taking on the koha and the kaupapa of the guests. Metaphorically, they are accepting that which the manuhiri are bringing for debate and mediation. But overall it is important that the kaupapa of the guests laid down at the hui is now the 'property' of the whole whanau. It is now the task of the whole whanau to deliberate the issues and to own the problems and concerns and ideas in a way that is real and meaningful, the way of whakakotahitanga (developing unity), where all will work for the betterment of the idea.

It is interesting to speculate about the difference in terminology in referring to laying down a koha or a take. It might seem that Pakeha researchers in the narratives tended to speak of laying down a koha and not a take, whereas the Maori researchers tended to 'lay down take'. Perhaps this might indicate an appropriate positioning for Maori and non-Maori researchers, where the former feel they are more a 'part of the picture' and able to move to the culturally inclusive action of laying down an idea to be discussed by other Maori people. Perhaps non-Maori should lay down ideas in such a way that Maori people can pick them up as and when they see fit in terms of Maori process of consideration. However, what does seem to be the pattern is that the closer the researcher is to the whanau of interest, the more likely they are to offer a take for discussion. Whereas, when they are not a member of the group, then it is more appropriate to offer the idea as a koha.

Nevertheless, the taking up of a take or a koha has a similar effect in recognising and facilitating self-determination of the hosts, for here is where the power lies. This is why it is culturally meaningful for the researcher to become part of the whanau rather than to be a consultant, for when the koha is accepted, the person's mana is 'picked up', with the idea. In this way the person's mana is acknowledged so that the person is then able to participate in the deliberations. In a way, to position a person solely as a consultant is to move outside of the Maori frame of reference and into a Pakeha frame of reference.

The idea of laying down a koha or a take addresses the notion of agency within a whanau of interest. Researchers have agency to facilitate the development in people of a sense of themselves as agentic and of having an authentic voice. However, this is not simply a result of the researcher 'allowing' this to happen. It is the function of the context within which the research participants position themselves, negotiate and conduct the research. The context positions the participants by constructing the story lines, and with them the metaphors and images, as well as the thinking as usual, the talk/language through which researcher and researched are constituted and
researcher/researched relationships are organised. This joint development of new story-lines is a collaborative effort to rewrite the constitutive metaphors of the relationship of researcher and researched. What makes it Maori is that it is done using Maori metaphor.

Representation

Another common metaphor used in the thesis narratives was that of weaving to describe the process of bringing together parts of a whole, the warp and the weft, to create a new form, to solve problems, to make sense of the world using language preferred by Maori people. For example, the use of the language of weaving addresses issues of representation where the means of conducting research is explainable in terms understood within Maori culturally constructed discursive practice. Representation was addressed in the voice understandable and preferred by the participants for meeting their own aspirations. Literally, to the weaver, the methods of weaving are the tikanga (customs). To the researcher the methods of research are those Maori tikanga of narrative; waiata, pakiwaitara, kauwhau, of hui, o' whitiwhiti korero (reciprocal dialogue/polylologue). To the weaver, the ideational framework behind the weaving is called the whakapapa (Barton, 1993). To the researcher, the whakapapa (methodological framework) behind the research project provides the orientation. To the researcher a whariki, or kupenga (net) (Irwin, 1992b, p. 13), is the model/paradigm within which educators and researchers are 'socialised', through which they move, within which they make sense of their experiences.

This weaving metaphor speaks to the manner in which the researchers work within the framework of Kaupapa Maori discursive practice. While whariki are constructed to a general pattern, the actual methods of construction vary from weaver to weaver, this variation creating the beauty and distinctive artistry of each artist. Similarly, in the narratives the researchers speak of the variety of methods they used to address Kaupapa Maori research goals.

The Maori metaphor of weaving is common in tauparapara and waiata. For example, "Tuia i runga, tuia i raro, tuia i te here tangata". The language many of the researchers used when discussing process included this holistic metaphor. Huata Holmes described the commonality of behaviour in terms of 'weaving' as a Maori preferred manner of conducting activities. He gave emphasis to the Maori temporal view, where the past is part of the present and of the future. Monty Montgomery and Marie Joyce described their approach as "bringing together the disparate threads". The process of weaving people together is one of the major constituents of whakawhanaungatanga, bringing together those who can help solve a problem rather than working within an exclusive group. The groups spoken of in the narratives all identified
that often it was other people outside of their immediate interest area who held the power to determine success or failure of their projects.

This analysis led to whakawhanaungatanga action by 'bringing on board' those people necessary to ensure the success of the project. In this sense the whanau of interest, as a dynamic group, is not complete until all those involved in the outcome are incorporated. This concept of 'spiral discourse' addresses the concerns raised by Robinson (1993) and Gibson (1985) about the exclusion of the powerful in attempts to effect systemic change and mechanisms of addressing systemic change beyond the primary interest group. Monty Montgomery, Marie Joyce and Alva Kapa used this process to gather a group of people who could affect change. Monty and Marie gathered local Maori people, education service providers, community groups, schools and Ministry of Education people together, and so developed a very powerful voice to speak with the policy makers in the central office of the Ministry of Education. Alva's group at the Southland campus of the Dunedin College of Education, and within the Special Education Service, moved out from their own interest groups to weave together a larger group of people oriented toward promoting systemic change. Ted Glynn described how his experiences of researching reading in the 1970s led him to realise that there were other levels that needed to be addressed in order to promote systemic change. The Maori metaphor used by Ted to describe the process of spiral discourse was "getting people on board the waka".

The waka is another potent metaphor of unity for Maori people. In one sense Maori people are politically divided into waka groups, this reflecting the arrival of Maori peoples into New Zealand. The waka is often mentioned in a person's mihi of introduction to people of another waka, or in a mihi of introduction to descendants of their own waka to ensure solidarity. When away from their own area, Maori people will often organise themselves into waka groups, e.g. Tainui ki Otepoti (Tainui descendants in Dunedin), Mataatua ki Otepoti, (descendants of Mataatua waka in Dunedin), Aotea waka (descendants of Aotea waka). In any context, Maori people will attempt to establish links of whanaungatanga to one another. The whanau is the most intimate, then hapu, iwi and waka in order of closeness of affiliation. No matter the distance, the attempt is still made to identify locational affiliations and solidarities.

The political solidarity of the waka symbol is also reflected in the feelings of togetherness that is developed by the notion of waka membership. Solidarity, support and aroha are to be extended to people of your own waka. As a metaphor in this sense, therefore, the waka is reinforcing the notions developed in the whanau, hapu and iwi concepts/contexts. Maori waiata, haka (action challenge), pakiwaitara, and Pukorero (orators) also constantly extoll the value of people 'paddling together for common benefit', of setting aside differences and 'climbing on board' the collective waka.
For example, the group of students that Alva Kapa was part of in Southland, soon realised that change would only come about if other people, outside of their immediate group, were 'brought on board the waka', or onto the kaupapa, or woven into the fabric of the whanau of interest. Two members of my own family project's whanau of interest, Emma Tonga and Paumea MacKay, when addressing the diaspora of our family, identified that to them the function of our research was to weave the members of the dispersed family back together. Most of the people spoken to chose as their way of explaining how they made sense of their experiences, some sort of reference to a process of bringing disparate or spread out phenomena together; whether it be physically people or problematic ideas or elements of a potential solution. Few referred to the practice of teasing apart the context to see the constitutive parts. Rather they concentrated on using holistic language. The emphasis was on 'bringing together' as compared to 'drawing out' or 'drawing apart' or 'teasing out' as in a reifying metaphor.

The concept of kawa/tikanga (literally protocol) was also commonly invoked as a metaphor for describing the correct conduct of the research process. This is a very powerful metaphor to Maori people. It is often said at hui, that if the kawa is right, then the hui will be right. Rose Pere (1991; 1994) addresses importance on correct kawa in beautiful astrological and naturalistic metaphors. For example, she talks of how the lining up of certain stars will herald peace. In other words, when the correct kawa is observed, and this is that which was laid down by those who have gone before, then so will the people find peace.

If the procedure is correct, then the project and the product will be correct. This has clear implications for researchers. For researchers working in a positivist paradigm or within a researcher-controlled qualitative project, the degree of control over the procedure will be determined by the concerns, interests and knowledge of research protocol located in the world-view of the researcher. In contrast, when researching in a collectivist realm, or when engaging in cross-cultural research, the researcher has to be flexible enough to ensure that the kawa is in fact that which is determined by the collectivity and is understandable by and suitable for the purposes determined by the participants. Despite contentions by qualitative researchers that their approach is flexible, experiential and phenomenological, qualitative methodologies per se are insufficient to avoid imposition of the researcher's agenda. For example, debates over whether to use a phenomenological approach (as in Taylor and Bogdan, 1984) versus a reflexive approach (as in Middleton, 1985), while in themselves necessary debates are nevertheless not sufficient to ensure that the researcher's agenda is not imposed across or within cultural borders. These inter- and intra-debates are conducted within monocultural parameters. They are still not oriented towards addressing cross-cultural research design and implementation issues.
c. Addressing power and control issues

This part of the discussion is an attempt to position whakawhanaungatanga as a participant-driven Kaupapa Maori approach to research. It also locates Kaupapa Maori research within contemporary international approaches to participatory research and considers the legitimacy/authority of a Kaupapa Maori stance in relation to contemporary positivist, post-positivist, post-modern and post-structural research concerns about legitimacy.5

Lather (1991) when addressing the need to engage research participants in 'maximal reciprocity', that is, the "involvement of research participants in the construction and validation of knowledge" (p. 60) noted that there are "at present few research designs which encourage negotiation of meaning beyond the descriptive level" (p. 59). This section of the discussion therefore addresses this key issue. What might constitute such a means of participation?

In the international literature, approaches that address this question are described as participatory or collaborative by Reinharz (1992), interaction methodology by Kleiber and Light (1978, as cited in Reinharz, 1992), feminist interviewing in Oakley (1981) and Polyphonic research by Bakhtin (as cited in Haig-Brown, 1992), and as used by Te Hennepe (1993).

In reference to the development of a methodology of participation and collaboration, Reinharz (1992) explains,

in participatory or collaborative research the people studied make decisions about the study format and data analysis. This model is designed to create social and individual change by altering the role relations of people involved in the project. The model can be limited to a slight modification of roles or expanded so that all participants have a combined researcher/subject role. In feminist participatory research the distinction between the researcher(s) and those on whom the research is done disappears. To achieve an egalitarian relation, the researcher abandons control and adopts an approach of openness, reciprocity, mutual disclosure and shared risk. Differences in social status and background give way as shared decision-making and self disclosure develops. (p. 181)

Reinharz (1992) in citing Cancian (1989) states that in order to promote egalitarian relations between 'researchers' and 'subjects', communal rather than hierarchical decision making processes were necessary, where
researchers work with the community members to resolve problems identified by the community, and the process of research is intended to empower participants... the three core features of participatory research are: 1) political action and individual consciousness raising... 2) relationships are democratic and participants share in making decisions and acquiring skills, 3) the everyday life experience and feelings of participants are a major source of knowledge. (p. 182)

Kleiber and Light (1978, cited in Stanley and Wise, 1983, in Reinharz, 1992) also conclude that in order to reduce the distance between 'researcher' and the 'researched' there was the need for

the sharing out of power, the ownership of information by everyone rather than just the researchers and the rejection of traditional interpretations of 'objectivity'... A consequence of the new role of the researched was that the primary results became interpreted for them. This research insists that the primary recipients and users of feminist research should be the people who are its subjects rather than the researchers. (p. 186)

Reinharz suggests that in participatory projects "the researcher invites members of the setting to join her in creating the study" (p. 184), that is, the traditional 'sampling' approach of gathering research informants by researcher controlled technologies of selection, are waived in preference for inclusion of all people who will be inextricably involved in the outcomes of the study. The notion of researcher control over 'informed consent' is also challenged (p. 182) by facilitating participants' control and accountability.

Lather's (1991) methodology involves interactive interviews as the most effective means of emancipatory action where researchers self-disclose, participate in multiple, sequential individual interviews and group interviews, negotiate interpretations of meaning, and deal with false consciousness in ways that go far beyond dismissing resistance (p. 185).

Haig-Brown (1992) suggests a methodological orientation that suggests a refinement of ethnography in order to

provide the opportunity for the sensitive interviewer and the interested co-investigator (study participant) to develop mutual understandings as they work together. Although not essential to conventional ethnography, participant involvement becomes possible at every stage in a carefully constructed study. From the framing of the research questions to the final
written report, the researcher has the opportunity to structure her working interactions with the other people participating in the study. (p. 105)

Haig-Brown (1992) quotes Clifford's (1988) reference to Bakhtin's term 'heteroglossia' which suggests a 'poly-phonic' ethnography where "ethnographic authority rises from several study participants having the opportunity to create and control the outcome of the study as well as the process of developing it" (p. 102). This stands in contrast to other types of ethnography that favour an 'interpretivist' approach where the task of the researcher as interpretivist ethnographer is to interpret 'cultures as text'. Clifford (in Haig-Brown, 1992) points out that in this agonistic approach, the other study participants disappear as the text is constructed (p. 101) and the 'voice' remaining is that of the researcher.

In the setting of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Ballard (1993; 1994b), has used Oliver's (1992) notion of "changing the social relations of research production" as the basis for participatory action research, and participatory 'research as stories' studies. These studies are aimed at promoting action from 'authentic voice/lived experience' analysis of educational policies and practice in the field of disability.

**Kaupapa Maori research as participatory**

In terms of this framework, Kaupapa Maori can be seen as participatory. Indeed the concept introduced in my family study (Bishop, 1991a), *participant-driven research*, is further developed in the narratives in this thesis, wherein a whanau of interest constituted by the process of research itself controlled the entire study. The studies discussed in this thesis were oriented at resolving problems either identified by the whanau members or were studies that spoke aloud the concerns that already existed within the interested communities. The studies were all oriented to alleviate problems of concern to the participants in terms of, and by means of, processes understood by and within their own control. The participants of the research, constituted as a 'whanau of interest', determined the research questions, the methods of research and, further, developed a collaborative approach to processing and constructing meaning/theorising about the information by culturally constituted means. In this manner, the issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability of research were addressed by the research process itself. This was achieved, not in the sense of the whanau of interest being an isolated group, but rather in terms of the whanau being constituted and conducted in terms of the cultural aspirations, preferences and practices within which the project was constituted.

The development of a whanau of interest by the process of *spiral discourse* conducted by means of invoking metaphorically the processes of whakawhanaungatanga, that is establishing relationships in a Maori culturally constituted
manner, describes how participants drove the research and how reference was constantly made to the kaupapa as defined in terms of the interests, concerns and methods of the research participants, rather than just those of the researcher. In addition, membership of these whanau of interest was inclusive of all people inextricably involved in the outcomes, whether they were positive or negative to the agenda, whether they were identified as 'powerful' or 'powerless'.

Participant-driven research challenges the traditional notion of the researcher as expert. It blurs the boundaries between 'researcher' and 'researched' and locates researchers in reference to their appropriate position within the collective. The position/s a person undertakes, or the identity of the person is more important than any assumed position gained from association with any non-Maori institution. The senior people in these various projects were not necessarily the researchers. Seniority was defined by the Maori context, not by the non-Maori rank. The latter issue challenges researchers in a Pakeha setting who typically take 'expert' positions as gatherers and provenders of knowledge.

In the experiences recounted here, Huata Holmes as Tohunga was inseparable from Huata as researcher. Alva's position was similarly inseparable from her identity as a mana whenua woman. Monty Montgomery and Marie Joyce and Ted Glynn took teina positions, offering their ideas as koha and offering to be part of structures that were iwi guided and controlled. This speaks of diversity of researcher positions as defined by the person. One implication of this understanding is that research into Maori contexts needs to be done within parameters set by Maori people, rather than within boundaries and guidelines established unilaterally by the research institution or the researcher. Besides the implications for ethical procedures, initiation strategies, research methods and means of representation and ownership of knowledge as addressed earlier, there are implications for legitimation, that is for the authority that the text so produced can claim.

**Legitimation/Authority**

There are dangers in attempting to construct a generalised methodology of participation by comparing Kaupapa Maori research experiences with the international literature. These dangers arise because of the strong agonistic tendency among researchers toward constructing quasi-positivistic, 'grand narratives' that address the need of the researcher to make sense of the research experience in reference to criteria outside of the experiences of the research participants. Such narratives constantly seek to develop a 'recipe' for research practice, and with such recipes comes the danger of outsiders controlling not only what constitutes reality for other people but what constitutes legitimacy/validity, that is what authority is claimed for the text. The attempt to locate Kaupapa Maori within the broad framework of international perspectives on
participatory research, indeed even to search for a methodology of participation, may defeat the very purpose of participatory research which is to reduce researcher imposition in order that research meets and works within and for the interests and concerns of the research participants.

Ballard (1994a) emphasises that for qualitative researchers each place, group of people and their development in time represents a context that may vary in one aspect or another. Variations, rather than causing problems for research design, may have "important implications for what people believe, how they behave and how they will implement and respond to change" (p. 301).

Therefore rather than asserting that a practice developed in one setting can be applied to another, a qualitative approach would involve introducing the practice to the group and then allowing them to develop their own understandings, interpretation, application and evaluation of the practice. Thus, change does not involve a prescription for practice but is a dynamic process in which resolution and the community engage in joint learning and problem solving. (Ballard, 1994a, p. 301)

Ballard (1994a) uses Donmoyer's (1990) work to suggest that formulaic research procedures are rarely in fact used as 'prescriptions for practice' because people use their own knowledge, experience, feelings and intuitions "when putting new ideas into practice or when working in new settings". Further, personal knowledge and personal experience can be seen as crucial in the application of new knowledge and/or working in new settings. This means that the application of research findings is most likely filtered through the prior knowledge, feelings and intuitions we already have. Donmeyer further suggests that experience compounds and this compounded knowledge/experience, when brought to a new task, provides an even more complex process of understandings to occur. Experience builds on and compounds experience and, as Ballard (1994a) suggests, this is why there is such value placed on 'colleagues with experience' in the Pakeha world and on kaumatua in the Maori world.

It is important, therefore that the presentation of participant-driven empowering research as developed within Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua be seen as one type of participatory research that comes within a broad spectrum of participatory research approaches, rather than being seen as an attempt to create a general method of participatory research. It may be preferable to restate the key question of this section to ask what would a spectrum of participatory methodologies look like or what constitutes a spectrum of participatory methodologies?

The second, and related, but somewhat more complex danger, is that by creating a methodology of participation there may be a tendency to construct a set of rules and
procedures that lie outside of any one research project, and, in so doing, control over what constitutes authority of the text will be removed from the participants. In that case it would seem important that a Kaupapa Maori stance does not stand alone but challenges what others claim as the authority of the text. For example it is essential to challenge modernist discourses, with their concomitant concerns regarding validity, including strategies such as insisting on objectivity/subjectivity, replicability and external measures for validity. These discourses are so pervasive that Maori researchers may automatically revert to using such means of establishing validity for their texts, but problematically so because these measures of validity are all positioned/defined within another world-view.

For example, as bell hooks (1993) suggests, the Black Power movement in the United States in the sixties was influenced by the modernist discourses on race, gender and class that were current at the time. As a result of not addressing these discourses and how they affected the condition of black folks, issues such as patriarchy were left un-addressed within the Black Liberation movement. bell hooks (1990) insists that unless Black folk address these issues themselves, others will do so for them, and in ways determined by the concerns and interests of others, rather than those that 'women of colour' would prefer. Donna Awatere (1981) and Kathie Irwin (1992a) are two Maori feminist scholars who have taken up this challenge in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in a way that has clearly delineated their stance as different from white feminisms. In operationalising Maori feminisms they have critiqued modernist issues from a Maori world-view in Maori ways.

Awatere (1981) critiqued white modernist feminisms for hegemonically voicing Maori feminist concerns as identical to their own. Kathie Irwin (1992a) in addressing the question that is vexatious to non-Maori modernist feminisms of 'why don't women speak on a marae', responds with another question "What do you mean by speaking?" and "Who is defining what speaking is?" She asserts that the validity of a text written about Maori women 'speaking' on a marae is understandable only in terms of the rules established within Maori cultural practices associated with marae protocols. In this she is not only addressing a Maori issue but is also addressing modernist feminists in post-structural terms of epistemological validity.

In other words, research conducted within what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) term as positivist and post-positivist frames of reference perpetuates problems of outsiders determining what is valid for Maori. This occurs by the very process of employing non-Maori methodological frameworks and conventions for writing about such research processes and outcomes. For example, Lincoln and Denzin (1994), identify that the terms such as "logical, construct, internal, ethnographic, and external validity, text-based data, triangulation, trustworthiness, credibility, grounding, naturalistic indicators, fit, coherence, comprehensiveness, plausibility, truth and relevance... (are) all attempts
to reauthorise a text's authority in the post-positivist moment." (p. 579) These concepts, and the methodological frameworks within which they exist, represent attempts to contextualise the grounding of a text in the external, empirical world. "They represent efforts to develop a set of transcendent rules and procedures that lie outside any specific research project" (p. 579). These externalised rules are the criteria by which the validity of a text are then judged.6

I suggest that a more appropriate approach, that is an approach that addresses control over text construction, would address questions about who defines what is accurate, true and complete in a text? Whose interests, needs and concerns are being met in the text? and Who determines what authority the text has? These questions identify methodological issues that need to be constantly addressed within participatory methodologies. They also identify legitimacies/validities that such an array of answers would generate from the spectrum of cultural contexts that are Maori today.

In this thesis I have suggested that Kaupapa Maori concerns about research can be addressed by referring to the ongoing conversation within post-structuralist frames of reference that reject outside control over what constitutes the text's call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Maori position therefore would promote an epistemological version of validity, one where the authority of the text is "established through recourse to a set of rules concerning knowledge, its production and representation" (Lincoln and Denzin, 1994. p. 578). In other words, Kaupapa Maori texts are epistemologically validated within a Maori cultural context. For example, research conducted within a Kaupapa Maori framework has rules established as taonga tuku iho and protected and maintained by the tapu of Maori cultural practices such as the multiplicity of rituals within the hui and within the central cultural processes of whanaungatanga. The use of these concepts as the constitutive research metaphors of this thesis, the hui as the metaphor for sequential interviewing, and whakawhanaungatanga as the metaphor of the research approach that seeks to establish collaborative narratives, are subject to the same culturally determined processes of validation, the same rules concerning knowledge, its production and its representation as are the literal phenomena.

Such an approach to validity locates the power within Maori cultural practices where what is acceptable and what is not acceptable research, text and/or processes is determined and defined by the research community itself. Hence power is constituted within the research community, here termed the whanau of interest. It is Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices which define the boundary lines of acceptability and non-acceptability, not some outside, researcher determined/defined criteria7 irrespective of the quality of the motives of the researchers.8

Maori people have always had criteria for evaluating whether a process or a product is valid. Taonga tuku iho are literally the treasures from the ancestors. These treasures are the collected wisdom of ages, the means that have been established over a
long period of time which guide and monitor our very lives today and in the future. Within these treasures are the messages of kawa, those principles that, for example, guide the process of establishing relationships. Whakawhanaungatanga is not a haphazard process, decided on an ad hoc basis, but rather is based on time-honoured and proven principles. Such principles are tapu, mana, wairua, maanaki, mauri and noa. How each of these principles is addressed in particular circumstances varies from tribe to tribe and hapu to hapu. Nevertheless, it is important that these principles are addressed. For example, the meeting of two groups of people at a hui on a marae involves acknowledgement of the tapu of each individual and of each group, by means of addressing and acknowledging the sacredness, specialness, genealogy and connectedness of the guests with the hosts. Much time will be spent to establish this linkage, a connectedness between the people involved. How this is actually done is the subject of local tikanga, which are the right ways to address these principles of kawa. Tikanga are an ongoing fertile ground for debate, but all participants know that if the kawa is not observed, then the event is 'invalid'. It does not have authority.

People often use the term kawa to refer to marae protocols. For example at the time of whaikorero, some tribes conduct this part of the powhiri by a tikanga known as paeke, where all the male speakers of the hosts' side will speak at one time, then turn the marae over to the visitors' speaker who then follow. Other tribes prefer to follow a tikanga termed utuutu, where hosts and visitors alternate (Salmond, 1975). Some tribes welcome visitors into their meeting house following a hongi, others keep the hongi until the end of the welcoming time. It is clear that these various tikanga are practices that are correct in certain tribal or hapu contexts, but underneath is the kawa handed down from those who have gone before about the need to recognise the tapu of people, their mana, their wairua, and the mauri of the place and events.

Kaupapa Maori addresses the political tendency of most research paradigms towards neo-colonialism by which they continually attempt to strip texts of their internal claims to authority. Such a stance suggests that a text must be taken on its own terms, that is a text will stand or fall in terms of its internal validity. Such validity as authority speaks to 'culturally conscious' participants since the voice/discourse of the text is located with reference to the principles of the culture. This is the intersection at which the researchers position themselves, within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori, as evidenced by their use of language. This intersection similarly calls for researchers to position themselves in relation to representation issues, for the text is the very voice of the participants as discourse, expressed from a position within the cultural context that is Maori. To do so from anywhere else is to recreate the problem of considering how the perspectives and experiences of the other can be expressed in a text.
Therefore, the verification of a text, the authority of a text, how well it represents the experiences and perspective of the participants, is judged by criteria constructed and constituted within the culture. For example, by using the hui as a metaphor for the process of conducting a series of in-depth, semi-structured interviews 'as conversations', and by using whakawhanaungatanga as the metaphor for the research process itself, I am invoking and claiming authority for these texts in terms of the principles, processes and practices that govern such events in their literal sense. By invoking metaphoric whanau, that is whanau of interest, such whanau are governed by the same principles and processes that govern a literal whanau, and as such are understandable to Maori people. In other words, literal whanau have means of addressing contentious issues, resolving conflict, constructing narratives, telling stories, raising children and addressing economic and political issues. And (contrary to popular opinion) such practices change over time to reflect changes going on in the wider world. The practices are not set in concrete. Whanau of interest also conduct their deliberations in a whanau style. Kaumatua preside, others get their say according to who they are, and positions are defined in terms of how it will benefit the whanau.

However, it is important to note that in this thesis I am not attempting to recreate the modernist mission, to construct a grand narrative with which to understand all events, or to progressively incorporate all cultures in the world into one understanding, only in this case a Polynesian one. This is not an attempt to ignore European colonialism by claiming that Maori culture has all the answers. Rather, I am asserting that for me to make sense of my experiences within the research matrix that constitutes this thesis, I needed to participate and seek explanations from within Maori cultural principles, preferences and practices.

My stance may be criticised on the grounds that in claiming that each culture is able to stand on its own, have its own integrity, that there can be no criticism from one culture to the next. However, such criticism does not speak to the lived experiences of Maori political, social and economic marginalisation over the last 150 years. Maori people are only too aware of the effects of colonial and neo-colonial 'interactions'. The reclaiming of cultural integrity, cultural validity and authority for texts is but part of a wider process of being critical of colonial and neo-colonial hegemonies. My stance goes beyond the attempts of critical theorists' to design a pedagogy of resistance.9 Such a pedagogy must eventually become another grand narrative of how the world should be for others, despite its altruistic motives of achieving social justice. From this perspective, the focus on emancipation/empowerment becomes a further attempt to recreate the world in terms defined by the critical theorists rather than in terms defined by their subjects. Like the 'Russian' people, Maori people are struggling to live in a world which they are able to define for themselves.
A Kaupapa Maori position states that resistance is a legitimate strategy, and has been an ongoing part of the Maori experience for over 150 years. However, both actual and potential hegemonic relationships need to be understood in terms of the principles within each culture. Maori people have a way of addressing such hegemonies that goes beyond mere resistance. Kaupapa Maori is a means of proactively promoting a Maori world-view as legitimate, authoritative and valid.

1 One exception might appear to be Huata who is anything but a teina in the research project. However, when his position within the totality of his projects is considered, it is seen from his relations to his tupuna as to where he gained the knowledge he uses. All the other researchers demonstrate more recognisable teina positionings.

2 Connelly & Clandenin (1990) define "voice" in Britzman's terms. "Voice is meaning that resides in the individual and enables that individual to participate in a community... The struggle for voice begins when a person attempts to communicate meaning to someone else. Finding the words, speaking for oneself, and feeling heard by others are all a part of this process... Voice suggests relationships: the individual's relationship to the meaning of her/his experience and hence to language, and the individual's relationship to the other, since understanding is a social process" (p. 4)

3 Similarly, the Maori meeting house is described/explained in terms of the house representing the body of an ancestor with a head, backbone, arms. Once inside only peaceful talk is correct because of where the speakers are located.

4 The argument goes along the lines of "Maori language needs special protection in New Zealand, because unlike Samoan, Tongan, Chinese, Indian etc there is nowhere else in the world where it exists as a living, vibrant language that can be used as a revitalisation referent.

5 Denzin and Lincoln (1994) suggest the following spectrum of paradigms.

Conventional positivist social science applies four criteria to disciplined inquiry; Internal validity, the degree to which findings correctly map the phenomenon in question; external validity, the degree to which findings can be generalized to other settings similar to the one in which the study occurred; reliability; the extent to which findings can be replicated, or reproduced, by another inquirer; and objectivity, the extent to which findings are free from bias.

The second position, postpositivist, argues that a set of criteria unique to qualitative research needs to be developed. Hammersley (1992, p.64 in Denzin and Lincoln, 1994) summarises post positivist criteria in the following way. Such researchers assess a work in terms of its ability to (a) generate generic/formal theory; (b) be empirically grounded and scientifically credible; (c) produce findings that can be generalised, or transferred to other settings; and (d) be internally reflexive in terms of taking
account of the effects of the researcher and the research strategy on the findings that have been produced.

As one moves from the postpositivist to the postmodern and poststructural positions, increased importance is attached to such antifoundational criteria as emotionality, caring, subjective understanding, dialogic texts, and the formation of long-term, trusting relationships with those studied.

The third position postmodernism, argues that "the character of qualitative research implies that there can be no criteria for judging its products" (Hammersley, 1992, p. 58). This argument contends that the very idea of assessing qualitative research is antithetical to the nature of this research and the world it attempts to study (see Smith, 1984, p. 383 in Denzin and Lincoln, 1994).

The fourth position, poststructuralism, contends that an entirely new set of criteria, divorced from the positivist and postpositivist traditions, needs to be constructed. Such criteria would flow from the qualitative project, stressing subjectivity, emotionality, feeling, and other antifoundational factors.

Perhaps on this spectrum, a kaupapa Maori stance may be positioned differently in that it challenges objectivity/subjectivity and promotes (after Berrnan, (1991 in Heshusius, 1994), Heshusius, 1994 and Ballard, 1994c)) cultural 'embodied' knowing, cultural 'participatory' consciousness, literally and metaphorically within culturally constituted aspirations, preferences and practices.

6What is crucial about this understanding in terms of narrative construction is that it is the author of the text is thus able to present the text to the reader as valid, thus replacing the sense making, meaning construction and voice of the researched person with that of the researcher by representing the text as an authoritative re-presentation of the experiences of others by using a system of researcher determined and dominated coding and analytic tools.

7 As Keith Ballard observed 16-9-94, much of the Action Research projects he has been involved in are searching for means of establishing relationships between non-Maori people in order that they can speak to each other in non-hegemonic fashions. The challenge they take on is to create and define a means of involving others in their research projects in such as way as to incorporate these other voices. However, there are few cultural practices available in an individually constituted culture. Maori researchers have an advantage that such cultural practices as the hui have remained a vital constitutive element of Maori culture. Despite the holocaust visited upon Maori people in the 19th and early 20th the central cultural constituents remained. especially the tangi.

8The reflexivity and self-critique of post-structural approaches has much to contribute to kaupapa Maori methodological reflections for example post-structuralism is critical of detachment, distanced observations, rather seeing their subjects as collaborators in projects not controlled by the researcher. Post-structuralist experiment with dialogic forms of representation that emphasis the voice and perspective of the research participants into the narrative and that reflects the dissonance and particularity of the process, a process that is more a construction of the self as the other. Rather than a
neo-colonial relationship where Maori experiences and meanings are judged by criteria established within another world view, a Maori post-structural perspective identifies that a text created within a Maori kaupapa has its own power to speak to the reader.

9 For example, the pedagogy of resistance that was initiated by Paolo Freire with adults in North East Brazil, and which has been subsequently developed by Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren
Glossary of Maori terms used in this thesis
Glossary

Please note. This glossary is a record of the Maori words used frequently in this thesis. Some that are used are not included in this glossary for they only appear once or they are better understood in their context, see especially chapter 4. When the words are first used in the text, an explanation in English is added in brackets. Any subsequent use of the word is not translated, this glossary is provided instead. Most of the words used in this thesis have many meanings. The meanings described here are those that make sense in this text, and are the meanings the author or speaker intends. Needless to say there are no meanings herein that step outside of the usual discursive practice of modern Maori. To help me determine the meanings detailed here I have referred to William's *Dictionary of the Maori Language*, Ryan's *Revised Dictionary of Modern Maori*, and Rose Pere's *Te Wheke*. I have not felt it necessary to use macrons or double vowels to indicate vowel length because as text, the intention of the Maori terms is not compromised by lack of pronunciation guidance.

ako: teaching/learning.
ariki: chief.
aroha: love in its broadest sense.
atua: god.
awa: areas of water e.g. rivers, lakes, that are of significance to the identity of a particular whanau, hapu or iwi.
awhi: helping.
hapu: sub-tribe, usually linked to a common ancestor.
haruru: greeting others by shaking hands and performing a hongi.
himene: hymn.
hinengaro: intellect.
hongi: greeting another person by pressing noses together, to share the breath of life.
hui: ceremonial, ritualised meeting.
hihi: essential force.
iwi: tribe.
kai: food.
kaiako: teacher.
kaiarahi: guide.
kaiarahi i te reo: Maori language teaching assistant.
kaiawhina: helper.
Kairaranga: a 'weaver' of people.
kaitiaki: guide.
kanohi kitea: a known face.
karakia: prayer/chant, recited to clear the way for a new activity.
karanga/karaga: ceremonial call of welcome
katoa: all (totally inclusive).
kaumatua koroua: male kaumatua.
kaumatua kuia: female kaumatua.
kaumatua: respected elder
kaupapa: agenda
kauwhau: a story with a message or moral.
kawa: protocol.
koha: gift.
korero: speak, talk.
kori a tinana: body language.
kowhaiwhai: rafter design, usually inside a meeting house.
kuia: female elder.
kupenga: net/network.
kura: school.
Kura Kaupapa Maori: Maori medium primary schools.
koru: spiral.
mamae: sadness/pain.
mana motuhake: absolute power.
mana whenua runanga: council of local Maori people.
mana whenua: Maori people whose whakapapa is rooted in the local area are said to be responsible for the mana of that area.
mana: power
manaaki: hospitality, caring.
manuhiri: guest/s.
Maori: indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand.
marae atea: the area in front of the meeting house where the manuhiri meet the hosts.
marae: ceremonial meeting place.
mata waka ropu: groups of mata waka people.
mata waka: Maori people living in an area, whose whakapapa is rooted in another area.
mate: illness, death, the dead.
maunga: mountain—usually of significance to the identity of a whanau, hapu or iwi and mentioned in one's mihi.

mauri: life force

mihi: ritualised self-introduction

mokai: slave, captive.

moko: tattoo.

moteatea: laments, poems.

noa: to be free from tapu.

ope: group.

ope whakaeke: group travelling to a marae.

oriori: lullaby.

Pakeha: New Zealander of European descent.

pakeke: adult.

pakiwaitara: folk tale, legend.

panui: notice.

papatibua marae: local marae.

poroporoaki: formal farewell.

potiki: youngest child.

powhiri: ceremonial rituals of welcome and introductions.

Pou here tagata/pou here tangata: the person who binds people together in order to offer guidance.

puhi: girl of a noble family.

pukorero: orators.

pumanawa: a natural, intuitive way of knowing.

rangatira/rakatira: chief.

rangatiratanga: chiefly control.

raranga korero/raraga korero: those stories that explain the people and events of a whakapapa.

ropu: group

runanga/runaka: tribal council

runanganui: grand council.

take: subject for discussion.

tane: man.

tangata whenua: indigenous people.

tangi: funeral.

taonga tuku iho: treasures passed down to the present generation from the ancestors.
taonga: treasures, including physical, social, cultural and intellectual.
tapu/tabu: sacred, to be treated with respect, a restriction, being with potentiality for power, integrity.
tata korero: close talk.
tatari, tautoko, tauawhi: pause, prompt, praise.
tauira: student.
tauiti: foreigner.
tauparapara: chant.
tautoko: support.
te reo: Maori language.
Te Kohanga Reo: Maori medium pre-schools.
tiaki: to look after.
tika: correct.
tikanga: customs, values, beliefs and attitudes.
tinana: body.
tino Rangatiratanga: self determination
tipuna/tupuna: ancestor
tira: travelling group.
titiro: look.
toenga: remnant.
tohunga whakairo: carving expert.
tohunga/tohua: expert.
tuakana/teina: older/younger.
tumanako: hope.
tumuaki: leader.
tupuna whaea: female ancestor.
tupuna/tipuna: ancestor.
tumu/hangi: to prepare food in an earth oven, also the earth oven itself.
uri: descendant
urupa: cemetery.
wahine: woman.
waiata: song
wairua: spirituality
waka: canoe, used here as meaning that waka that is of significance to the identity of a particular whanau, hapu or iwi and usually mentioned in a mihi.
watea: blessing.
wairuatanga: spirituality.
wehi: awe.
whaikorero: ritualised, ceremonial speech making, oratory.
whakakapa: summing up.
whakakotahitanga: developing unity.
whakama: shy, ashamed.
whakamana: strengthen.
whakamihi: making introductions.
whakapapa/raranga igoa: genealogy.
whakarongo: listen.
whakatauaki/whakatauki: proverb
whakawatea: to bless.
whakawhanaungtanga: establishing relationships.
whanau: extended family.
whanaunga: relative.
whanaungatanga: relationships.
whangai: to foster.
Whare Kura: Maori medium secondary schools.
Whare Waananga: centre of higher learning.
whare: house.
whare whakairo/wharenui: meeting house.
whariki: woven mat.
whitiwhiti korero: reflexive/spiral dialogue, reciprocity.
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Information to Participants and consent form.

**Topic.** An investigation into the process of conducting research in bicultural contexts.

**Contact.** Russell Bishop. Lecturer in Education, Education Department, University of Otago, Box 56 Dunedin. P. 4798616.

**Purpose of the Study.**

The research has been initiated by myself in my capacity as convenor of te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua, the research group of the Education Department of University of Otago, as Chairperson of META, Otago's Maori Education and Training Association and as a Doctoral candidate within the Education Department of the University of Otago.

The research is aimed at benefitting Maori people by examining and evaluating the process of research itself and recommending research practices that will be culturally acceptable to Maori people and that will produce positive changes in the life’s styles and life's chances of Maori people.

This study will investigate methods of educational research that will empower Maori people to participate fully in the decision making processes associated with education. The aim is to promote and enhance educational achievement for Maori pupils in educational institutions. It is hoped that by identifying examples of good educational research practice that there will be a big improvement in usefulness of educational research for Maori people. Participants will be asked to provide information, opinions and ideas that will be collated and processed by the author in order to write a doctoral thesis. From this thesis, papers will be written for publication in academic journals in order to influence and to promote change among academic researchers. The information and methodology are also used to run a graduate education class for training future educational researchers.

**Method.**

You have been approached to help with this project because you are involved in a research project within the bicultural research group of the Education Department of the University of Otago. In order to see if this type of project is useful to Maori people we need to evaluate the process by which the project was initiated and run.
Your role.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate personally and you may decide to withdraw your whole project from consideration without prejudice. If you do choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time without question.

As a participant you will be interviewed twice or perhaps three times. The first interview will focus on the initiation of your particular project, the purposes you had in mind for the project and the types of interactions and negotiation processes that went on at the initiation of the project. The second interview will focus on the ongoing interactions and developments of your case study focussing on the relationships between the participants in your particular case study. The second and any subsequent interviews will also ask you to comment on common topics that were identified in your first interview. This will be an opportunity to review your ideas on the process of how the particular research project you are involved in was initiated and is proceeding. Interviews will be spaced several weeks or even months apart. Interviews will be conducted at times and places that will suit you and you have the right to negotiate time and place.

Each interview will be taped (voice only) and the contents will be typed on a word processor for collation and analysis. The full text of the interviews will be returned to you for your perusal and editing, as will the text created from the interviews. The interviews will not be used for any other purpose without further negotiation with you.

Your Rights.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate, then you may withdraw your consent at any time. There will be no penalty if you choose to withdraw. If you choose to participate the results of this thesis will be reported back to your research whanau in a culturally acceptable manner. The further use of the information pertaining to your research whanau will be subject to further discussion at that point, also negotiated will be the issue of further use of this information in subsequent publications.

You have the right to privacy. If you wish to be acknowledged then your name will be listed alongside those of your research whanau. However, if you wish to remain anonymous then your name and other potentially identifying information will be withheld from publication.

Control over distribution of the information will rest with the participants of this research project into the process of doing research.
Consent Form.

My signature below indicates that I have either read and understand the information above or I have received detailed verbal explanation about the project at a hui/meeting and I understand the verbal explanation, and I consent to participate in this research project.

Name ____________________ Address ____________________

Phone Number ____________________

Please indicate your preference to the questions below.

I prefer to remain anonymous Yes/No

(Please understand that the projects will be identified, as will the locations where the research projects are being undertaken).

I permit quotes to be used from my interview tapes. Yes/No.

Signed. ____________________

Date; ____________________
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Interview Schedule

Note: this is an agenda only, albeit stated as questions, that will provide the stimulus for the interviews. The interviews will be conducted in a dialogic and reflexive manner, essentially conversations, sharing the concern to examine the process of an empowering methodology. The interviews will be based upon the relationship between interviewer and the interviewed as participants in research projects under the Kaupapa of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua.

A. Description of the Project and the researcher.
   - Could you please tell me something about yourself and your previous experiences in research.
   - Could you please describe the project in your own words.

B. Initiation of the Project.
   - Who initiated the project and why was it initiated?
   - What are the goals of the project?
   - Who established these goals?
   - How were the goals established?
   - Who will benefit from the project? How will they benefit? Who says so? What difference will this study make for Maori?
   - How will you benefit from the project?
   - What part did you play in the initiation of the project? Why?
   - How do you feel about the your part in the process? Project?
   - Can you compare the initiation of this project with others that you have been involved in?
   - Who will gain most from this study?

C. Work.
   - What work has to be done in the project?
   - Who designed the work?
   - How was the work designed?
   - How were tasks allocated?
   - Were those who designed the work different from those who did the work?
   - What are the power relationships between the workers? i.e. Who has control over the work that is being done?
- How are decisions about work that needs to be done made? Are those involved in the project seen as co-workers? Are they seen as co-researchers? Do they feel part of the project? Is there any one clear boss or group of bosses who dish out the jobs? Is there a feeling of equality or a feeling of hierarchy?

**D. Role of the Researcher and the Researched.**
- Who are the researchers?
- Who are the researched?
- What part does the researcher play?
- What part do the researched play?
- What work do the researched do?
- What way did the researched contribute to understanding the data? What voice/agency did people have?
- How were participants recruited and involved in the project?
- What was the distance between the researcher and the researched?
- How was this distance reduced or extended by the process of this project?
- What cultural group will gain new knowledge from this study?
- Who defines what is accurate, complete and true in the text, and how is this done?

**E. Gathering and processing information.**
- Is data going to be gathered? If so what sort of data?
- Who is going to have access to this data/raw material?
- Who is going to process the raw material?
- Who is going to consider the results of the processing?
- What will happen to the results? Who has a say in this?
- Who will have access to the research findings?
- Who has the task of making sense of the findings?
- Who has the task of theorising about the findings?

**F. Accountability**
- Who is the researcher accountable to?
- Who has control over the distribution of the findings?

**G. Conflict Resolution.**
- If disputes arise during the gathering or processing of the data how will these be resolved?
- If you noticed something going wrong during the project, what could you do about it?
- Can you identify any critical incidents i.e. any significant turning points or "light bulbs" in the project? Can you identify any conflicts and the methods of resolution?
  - What barriers have you run into when pursuing systemic change?
  - How have you attempted to resolve these conflicts?

**H. Overall impressions**

*What meaningful interventions are going to result from this project?*

How do you feel about the project now?

Has this feeling ever been any different?

If change in your attitude to the project, what produced the change?

Compare it with other projects the you have been involved in. Would you use this methodology again? Why?

- What assessments have you been involved in?

*How does this research support Maori cultural and language aspirations?*

*In what ways did this project add to your knowledge?*

Note: The questions in *italics* are after Smith (1991) and Smith (1992a). The rest from Bishop (1992a & 1992b) and as generated by the studies.