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This book draws together many previously published articles and book chapters produced by the author over the past 20 years of work in the field of indigenous education. However, rather than just being a compilation of a series of papers, this book is a record of the development of an indigenous approach towards large-scale, theory-based education reform that is now being implemented, in two different forms, in almost half of the secondary schools in New Zealand. Fundamental to this theorising is the understanding, identified by Paulo Freire over forty years ago, that answers to the conditions oppressed peoples find themselves in is not to be found in the language or understandings of the oppressors. Rather, it is to be found in those of the oppressed. This realisation has been confirmed by the examples in this book. The first is seen where it is identified how researching in Maori contexts needs to be conducted dialogically within the world view and understandings of Maori people. Secondly, dialogue in its widest sense is crucial for developing a means whereby Maori students are able to participate successfully in education.

The book details how researching the impact of colonization on his mother’s Maori family enabled the author to develop a means of researching within indigenous, Maori contexts. It then details how the lessons learnt here appealed as being a means by which the marginalization of Maori students in mainstream, public school classrooms could be re-theorised, and how schools and education systems could be reorganised so as to support indigenous students to be successful learners.
This book series is dedicated to the radical love and actions of Paulo Freire, Jesus “Pato” Gomez, and Joe L. Kincheloe.
Cultural studies provides an analytical toolbox for both making sense of educational practice and extending the insights of educational professionals into their labors. In this context Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education provides a collection of books in the domain that specify this assertion. Crafted for an audience of teachers, teacher educators, scholars and students of cultural studies and others interested in cultural studies and pedagogy, the series documents both the possibilities of and the controversies surrounding the intersection of cultural studies and education. The editors and the authors of this series do not assume that the interaction of cultural studies and education devalues other types of knowledge and analytical forms. Rather the intersection of these knowledge disciplines offers a rejuvenating, optimistic, and positive perspective on education and educational institutions. Some might describe its contribution as democratic, emancipatory, and transformative. The editors and authors maintain that cultural studies helps free educators from sterile, monolithic analyses that have for too long undermined efforts to think of educational practices by providing other words, new languages, and fresh metaphors. Operating in an interdisciplinary cosmos, Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education is dedicated to exploring the ways cultural studies enhances the study and practice of education. With this in mind the series focuses in a non-exclusive way on popular culture as well as other dimensions of cultural studies including social theory, social justice and positionalities, cultural dimensions of technological innovation, new media and media literacy, new forms of oppression emerging in an electronic hyperreality, and postcolonial global concerns. With these concerns in mind cultural studies scholars often argue that the realm of popular culture is the most powerful educational force in contemporary culture. Indeed, in the twenty-first century this pedagogical dynamic is sweeping through the entire world. Educators, they believe, must understand these emerging realities in order to gain an important voice in the pedagogical conversation.

Without an understanding of cultural pedagogy’s (education that takes place outside of formal schooling) role in the shaping of individual identity—youth identity in particular—the role educators play in the lives of their students will continue to fade. Why do so many of our students feel that life is incomprehensible and devoid of meaning? What does it mean, teachers wonder, when young people are unable to describe their moods, their affective affiliation to the society around them. Meanings provided young people by mainstream institutions often do little to help them deal with their affective complexity, their difficulty negotiating the rift between meaning and affect. School knowledge and educational expectations seem as anachronistic as a ditto machine, not that learning ways of rational thought and making sense of the world are unimportant.

But school knowledge and educational expectations often have little to offer students about making sense of the way they feel, the way their affective lives are shaped. In no way do we argue that analysis of the production of youth in an electronic mediated world demands some “touchy-feely” educational superficiality. What is needed in this context is a rigorous analysis of the interrelationship between pedagogy, popular culture, meaning making, and youth subjectivity. In an era marked by youth depression, violence, and suicide such insights become extremely important, even life saving. Pessimism about the future is the common sense of many contemporary youth with its concomitant feeling that no one can make a difference.

If affective production can be shaped to reflect these perspectives, then it can be reshaped to lay the groundwork for optimism, passionate commitment, and transformative educational and political activity. In these ways cultural studies adds a dimension to the work of education unfulfilled by any other sub-discipline. This is what Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education seeks to produce—literature on these issues that makes a difference. It seeks to publish studies that help those who work with young people, those individuals involved in the disciplines that study children and youth, and young people themselves improve their lives in these bizarre times.
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INTRODUCTION

FREEING OURSELVES

An Indigenous Response to Neo-Colonial Dominance in Research, Classrooms, Schools and Education Systems

This then is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well. The oppressors, who oppress, exploit and rape by virtue of their power, cannot find in this power the strength to liberate either the oppressed or themselves. Only power that springs from the weakness of the oppressed will be sufficiently strong to free both (Freire, 1972, p. 21).

This book draws together many previously published articles and book chapters that I have produced over the past 20 years of work in the field of indigenous education. This journey over time has led me from researching the impact of colonization on my mother’s Māori family to an appreciation of just what researching in Māori contexts involves. The lessons learnt here also appealed to me, as an ex-secondary school teacher, as being a means by which we could re-theorise the marginalization of Māori students in mainstream classrooms. From this understanding we could develop a means whereby educators could reposition themselves discursively and create caring and learning relationships within mainstream classrooms that would see Māori students benefitting from their participation in education. From these theoretical beginnings grew a large-scale classroom-based project that eventually developed into a comprehensive approach towards theory or principle-based education reform that is now being implemented, in two different forms, in 150 secondary schools in New Zealand1. I have included in the text the full references to the original works that this book draws together so that the interested reader can follow up on some of the topics raised here in more detail. However, what I have attempted to produce in this volume is not just a compilation of a series of papers, but rather a record of the development of a theoretical positioning that has grown into a project that has now begun to make a difference to Māori students’ life chances.

Fundamental to this theorising and practice were the understandings promoted by Paulo Freire forty years ago, that the answers to the conditions that oppressed peoples found themselves in was not to be found in the language or epistemologies of the oppressors, but rather in that of the oppressed. This realisation was confirmed when I understood that researching in Māori contexts needed to be conducted dialogically within the world view and understandings of the people with whom I was working. This realisation also led me to understand how dialogue in its widest sense is crucial for developing a means whereby Māori students would be able to participate successfully in education.
INTRODUCTION

I wish to acknowledge many of the people who have supported me in this work over the past 20 years. The early theorising of Graham Hingangaroa Smith who, in following Freire’s notions of the essential interaction of conscientisation, resistance and praxis, developed the first iterations of what has become known as Kaupapa Māori research. Linda Tuhiwai Smith whose early work with decolonising methodologies was inspirational to developing my own understanding of how Kaupapa Māori research and pedagogy might work. Ted Glynn and Keith Ballard took on the unenviable task of teaching me the craft of being an academic and worked with me for many years. Mere Berryman then took on the task of partnering much of the work over the past decade, which has included her co-authoring many papers and books. Now I am working with many schools, their leaders, teachers, students and communities and I can look back and see the genesis of the ideas in this book and I wish to thank them all for the part they have played in the development of the theorising and practice described in these pages.

The Current Context

The major challenge facing education in New Zealand today is the continuing social, economic and political disparities within our nation, primarily between the descendents of the European colonisers (Pākehā) and the indigenous Māori people. Māori have higher levels of unemployment, are more likely to be employed in low paying employment, have much higher levels of incarceration, illness and poverty than do the rest of the population and are generally under-represented in the positive social and economic indicators of the society. These disparities are outcomes of a process of colonisation that removed Māori control and power over their resource base, language and culture and promoted non-Māori ways of making sense of the world.

Given a different set of relationships, we could have seen Māori people being full participants in the emerging economy and society of the new nation, instead of marginalised and minoritised, a process of colonisation that has resulted in Māori being over-represented in the negative indices of society, and under-represented in the positive (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Walker, 1990). As Colin James (2008) wrote recently in a New Zealand Herald column under the title “Nation’s Duty to Protect Vulnerable”:

Iwi and hapu were protected in theory by the Treaty of Waitangi. Māori were made equal ‘subjects’ (citizens). In fact, they were largely dispossessed of their assets, their culture and their self-respect. It wasn’t genocide but it crushed morale. Hapu and whanau were less able to ensure their members’ welfare. In part the gang violence can be traced to that dispossession and demoralisation. In short, Governments here for 140 years failed the ‘responsibility to protect’ test for a large and distinguishable minority of our citizens. Only with the initiation of the Treaty of Waitangi process of truth and reconciliation and compensation a generation ago have governments recognised this past failure and attended to it … Rebuilding assets and morale is a multi-generation task … [and indicates] the paramount necessity [for the state] to invest well in our children … reversing the demoralisation of iwi is a demanding project, this responsibility to protect.
The necessity to invest well in our children was also the subject of a recent report to Parliament, entitled the *Inquiry into Making the Schooling System Work for Every Child*, by the Education and Science Committee of the House of Representatives (2008). In their report they point to the part education should play in addressing disparities in terms of the impact on Māori as a people, and as people expected to contribute to the nation. They pointed out that because Māori represent 28 percent of newborn New Zealanders, the increasing proportion of Māori in the population means that unless “the gap between the performance of Māori students and others is not addressed, the negative consequences for New Zealand will grow exponentially” (p. 10). Professor Mason Durie (1994) is quoted as saying that “until the disparity in Māori achievement is corrected, Māori will continue to feature disproportionately in indicators of poor outcomes, and will be a wasted resource for New Zealand” (p. 10, emphasis added). In other words, impact on society is seen in there being a strong “connection between non-engagement with school and youth offending” (p. 11) and;

[a]s employment becomes less labour-intensive, and more dependent on the use of technology, fewer jobs will be available for those who lack functional literacy and numeracy. The larger the group, the more difficult will it be for New Zealand to create and sustain a high-performing, internationally competitive economy (p. 11).

The Education Counts website also identifies a substantial body of evidence that demonstrates that students who are not well served by the education system are heavily disadvantaged later in life, in terms of their earning and employment potential and their health and wellbeing. For example, those with higher levels of education are more likely to participate in the labour market, face lower risks of unemployment, have greater access to further training and receive higher earnings on average. Conversely, people with no formal school qualifications have unemployment rates far exceeding those with qualifications, and have the lowest median incomes:

In 2006, the unemployment rate for those with a bachelor’s degree or higher was 2.1 percent; for those with another tertiary qualification 2.9 percent; with only a school qualification 4.1 percent; and with no qualification 5.2 percent …
The median weekly income for those with bachelors’ and higher degrees was $785; for those with other tertiary qualifications it was $575; for those with school qualifications it was $335; and for those with no qualifications $310 (Education and Science Committee, 2008, pp. 10–11).

The Education Counts website also contends that young people leaving school without any qualifications may have difficulty performing in the workforce and may face difficulties in terms of lifelong learning or returning to formal study in later years. They suggest that a considerable number of research studies show a strong connection between early school leavers and unemployment and/or lower incomes, which are in turn generally related to poverty and dependence on income support.

In his submission to the Education and Science Committee (cited above), Judge Andrew Becroft, the Principal Youth Court Judge, estimated that up to 80 percent of offenders in the Youth Court are not attending school, either because they are not enrolled or because they are suspended or excluded. He continued by suggesting
that between 25 and 30 percent of youth offending takes place between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Judge Becroft proposed that “[e]ngaging all young people of compulsory school age in education would reduce the crime rate among this group significantly” (p. 11).

In terms of offending, the report noted that young Māori offend at twice the rate of young Pasifika people and at four times the rate of young Pākehā, and in the experience of Judge Becroft, failure at school contributes to the establishment of a vicious circle that leads to recidivist offending. The Ministry of Social Development also presented evidence that gaining stable employment helps young offenders to desist from offending, particularly if their jobs offer learning opportunities. However, “[s]tudents who fail at school clearly have less chance of obtaining such employment” (pp. 10–11).

The educational disparities that afflict Māori are stark. The overall academic achievement levels of Māori students are low; more leave school without any qualifications than do their non-Māori counterparts; their retention rate to age 17 is far less than that for non-Māori; their rate of suspension from school is three to five times higher, depending on gender; they are over-represented in special education programmes for behavioural issues; they enrol in preschool programmes in lower proportions than other groups; they tend to be over-represented in low-stream education classes; they receive less academic feedback than do children of the majority culture; they are more likely than other students to be found in vocational curriculum streams; they leave school earlier, with fewer formal qualifications; and they enrol in tertiary education in lower proportions (Hood, 2008; Ministry of Education, 2005). Further, while these outcomes are most clearly exhibited in secondary schools, the foundations for these problems commence in the primary school years. Indeed there are indications (Crooks, Hamilton & Caygill, 2000; Wylie, Thompson & Lythe, 1999), that while there are achievement differentials evident on children entering primary school, it is by years 4 and 5 that these achievement differentials begin to stand out starkly.

Despite the choice provided by Māori-medium education in New Zealand, the vast majority of Māori students attend public/mainstream schools and are taught by non-Māori teachers who have problems relating to and addressing the educational needs of Māori students (Bishop & Berryman, 2006). In addition, decades of educational reforms and policies such as integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism have failed to support teachers adequately to address systemic shortcomings and models of reform based on deficiencies of the home in terms of literacy resources, (Nash, 1993) and more recently, neurophilosophy claims about the deficiencies of the brain (Clark, 2006), have done little to alleviate the situation. These reforms have made very little difference for the large proportion of Māori students who have attended mainstream schools since these educational disparities were first statistically identified over 50 years ago (Hunn, 1960).

Addressing these educational disparities is a difficult, yet necessary, task for educators at all levels within our system. Most countries that have diverse ethnic student populations will attest to this fact, for this is where educational disparities really show themselves: among the marginalised and minoritised peoples within mainstream educational settings.
INTRODUCTION

Kaupapa Māori Responses

This book looks at three examples of how an indigenous people have freed themselves from neo-colonial oppression in a way that also suggests how other minoritised peoples can similarly liberate themselves. The book also highlights how such an approach has redirected the actions of the oppressors to discursively reposition themselves through an ongoing process of conscientisation in relation to the representations of Māori as a minoritised group.

While the book primarily focuses on addressing educational disparities in mainstream/public school settings, the first example examines an indigenous initiative in research within Aotearoa/New Zealand termed Kaupapa (agenda/philosophy) Māori research. I commenced this project in 1990 as part of a group of people led by Graham and Linda Smith who were developing a means of wresting control over what constituted research into Māori peoples’ lives away from the dominance of the traditional academy. This chapter has been through many versions but it is fundamental to the study of addressing educational disparities because if sense-making and knowledge-producing processes remain in the control of the dominant group, what Scheurich and Young (1993) term epistemological racism is maintained; where the social history of the dominant group in society is used to produce solutions for those dominated. Hence the importance of firstly freeing ourselves of neo-colonial dominance in research so that models of reform for the oppressed groups can be developed from within the epistemological frameworks of those groups, rather than from within the dominant. This chapter cites recent studies conducted within Māori contexts to illustrate the process. This agenda for research is concerned with how research practice might realize Māori desires for self-determination while addressing on-going research issues of Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimacy and Accountability (IBRLA).

This chapter suggests that it is the cultural aspirations, understandings and practices of Māori people that implements and organizes the research process and positions researchers in such a way as to operationalise self-determination (agentic positioning and behaviour) for research participants. The cultural context positions the participants by constructing the story lines, and with them the cultural metaphors and images, as well as the ‘thinking as usual’, the talk/language through which research participation and researcher/researched relationships are constituted. Kaupapa Māori research rejects outsider control over what constitutes the text’s call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Māori position therefore promotes what Lincoln and Denzin (1994) term an epistemological version of validity. Such an approach to validity locates the power within Māori 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.

The second example in this book addresses the situation in New Zealand where, despite decades of educational reform, there has been little if any shift in the educational disparities that afflict the large proportion of Māori students who attend mainstream/public schools. This chapter considers how theories and models of reform that draw from relational discourses that are fundamental to indigenous people’s epistemologies may provide sufficient conditions for education reform.
I commenced this project in the late 1990s when considering how, from the theoretical position of Kaupapa Māori research, and an examination of appropriate Māori cultural metaphors used in Māori medium schooling, I developed a model whereby educators could create learning contexts within their classrooms that would allow Māori students to bring their own sense-making processes into the classroom, where what they knew was legitimate and not marginalised. This model suggested that teachers needed to develop pedagogic relationships and interactions: where power is shared between self-determining individuals within non-dominating relations of interdependence; where culture counts; where learning is interactive, dialogic and spirals; where participants are connected to one another through the establishment of a common vision for what constitutes excellence in educational outcomes. This pedagogy has since been developed further and termed a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations which is in Freirean terms a “Pedagogy of Hope”.

I was then fortunate enough to attract funding that enabled me to examine what a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations might look like in practice. In 2001, we began a professional development project for teachers that eventually grew into what is now called Te Kotahitanga, which is now a large-scale project that aims to improve the educational achievement of Māori students in Mainstream/Public Schools (Bishop et al., 2003, 2005).

The project commenced in 2001, seeking to address the self determination of Māori secondary school students by talking with them and other participants in their education about just what is involved in limiting and/or improving their educational achievement through an examination of the main influences on Māori students’ educational achievement. The project sought to examine how a number of groups might address this issue and commenced with the gathering of a number of narratives of students’ classroom experiences and meanings by the process of collaborative storying (Bishop, 1996) from a range of engaged and non-engaged Māori students (as defined by their schools), in five non-structurally modified mainstream secondary schools. These stories were also complemented by the gathering of stories of experience and meaning from those parenting these students, their principals and their teachers. Since then the project has grown to now being implemented in 50 secondary schools in New Zealand where there is evidence of very acceptable changes in the schooling experiences and outcomes for Māori students (Bishop et al., 2007, 2009).

It is clear from working with teachers’ attempts to address educational disparities in their own classrooms, that what is effective for Māori is effective for other minoritised students. This understanding has major implications for what many educators are identifying as the most pressing problem facing us in education today. That is the interaction between increasingly diverse student populations and the associated persistent pattern of educational disparities affecting indigenous peoples and populations of colour, poverty, different abilities and new migrants. This problem is exacerbated by the continuing lack of diversity among the teaching force who demonstrate discursive positionings and pedagogic practices more appropriate to monocultural populations.

The third example in the book is about developing a model for freeing public schools and the education system that supports them from neo-colonial dominance.
by scaling up, that is extending and sustaining effective, indigenous/minoritised-based education reform as opposed to education reform that is based on dominant group understandings. Scaling up such education reform has the potential to have a major impact on the disparities that exist in society because deepening and expanding the benefits of effective education reform programmes will change the status quo of historical, ongoing and seemingly immutable disparities. Nevertheless, I am not claiming that educational reform on its own can cure historical disparities; however, it is clear that educational reform can play a major part in a comprehensive approach to addressing social, economic and political disparities.

Current approaches to scaling up educational reform have not worked for indigenous and other minoritised students. Most attempts are short term, poorly funded at the outset, and often abandoned before any real changes can be seen, soon to be replaced by some “bold new initiative”. In contrast, the model identified in this chapter suggests that educational reforms need to have built into them, from the very outset, those elements that will see them sustained in the original sites and spread to others. These elements will allow educational reforms to be scaled up with the confidence that the reform will not only be able to be sustained in existing and new sites, but that, above all, will work to reduce disparities and realise the potential of those students currently not well served by education. Put simply, educational reforms that can be sustained and extended can have an impact on educational and social disparities through increasing the educational opportunities for students previously denied these options, on a scale currently not available in most western countries.

Again, I am fortunate, that with a group of colleagues, which this time includes those from another institution, Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi, a Māori tribal university, we have been able to attract sufficient funds to support one hundred secondary schools to implement this model as a means of moving their institutions towards being responsive to Māori students’ learning needs.

So overall, this book records the development of a means where, just as Paolo Freire predicted it should, educational reform has grown out of the power of the oppressed. It commenced by our initially wresting control over what constitutes research into Māori peoples’ lives from the dominant groups. It then meant that we could use this control to establish professional development for teachers that makes sense to Māori students and not just to the teachers (although that happens as well) and then designing a model to expand this process to a large number of sites in New Zealand.

NOTES

1 There are approximately 320 secondary schools in New Zealand.
3 Adrienne Alton-Lee (2008) provides us with evidence that students in Māori-medium classrooms are achieving at higher rates than their contemporaries in mainstream schools.
CHAPTER 1

FREEING OURSELVES FROM NEO-COLONIAL DOMINATION IN RESEARCH

_A Kaupapa Māori Approach to Creating Knowledge_

One of the challenges for Māori researchers… has been to retrieve some space—first, some space to convince Māori people of the value of research for Māori; second, to convince the various, fragmented but powerful research communities of the need for greater Māori involvement in research; and third, to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research, and the parameters of both previous and current approaches. What is now referred to as Kaupapa Māori approaches to research… is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims (Smith, 1999, p. 183).

This chapter seeks to identify how issues of power including initiation, benefits, representation, legitimisation and accountability, are addressed in practice within an indigenous Kaupapa Māori approach in such a way as to promote the self-determination of the research participants. In addition, this chapter questions how such considerations may impact on the Western-trained and -positioned researcher.

Māori people, along with many other minoritised peoples, are concerned that educational researchers have been slow to acknowledge the importance of culture and cultural differences as key components in successful research practice and understandings. As a result, key research issues of power relations, initiation, benefits, representation, legitimisation, and accountability continue to be addressed in terms of the researchers’ own cultural agendas, concerns, and interests. This chapter seeks to identify how such domination can be addressed by both Māori and non-Māori educational researchers by their conscious participation within the cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices of the research participants.

It is important to position this chapter within the growing body of literature that questions traditional approaches to researching on/with minoritised peoples by placing the culture of “an ethnic group at the center of the inquiry” (Tillman, 2002, p. 4). Notable among these are: Frances Rains, Jo-Ann Archibald and Donna Dehyle (2000) who in editing and introducing a special edition of the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE) entitled, *Through our Eyes and in Our Own Words-The Voices of Indigenous Scholars*, featured examples of “American-Indian/Native American intellectualism, culture, culture-based curriculum, and indigenous epistemologies and paradigms” (Tillman, 2002, p. 5). K. Tsianina Lomawaima’s (2000) analysis of the history of power struggles between academic researchers and
those who they study identified how the history of scholarly research (including education) in Native America “has been deeply implicated in the larger history of the domination and oppression of Native American communities.” (p. 14) On a positive note however, she identified how the development of new research protocols by various tribes shows the way toward more respectful and responsible scholarship. Similarly, Verna Kirkness, Carl Uri on and Jo-Anne Archibald in Canada and their work with the Canadian Journal of Native Education have brought issues of researching with respect to the fore. In addition, Donna Deyhle and Karen Swisher (1997) have examined the growth of self-determination approaches among indigenous peoples of North America. Others include African-American scholars, (Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2000; Stanfield, 1994; Tillman, 2002), Chicana and Chicano scholars (Gonzalez, 2001; Moll, 1992; Reyes, Scribner & Scribner, 1999; and Villegas & Lucas, 2002) who are all calling for greater attention to power relations and the role of culture in the research process.

However, while drawing on these and others to illustrate some of the arguments in this chapter, this discussion of culturally responsive research will focus on Māori peoples’ experiences of research as an example of the wider argument.

MĀORI PEOPLE’S CONCERNS ABOUT RESEARCH: ISSUES OF POWER

Despite the guarantees of the Treaty of Waitangi,2 the colonization of Aotearoa/New Zealand through the subsequent neocolonial dominance of majority interests in social and educational research has continued. The result has been the development of a tradition of research3 into Māori people’s lives that addresses concerns and interests of the predominately non-Māori researchers’ own making, as defined and accountable in terms of the researchers’ own cultural world-view(s).

Researchers in Aotearoa/New Zealand have developed a tradition of research that has perpetuated colonial power imbalances, thereby undervaluing and belittling Māori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonizers and adherents of neo-colonial paradigms. There has developed a social pathology research approach in Aotearoa/New Zealand that has implied in all phases of the research process, the “inability” of Māori culture to cope with human problems and proposed that Māori culture was and is inferior to that of the colonizers in human terms. Further, such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes and the legitimization of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.

Traditional non-Māori research has misrepresented Māori understandings and ways of knowing by simplifying, conglom erating, and commodifying Māori knowledge for “consumption” by the colonisers. These processes have consequently misrepresented Māori experiences, thereby denying Māori authenticity and voice. Such research has displaced Māori lived experiences and the meanings that these experiences have with the “authoritative” voice of the methodological “expert,” appropriating Māori lived experience in terms defined and determined by the “expert.” Moreover, many misconstrued Māori cultural practices and meanings are now part
of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Māori and non-Māori alike, and traditional social and educational research has contributed to this situation. As a result, Māori people are deeply concerned about to whom researchers are accountable. Who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, construction, and distribution of newly defined knowledge? Analyses by Bishop (1996, 1998a and 1998b) and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) have identified that control over legitimisation and representation is maintained within the domain of the colonial and neo-colonial paradigms and that locales of initiation and accountability are situated within Western cultural frameworks, thus precluding Māori cultural forms and processes of initiation and accountability.

Traditional research epistemologies have developed methods of initiating research and accessing research participants that are located within the cultural preferences and practices of the Western world as opposed to the cultural preferences and practices of Māori people themselves. For example, the preoccupation with neutrality, objectivity, and distance by educational researchers has emphasized these concepts as criteria for authority, representation, and accountability and, thus, has distanced Māori people from participation in the construction, validation, and legitimization of knowledge. As a result, Māori people are increasingly becoming concerned about who will directly gain from the research. Traditionally, research has established an approach where the research has served to advance the interests, concerns, and methods of the researcher and to locate the benefits of the research at least in part with the researcher, other benefits being of lesser concern.

The following table summarises these concerns noting that while Lincoln and Denzin (1994) identified two crises in qualitative research, that from this analysis of Māori peoples’ concerns about research, it is clear that there are indeed five crises that affect indigenous peoples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Māori people’s concerns about research focuses on the locus of power over issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy and accountability being with the researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (Continued)

| Representation | Whose research constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality? Traditional research has misrepresented, that is simplified/conglomerated and commodified Māori knowledge for ‘consumption’ by the colonisers and denied the authenticity of Māori experiences and voice. Such research has displaced Māori lived experiences with the ‘authoritative’ voice of the ‘expert’ voiced in terms defined/determined by the ‘expert’. Further, many misconstrued Māori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Māori and non-Māori alike. |
| Legitimacy | This issue concerns what authority we claim for our texts. Traditional research has undervalued and belittled Māori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonisers, and adherents of neo-colonial paradigms. Such research has developed a social pathology research approach that has focused on the “inability” of Māori culture to cope with human problems, and proposed that Māori 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. Traditional research has claimed that all people have an inalienable right to utilise all knowledge, and maintained that research findings be expressed in term of criteria located within the epistemological framework of traditional research, thus creating locales of accountability that are situated within Western cultural frameworks. |

Insiders/Outsiders: Who can Conduct Research in Indigenous Settings?

The concerns about initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy and accountability raise a number of questions about how research with Māori and Indigenous peoples should be conducted, but perhaps initially it is important to consider, by whom that research should be conducted.

One solution to this initial question might well be to take an essentialising position and suggest that cultural ‘insiders’ might well undertake research in a more sensitive and responsive manner than ‘outsiders’. As Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane and Muhamad (2001) suggests it has “commonly been assumed that being an insider means easy access, the ability to ask more meaningful questions and read non-verbal cues, and most importantly be able to project a more truthful, authentic understanding of the culture under study” (p. 411). On the other hand, of course, there are also the concerns that insiders are accused of being inherently biased, too close to the culture to ask critical questions.
Whatever the case, such understandings assume a homogeneity that is far from the reality of the diversity and complexity that characterises indigenous people’s lives, and the impact that age, class, gender education and colour among other variables might have upon the research relationship, albeit the researcher might consider themselves to be an ‘insider’. A number of studies by researchers who had initially considered themselves to be ‘insiders’ (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Johnson-Bailey, 1999; Merriam et al., 2001; Smith, 1999) attest to this problem. Further, as Linda Tuhiai Smith (1999) argues, even Western trained indigenous researchers who are intimately involved with community members will typically employ research techniques and methodologies that will likely marginalise the communities’ contribution to the investigation. This suggests that indigenous researchers will not automatically conduct research in a culturally appropriate manner when researching their own communities.

However, as Native American scholar, Karen Swisher (1998) argues, the dilemma remains, for despite developments in research that attempt to listen to the voices and the stories of the people and presenting them in ways “to encourage readers to see through a different lens…, much research still is presented from an outsiders perspective.” (p. 191) Nevertheless, despite the problems that indigenous researchers might well face, she argues that American Indian scholars need to become involved in leading research rather than being the subjects or consumers of research. She suggests that this will assist in keeping the control over the research in the hands of those involved. She cites (among other sources) a 1989 report of regional dialogues, Our Voices, Our Vision: American Indians Speak Out for Educational Excellence as an example of research that addressed the self-determination of the people involved because from the “conception of the dialogue format to formulation of data and publication, Indian people were in charge of and guided the project; and the voices and concerns of the people were clearly evident” (p. 192).

Swisher (1998) argues that what is missing from the plethora of books, journals and articles produced by non-Indians about Indians is “the passion from within and the authority to ask new and different questions based on histories and experiences as indigenous people” (p. 193). Further, she argues that it more than just different ways of knowing, but rather it is “knowing that what we think is grounded in principles of sovereignty and self-determination; and that it has credibility” (p. 193). In this way, Swisher is clear that “Indian people also believe that they have the answers for improving Indian education and feel they must speak for themselves.” (p. 192). In other words, if we were to extrapolate this argument to other indigenous settings, we could see this as a call for the power of definition over issues of research; initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability being with indigenous peoples themselves. Swisher (1998) identifies that there is an attitude of ‘we can and must do it ourselves’, but it is clear that non-indigenous people must help, but not in the impositional ways of the past. Of course, this raises the question of just what are the new positions on offer to non-indigenous researchers and also for indigenous researchers for that matter. Margie Maaka at a recent NZARE conference clearly stated this position when she said that Māori must be in control of the research agenda, must be the ones who set the parameters; however,
others can participate at the invitation of the indigenous people. In other words, it is Māori research by Māori for Māori with the help of invited others.

Tillman (2002), addressed this issue when considering who should conduct research in African-American communities and suggests that it is not simply a matter of saying that the researcher must be African-American, but “[r]ather it is important to consider whether the researcher has the cultural knowledge to accurately interpret and validate the experiences of African-Americans within the context of the phenomenon under study” (p. 4).

Jacobs-Huey (2002) and Smith (1999) emphasizes the power of critical reflexivity for native scholars. The former stating that “critical reflexivity in both writing and identification as a native researcher may act to resist charges of having played the ‘native card’ via a non-critical privileging of one’s insider status” (p. 799). The latter emphasising that “at a general level insider researchers have to have ways of thinking critically about their processes, their relationships and the quality and richness of their data and analysis. So to do outsiders…” (p. 137) Researchers such as Narayan (1993), Griffiths (1998) and Bridges (2001) explain that it is no longer useful to think of researchers as insiders or outsiders, but rather indigenous researchers might be positioned “in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations” (Narayan, 1993, p. 671). Narayan proposes that instead of trying to define insider or outsider status,

what we must focus our attention on is the quality of relations with the people we seek to represent in our texts: are they viewed as mere fodder for professionally self-serving statements about a generalized Other, or are they accepted as subjects with voices, views, and dilemmas- people to whom we are bonded through ties of reciprocity…? (p. 672).

This chapter suggests how these concerns and aspirations might be met.

KAUPAPA MĀORI RESEARCH

Out of the discontent with traditional research and its disruption of Māori life, an indigenous approach to research has emerged in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This approach, termed Kaupapa (agenda/philosophy) Māori research, is challenging the dominance of the Pākehā world-view in research. Kaupapa Māori research emerged from within the wider ethnic revitalization movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid Māori urbanization of the post-Second World War period. This revitalization movement blossomed in the 1970s and 1980s with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Māori communities. More recently, in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, this consciousness has featured the revitalization of Māori cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and a resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse. In effect therefore, Kaupapa Māori presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within our society, those structures that work to oppress Māori people. These include rejection of hegemonic belittling, “Māori can’t cope” discourses, together with a commitment to the power
of conscientisation and politicization through struggle for wider community and social freedoms (Smith, 1997).

There are a number of significant dimensions to Kaupapa Māori research that set it apart from traditional research. One main focus of a Kaupapa Māori approach to research is the operationalisation of self-determination (tino rangatiratanga) by Māori people (Bishop, 1996; Durie, 1995, 1998; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999; and Pihama, Cram & Walker, 2002). Self-determination in Durie’s (1995) terms “captures a sense of Māori ownership and active control over the future” (p. 16). Such a position is consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi where Māori people are able “to determine their own policies, to actively participate in the development and interpretation of the law, to assume responsibility for their own affairs and to plan for the needs of future generations” (Durie, 1995, p. 16). In addition, the promotion of self-determination has benefits beyond these aspects. A 10 year study of Māori households conducted by Durie (1998), shows that the development of a secure identity offers Māori people advantages in that a secure identity may:

afford some protection against poor health; it is more likely to be associated with active educational participation and with positive employment profiles.

The corollary is that reduced access to the Māori resources, and the wider Māori world, may be associated with cultural, social and economic disadvantage (pp. 58–59).

Such an approach challenges the locus of power and control over the research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability as outlined above, being located in another cultural frame of reference/world-view. Kaupapa Māori is, therefore, challenging the dominance of traditional, individualistic research which primarily, at least in its present form, benefits the researchers and their agenda. In contrast, Kaupapa Māori research is collectivistic and is oriented toward benefiting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas, defining and acknowledging Māori aspirations for research, while developing and implementing Māori theoretical and methodological preferences and practices for research.

Kaupapa Māori is a discourse that has emerged and is legitimized from within the Māori Community. Māori educationalist, Graham Hingararoa Smith (1992) describes Kaupapa Māori as “the philosophy and practice of being and acting Māori” (p. 1). It assumes the taken-for-granted social, political, historical, intellectual, and cultural legitimacy of Māori people, in that it is an orientation in which “Māori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right” (p. 13). Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), another leading Māori exponent of this approach, identifies that such naming provides a means whereby communities of the researched and the researchers can “engage in a dialogue about setting directions for the priorities, policies, and practices of research for, by, and with Māori” (p. 183).

One fundamental understanding of a Kaupapa Māori approach to research is that it is the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Māori that positions researchers in such a way as to operationalise self-determination in terms of agentic positioning and behaviour for research participants thus challenging the essentialising dichotomization of the insider/outsider debate by offering a discursive position for researchers,
irrespective of ethnicity. This positioning occurs because the cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices of Māori people implement and organize the research process. Further, the associated research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization, and accountability are addressed and understood in practice by practitioners of Kaupapa Māori research within the cultural context of the research participants.

Such understandings challenge traditional ways of defining, accessing, and constructing knowledge about indigenous peoples and the process of self-critique, sometimes termed paradigm shifting, that is used by Western scholars as a means of “cleansing” thought and attaining what becomes their version of the “truth.” Indigenous peoples are challenging this process because it maintains control over the research agenda within the cultural domain of the researchers or their institutions.

A Kaupapa Māori position is predicated on the understanding that Māori means of accessing, defining, and protecting knowledge existed before European arrival in New Zealand. Such Māori cultural processes were protected by the Treaty of Waitangi, subsequently marginalised, but have always been legitimate within Māori cultural discourses. As with other Kaupapa Māori initiatives in education, health, and welfare, Kaupapa Māori research practice is, as Irwin (1994) explains, epistemologically based within Māori cultural specificities, preferences, and practices. In Olssen’s (1993) terms, Māori initiatives are “epistemologically productive where in constructing a vision of the world and positioning people in relation to its classifications, it takes its shape from its interrelations with an infinitely proliferating series of other elements within a particular social field” (p. 4).

However this is not to suggest that such an analysis promotes an essentialist view of Māori where all Māori must act in prescribed ways for Māori are just as diverse a people as any other. One of the main outcomes of Durie’s (1998) longitudinal study of Māori families, Te Hoe Nuku Roa, is the identification of this very diversity within Māori peoples. To Pihama, Cram and Walker (2002) this means that Kaupapa Māori analysis must take this diversity of Māori peoples into account. They argue that Kaupapa Māori analysis is for all Māori, “not for select groups or individuals. Kaupapa Māori is not owned by any group, nor can it be defined in ways that deny Māori people access to its articulation” (p. 8). In other words, Kaupapa Māori analysis must benefit Māori peoples in principle and in practice in such a way that the current realities of marginalisation and the heritage of colonialism and neo-colonialism are addressed.

Examples of Culturally Responsive Research Practices

This analysis is based on a number of studies conducted by the author using Kaupapa Māori research. The first study, Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative Research Stories. (Bishop, 1996, 1998b) was a collaborative meta-study of five projects that addressed Māori agendas in research in order to ascertain the ways in which a group of researchers were addressing Māori peoples’ concerns about research and what the researchers’ experiences of these projects meant to them individually. These experiences of the various researchers and their understandings of their
experiences were investigated by co-constructing collaborative research stories. The objective was to engage in a process of critical reflection and build a discourse based on the formal and informal meetings that were part of each of the projects in order to connect epistemological questions to indigenous ways of knowing by way of descriptions of actual research projects. The meta-study examined how a group of researchers addressed the importance of devolving power and control in the research exercise in order to promote self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga) of Māori people, i.e. to act as educational professionals in ways consistent with Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. I talked with other researchers who had accepted the challenge of being repositioned by and within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Māori.

The meta-study in effect sought 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 collaborative stories go beyond an approach that simply focuses on the cooperative sharing of experiences and focuses on connectedness, engagement, and involvement with the other research participants within the cultural world view/discursive practice within which they function. This study sought 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 participatory and cultural consciousness and connectedness within Māori discursive practice.

The second study, Te Toi Huarewa: Effective Teachers and Learning in Total Immersion Māori language Settings (Bishop, Berryman, & Richardson, 2002), sought to identify effective teaching and learning strategies, effective teaching and learning materials, and the ways in which teachers assess and monitor the effectiveness of their teaching in Māori-medium reading and writing programs for students aged 5 to 9 years. Following a period of establishing relationships and developing a joint agenda for the research to identify what effective teachers do in their classrooms and why they teach in a particular manner, the researchers sought to operationalise Kaupapa Māori concerns that the self determination of the research participants over issues of representation and legitimation be paramount. The strategy consisted of interviews and directed observations followed by facilitated teacher reflections on what had been observed by using stimulated recall interviews (Calderhead, 1981, p. 240). The stimulated recall interviews that followed the observation sessions focused on specific interactions observed in the classrooms. In the stimulated recall interviews, the teachers were encouraged to reflect upon what had been observed and to bring their own sense-making processes to the discussions in order to co-construct a ‘rich’ descriptive picture of their classroom practices. In other words, they were encouraged to reflect upon and explain why they did what they did on their own terms. Through the use of this process, they explained for us that they all placed the culture of the child at the centre of learning relationships by developing in their classrooms what we later termed (after Gay, 2000; Villegas and Lucas, 2000) a culturally appropriate and responsive context for learning.
The third study, *Te Kotahitanga: Improving the Educational Achievement of Māori students in Mainstream Schools* (Bishop et al., 2003), which will be detailed in Chapter 2, is a work-in-progress, research/professional development project that is now entering its fifth phase of implementation in 50 schools with some 2000 teachers. The project commenced in 2001 seeking to address the self determination of Māori secondary school students by talking with them and other participants in their education about just what is involved in limiting and /or improving their educational achievement. The project commenced with the gathering of a number of narratives of students’ classroom experiences by the process of Collaborative Storying from a range of engaged and non-engaged Māori students (as defined by their schools), in five non-structurally modified mainstream secondary schools. This approach is very similar to that termed *testimonio* in that it is the intention of the direct narrator (research participant) to use an interlocutor (the researcher) to bring his/her or their situation to the attention of an audience “to which he or she would normally not have access because of their very condition of subalternity to which the *testimonio* bears witness” (Beverly, 2000, p. 556). In this research project, the students were able to have their narratives about their experiences of schooling shared with teachers who otherwise might not have access to them.

It was from these amazing stories (Bishop & Berryman, 2006), that the rest of this project developed. In their narratives the students clearly identified the main influences on their educational achievement by articulating the impact and consequences of their living in a marginalized space. That is, they explained how they were perceived in pathological terms by their teachers, and how this has had a negative effect up on their lives. In addition, the students told the research team how teachers, in changing how they related and interacted with Māori students in their classrooms, could create a context for learning wherein Māori students’ educational achievement could improve; again by placing the self-determination of Māori students at the centre of classroom relationships.

Such an approach is consistent with Ryan (1999) who suggests that a solution to the one-sidedness of representations that are promoted by the dominance of the powerful, in this case pathologising discourses, is to portray events as were done in the collaborative stories of the Māori students, in terms of “competing discourses rather than as simply the projection of inappropriate images” (p. 187). He suggests that this approach, rather than seeking the truth or “real pictures,” allows for previously marginalized discourses “to emerge and compete on equal terms with previously dominant discourses” (p. 187).

On the basis of the suggestions from Year 9 and 10 (ages 14–16) Māori students, the research team developed an Effective Teaching Profile. Together with other information from narratives of experiences from those parenting the students, their principals and their teachers, and from the literature, this Effective Teaching Profile has formed the basis of a professional development program, that when implemented with a group of teachers in four schools, was associated with improved learning, behaviour and attendance outcomes for Māori students in the classrooms of those teachers who had been able to participate fully in the professional development program (Bishop et al, 2003).
FREEING OURSELVES FROM NEO-COLONIAL DOMINATION

ADDRESSING ISSUES OF SELF-DETERMINATION

Western approaches to operationalising self-determination (agentic positioning and behaviour) in others are, according to Noddings (1986) and Davies (1990), best addressed by those who position themselves within empowering relationships. Authors such as Oakley (1981), Tripp (1983), Burgess (1984), Lather (1986; 1991), Patton (1990), Delamont (1992), Eisner (1991), Reinharz (1992), and Sprague and Hayes (2000) suggest that an “empowering” relationship could be attained by developing what could be termed 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 is also the recognition of the need for personal investment in the form of self-disclosure and openness on the part of the researcher. Sprague and Hayes (2000) explain that such relationships are mutual:

[to] the degree to which each party negotiates a balance between commitment to the other’s and to one’s own journey of self-determination. In mutual relationships each strives to recognize the other’s unique and changing needs and abilities, [and] takes the other’s perspectives and interests into account (p. 684).

In the practice of Kaupapa Māori research, however, there develops a degree of involvement on the part of the researcher, constituted as a way of knowing, that is fundamentally different from the concepts of personal investment and collaboration as suggested by the above authors. For, while it appears that “personal investment” is essential, this personal investment is not on terms determined by the “investor.” The investment is on terms of mutual understanding and control by all participants, so that the investment is reciprocal and could not be otherwise. In other words, the “personal investment” by the researcher is not an act by an individual agent but emerges out of the context within which the research is constituted.

Traditional conceptualizations of knowing do not adequately explain this understanding. Elbow (1986, as cited in Connelly & 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, where the concerns, interests, and agendas of the researcher become the concerns, interests, and agendas of the researched and vice versa. Hogan (as cited in Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 4) refers to this as a “feeling of connectedness.” Heshusius (1994, 2002) transforms this notion by suggesting the need to move from an alienated mode of consciousness which sees the knower as separate from the known to a participatory mode of consciousness. Such a mode of consciousness addresses a fundamental reordering of our understanding of the relationship “between self and other (and therefore of reality), 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” (Heshusius, 1994, p. 15).

Heshusius (1994) identifies this form of knowing as involving, that which Polyani (1966) calls “tacit knowing,” which Harman calls “compassionate consciousness” (as cited in Heshusius, 1994), and which Berman calls “somatic” or “bodily” knowing.
(as cited in Heshusius, 1994). Barbara Thayer-Bacon (1997) describes a relational epistemology that “views “knowledge as something that is socially constructed by embedded, embodied people who are in relation with each other” (p. 245). Each of these authors is referring to an embodied way of being and of a knowing which is 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” (p. 17). Heshusius (1996) also suggests that:

In a participatory mode of consciousness the quality of attentiveness is characterised by an absence of the need to separate, distance and to insert predetermined thought patterns, methods and formulas between self and other. It is characterised by an absence of the need to be in charge (p. 627).

Heshusius (1994) identifies the ground from which a participatory mode of knowing emerges as “the recognition of the deeper kinship between ourselves and other” (p. 17). This form of knowing speaks in a very real sense to Māori ways of knowing, for the Māori term for connectedness and engagement by kinship is whanaungatanga.

This concept is one of the most fundamental ideas within Māori culture, both as a value and as a social process. Whanaungatanga literally consists of kin relationships between ourselves and others and is constituted in ways determined by the Māori cultural context.

**Whakawhanaungatanga as a Kaupapa Māori Research Approach**

Whakawhanaungatanga is the process of establishing family (whānau) relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness, and, therefore, an unspoken but implicit commitment to other people. For example, a mihimihi (formal ritualized introduction) at a hui (Māori ceremonial gathering) involves stating your own whakapapa (genealogy) in order to establish relationships with the hosts/others/visitors. A mihimihi does not identify you in terms of your work, in terms of your academic rank or title, for example. Rather, a mihimihi is a statement of where you are from and of how you can be related and connected to these other people and the land, in both the past and the present.

For Māori 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. 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 and 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 subtribe (hapu). We are of the same family (whānau), the family into which we were born (whānau). 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 Māori people introduce ourselves as whanaunga (relatives), whether it be to engage in research or not, we are introducing part of one to another part of the same oneness. Knowing who we are is a somatic acknowledgment of our connectedness with and commitment to our surroundings, human and nonhuman. For example, from this positioning it would be very difficult to undertake research in a “non-somatic” distanced manner. To invoke “distance” in a Māori research project would be to deny that it is a Māori project. It would have different goals, not Māori goals.

Establishing and maintaining whānau relationships, which can be either literal or metaphoric within the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Māori, is an integral and ongoing constitutive element of a Kaupapa Māori approach to research. Establishing a research group as if it were an extended family is one form of embodying the process of whakawhanaungatanga as a research strategy.

In a Kaupapa Māori approach to research, research groups constituted as whānau attempt to develop relationships and organizations based on similar principles to those which order a traditional or literal whānau. Metge (1990) explains that to use the term whānau is to identify a series of rights and responsibilities, commitments and obligations, and supports that are fundamental to the collectivity. These are the tikanga (customs) of the whānau; warm interpersonal interactions, group solidarity, shared responsibility for one another, cheerful cooperation for group ends, corporate responsibility for group property, material or nonmaterial (e.g. knowledge) items and issues. These attributes can be summed up in the words aroha (love in the broadest sense, also mutuality), awhi (helpfulness), manaaki (hospitality), and tiaki (guidance).

The whānau 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. 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 (respected elders of either gender) for approval, and the group will seek to operate with the support and encouragement of kaumatua. This feature acknowledges the multigenerational compositioning of a whānau with associated hierarchically determined rights, responsibilities, and obligations.

*Determining Benefits: Identifying Lines of Accountability using Māori Metaphor*

Determining who benefits from the research and to whom the researchers are accountable can also be understood in terms of Māori discursive practices. What non-Māori people would refer to as management or control mechanisms are traditionally constituted in a whānau as taonga tuku iho, literally those treasures passed down to us from the ancestors, those customs that guide our behaviour. In this manner the structure and function of a whānau describes and constitutes the relationship among research participants, in traditional research terminology between the researcher
and the researched, within Kaupapa Māori research practice. Research, thus, cannot proceed unless whānau support is obtained, unless kaumatua provide guidance, and unless there is aroha (mutuality) between the participants, evidenced by an overriding feeling of tolerance, hospitality, and respect for others, their aspirations, preferences and practices. The research process is participatory as well as participant-driven in the sense that it is the concerns, interests, and preferences of the whānau that guide and drive the research processes. The research itself is driven by the participants in terms of setting the research questions, ascertaining the likely benefits, the design of the work, the undertaking of the work that had to be done, the distribution of rewards, the access to research findings, the control over the distribution of the knowledge and to whom the researcher is accountable.

This approach has much in common with that described by Kemmis and McTaggart (2000) as participatory and collaborative action research which emerged “more or less deliberately as forms of resistance to conventional research practices that were perceived by particular kinds of participants as acts of colonisation” (p. 572). To Esposito and Murphy (2000) participatory action research emphasizes the political nature of knowledge production and places a premium on self-emancipation (p. 180) where

[s]uch research groups are typically comprised of both professionals and ordinary people, all of whom are regarded as authoritative sources of knowledge. By making minorities the authorized representatives of the knowledge produced, their experiences and concerns are brought to the forefront of the research. The resulting information is applied to resolving the problems they define collectively as significant. As a result, the integrity of distinct racial groups is not annihilated or subsumed within dominant narratives that portray them as peripheral members of society (p. 181).

For researchers, this means they are not information gatherers, data processors and sense makers of other people’s lives, but rather they are expected to be able to communicate with individuals and groups, to participate in appropriate cultural process and practices and interact in a dialogic manner with the research participants. Esposito and Murphy (2000) explain that research “methods are geared to offer opportunities for discussion. After all, information is not transmitted between researchers and individuals; instead, information is co-created, data are coproduced intersubjectively in a manner that preserves the existential nature of the information” (p. 182).

Esposito and Murphy (2000) also suggest that such an approach may facilitate the development of the kind of research that Lomawaima (2000) and Fine and Weis (1996) describe where investigators are more attuned to “locally meaningful expectations and concerns” (Lomawaima 2000, p. 15). In addition, they suggest that the researchers become actively involved in the solutions, and promote the well-being of communities, instead of merely using locations as sites for data collection as Lomawaima (2000) suggests, opening up the “possibilities for directly meaningful research - research that is as informative and useful to tribes as it is to academic professionals and disciplinary theories” (p. 15).
However, what is crucial to an understanding of what it means to be a researcher in a Kaupapa Māori approach is that it is through the development of a participatory mode of consciousness that a researcher becomes part of this process. He or she does not start from a position outside of the group and then chooses to invest or reposition him/herself. Rather the (re)positioning is part of participation. The researcher cannot “position” him/herself or “empower” the other. Instead, through entering a participatory mode of consciousness the individual agent of the “I” of the researcher is released in order to enter a consciousness larger than the self.

One example of how whānau processes in action affect the position of the researcher is the way in which different individuals take on differing discursive positionings within the collective. These positionings fulfil different functions oriented towards the collaborative concerns, interests, and benefits of the whānau as a group, rather than towards the benefit of any one member, a member with a distanced research agenda for example. Such positionings are constituted in ways that are generated by Māori cultural practices and preferences. For example, the leader of a research whānau, here termed a whānau of interest to identify it as a metaphoric whānau, will not necessarily be the researcher. Kaumatua, which is a Māori-defined and -apportioned position, will be the leaders. Leadership in a whānau of interest, however, is not in the sense of making all the decisions, but in the sense of being a guide to culturally appropriate procedures (kawa) for decision making and a listener to the voices of all members of the whānau. The kaumatua are the consensus seekers for the collective and the producers of the collaborative voice of the members. By developing research within such existing culturally constituted practices, concerns about voice and agency can be addressed.

This emphasis on positionings within a group constituted as a whānau also addresses concerns about accountability, authority and control. In a Māori collective whānau, there are a variety of discursively determined positions, some of which are open to the researcher, some of which are not. The extent to which researchers can be positioned within a whānau of interest is therefore tied very closely to who they are, often more so than what they are. Therefore, positioning is not simply a matter of the researchers’ choice, because this would further researcher imposition. That is, researchers are not free to assume any position that they think the whānau of interest needs in order for the whānau to function. The researchers’ choice of positions is generated by the structure of the whānau and the customary ways of behaving constituted within the whānau. The clear implication is that researchers are required to locate themselves within new “story-lines” that address the contradictory nature of the traditional researcher/researched relationship.

The language used by researchers working in Kaupapa Māori contexts in Bishop (1996, 1998b) for example, contains the key to the new story-lines. The metaphor and imagery they used to explain their participation in the research were those located within the research participants’ domains, and the researchers either were or needed to move to become part of this domain. Researchers were positioned within the discursive practices of Kaupapa Māori by the use of contextually constituted metaphor within the domain where others constituted themselves as agentic. Further, within this domain existed discursive practices which provided the researchers with
positions that enabled them to carry through their negotiated lines of action whether they were insiders or outsiders. As a result of these negotiations they had differing positions and expectations/tasks offered to them.

From this analysis, it can be seen that through developing a research group by using Māori customary socio-political processes, the research participants become members of a research whānau of interest, which, as a metaphoric whānau, is a group constituted in terms understandable and controllable by Māori cultural practices. These whānau of interest determine the research questions and the methods of research, and they use Māori cultural processes for addressing and acknowledging the construction and validation/legitimization of knowledge. Further, the whānau of interest develops a collaborative approach to processing and constructing meaning/theorizing about the information, again by culturally constituted means. It is also important to recognize that whānau of interest are not isolated groups, but rather are constituted and conduct their endeavors in terms of the wider cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices of Māori cultural revitalization within which their projects are composed.

Spiral Discourse

Whānau of interest are developed by and use a Māori cultural process in both its literal and metaphoric senses. This process is termed here spiral discourse, a culturally constituted discursive practice which is found in many Māori cultural practices associated for example with hui (Māori formal meetings). A hui generally commences with a formal welcome (a powhiri), a welcome rich in cultural meaning, imagery, and practices which fulfill the enormously important task of recognizing the relative tapu (specialness; being with potentiality for power) and mana (power) of the two sides; the hosts and the visitors (Salmond, 1975; Shirres, 1982). Once the formal welcome is complete and once the participants have been ritually joined together by the process of the welcoming ceremony, hui participants move on to the discussion of the matter under consideration (the Kaupapa of the hui). 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, which further emphasizes the normality of a somatic approach to knowing in such a setting and within these processes.

The participants address the matters under consideration, under the guidance of respected and authoritative elders (kaumatua), whose primary function is to provide and monitor the correct spiritual and procedural framework within which the participants can discuss the issues before them. People get a chance to address the issue without fear of being interrupted. Generally the procedure is for people to speak one after another, in sequence of left to right. People get a chance to state and restate their meanings, to revisit their meanings, and to modify, delete, and adapt their meanings according to local customs (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 and spiritual, as in all Māori 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. Such procedures are time proven and to the participants are highly effective in dealing with contemporary issues and concerns of all kinds. The aim of a hui is to reach a 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 elders monitoring proceedings can tell when a constructed “voice” has been arrived at.

INITIATING RESEARCH USING MĀORI METAPHOR: REJECTING EMPOWERMENT

Addressing the self-determination of participants is embedded within many Māori cultural practices and understandings, for example, during the proceedings of a hui, one visible manifestation of this reality is seen in the way visitors make a contribution toward the cost of the meeting. This contribution is termed a koha. In the past, this koha was often a gift of food to contribute to the running of the hui; nowadays it is usually money that is laid down on the ground, by the last speaker of the visitors’ side, between the two groups of people who are coming together at the welcoming ceremony. The koha remains an important ritualized part of a ceremony that generally proceeds without too much trouble. What must not be forgotten, however, is that the reception of the koha is up to the hosts. The koha, as a gift or an offering of assistance towards the cost of running the hui, goes with the full mana (status/power) of the group so offering. It is placed in a position, such as laying it on the ground between the two groups coming together, so as to be able to be considered by the hosts. It is not often given into the hands of the hosts, but 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, that is to choose whether to pick it up or not.

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 visitors (manuhiri) by the process of the hongi and haruru (pressing noses and shaking hands). Symbolically, with the koha, the hosts are taking on the kaupapa (agenda) of the guests by accepting that which the manuhiri (guests) are bringing for debate and mediation. But overall it is important that the kaupapa (agenda) the guests laid down at the hui is now the “property” of the whole whānau. It is now the task of the whole whānau to deliberate the issues and to own the problems, 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.

By invoking these processes in their metaphoric sense, Kaupapa Māori research is conducted within the discursive practices of Māori culture. Figuratively, laying down a koha as a means of initiating research, for example, or of offering solutions to a problem, challenges notions of empowerment, which is a major concern within contemporary Western-defined research. It challenges what constitutes “self” and “other” in Western thought. Rather than figuratively saying “I am giving you power,”
or “I intend to empower you,” the laying down of a koha and stepping away for the others to consider your gift, means that your mana is intact, as is theirs and that you are acknowledging their power of self-determination. The three research projects referred to above all saw the researchers either laying out their potential contribution as a researcher, or asking a research participant to explain what has been observed in their classrooms or seeking the meaning that participants construct about their experiences as young people in secondary schools. In each of these cases, the researcher was indicating that they do not have the power to make sense of the events or experiences alone and indeed do not want anything from the relationship that is not a product of the relationship. In this way, it is up to the others to exert agency, to decide if they wish to “pick it up,” to explain the meanings of their own experiences on their own terms. Whatever they do, both sides have power throughout the process. Both sides have tapu (specialness) that is being acknowledged.

In this sense, researchers in Kaupapa Māori contexts are repositioned in such a way as no longer needing to seek to give voice to others, to empower others, to emancipate others, or to refer to others as subjugated voices, but rather to listen to and participate with those traditionally “othered” as constructors of meanings of their own experiences and agents of knowledge. Not wanting anything from the experience for one’s “self” is characteristic of what Schachtel (as cited in Heshusius, 1994) calls “allocentric knowing.” It is only when nothing is desired for the self, not even the desire to empower someone, that complete attention and participation in “kinship” terms is possible.

In such ways, researchers can participate in a process that facilitates the development in people of a sense of themselves as agentic and of having an authoritative voice. This is not a result of the researcher “allowing” this to happen or “empowering” participants. It is the function of the cultural context within which the research participants are positioned, negotiate, and conduct the research. In effect, the cultural context positions the participants by constructing the story-lines, and with them the cultural metaphors and images, as well as the “thinking as usual,” the talk/language through which research participants are constituted and researcher/researched relationships are organized. Thus, the joint development of new story-lines is a collaborative effort. The researcher and the researched together rewrite the constitutive metaphors of the relationship. What makes it Māori is that it is done using Māori metaphor within a Māori cultural context.

Such approaches are essential to move the power dynamics of research relationships for as was identified earlier, differential power relations among participants, while construed and understood as collaborative by the researcher, may still enable researcher concerns and interests to dominate how understandings are constructed. This can happen even within relations constructed as reciprocal, if the research outcome remains one determined by the researcher as a data-gathering exercise (Goldstein, 2000; Tripp, 1983). Where attempts at developing dialogue move beyond efforts to gather “data” and move towards mutual, symmetrical, dialogic construction of meaning within appropriate culturally constituted contexts, as is illustrated in the three examples introduced earlier, then the voice of the research participants is heard, and their agency is facilitated.
Such understandings seeks to address the self/other relationship by examining how researchers shift themselves from a “speaking for” position to a situation Michelle Fine (1994) describes as taking place “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). Fine (1994) 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).

Fine and her colleagues Weis, Weseen and Wong (2000) stress “that questions of responsibility-for-whom will, and should, forever be paramount” (p. 125). Reciprocity in indigenous research, however, is not just a political understanding, never an individual act, nor just a matter of refining and/or challenging the paradigms within which researchers work. It is the very world-view within which the researcher becomes immersed that holds the key to knowing. For example, establishing relationships and developing research whānau by invoking the processes of whakawhanaungatanga establishes interconnectedness, commitment, and engagement, within culturally constituted research practices by means of constitutive metaphor from within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Māori. It is the use of such metaphor that reorders the relationship of the researcher/researched from within, from one which focused on researcher as “self” and on the researched as “other” to one of a common consciousness of all research participants.

Similarly, a Kaupapa Māori approach suggests that concepts of “distance,” “detachment,” and “separation”, epistemological and methodological concerns that researchers have spent much time on in the recent past (Acker, Barry & Esseveld, 1991; Stacey, 1991; and Troyna & Carrington, 1992), do not characterise these research relationships in any way. Rather, Kaupapa Māori research experiences insist that the focus on “self” is blurred and that the focus turns to what Heshusius (1994) describes as a situation where “reality is no longer understood as truth to be interpreted but as mutually evolving” (p. 18). In an operational sense, it is suggested that researchers address the concerns and issues of the participants in ways that are understandable and able to be controlled by the research participants so that these concerns and issues also are, or become, those of the researchers. In other words, spiral discourse provides a means of effecting a qualitative shift in how participants relate to one another.

Sidorkin (2002) suggests that such understandings have major implications for how we understand the “self” and “invites us to think about the possibilities of a relational self” (p. 96), one where “only analysis of specific relations in their interaction can provide a glimpse of the meaning of the self” (p. 97). To this end Fitzsimons and Smith (2000) describe Kaupapa Māori philosophy as that which is “call[ing] for a relational identity through an interpretation of kinship and genealogy and current day events, but not a de-contextualised retreat to a romantic past” (p. 39).
This re-ordering of what constitutes the research relationship with its implications and challenges of the essential enlightenment-generated self is not on terms or within understandings constructed by the researcher, however well intentioned contemporary impulses to “empower” the “other” might be. From an indigenous perspective such impulses are misguided and perpetuate neo-colonial sentiments. In other words, rather than researcher-determined criteria for participation as a research process, whakawhanaungatanga uses Māori cultural practices, such as those found in hui, to set the pattern for research relationships, collaborative storying being but one example of this principle in practice. Whakawhanaungatanga as a research process uses methods and principles similar to those used to establish relationships among Māori people. These principles are invoked to address the means of research initiation, to establish 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.

Kincheloe and McLaren (2000) demonstrate how developments in critical ethnography as one example, have benefited from such new understandings of culture and cultural practices and processes, used in both literal and figurative senses, to identify “possibilities for cultural critique, that have been opened up by the current blurring and mixing of disciplinary genres-those that emphasize experience, subjectivity, reflexivity and dialogical understanding” (p. 302). One major benefit from such analysis is that social life is “not viewed as preontologically available for the researcher to study” (p. 302). They suggest that this is a major breakthrough in the domain of critical theory which previously remained rooted in the western-based dialectic of binary analysis of oppositional pairings which viewed emancipation in terms of emancipating ‘others’ (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2000), and in many cases conflated economic marginalization with ethnicity and gender and other axes of domination (See Bishop and Glynn, 1999, Chapter 2, for a detailed critique of this approach in New Zealand).

ADDRESSING ISSUES OF REPRESENTATION AND LEGITIMATION:
A NARRATIVE APPROACH

Interviewing as Collaborative Storying (Bishop, 1997) as used in the three studies identified earlier, addresses what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) identify as the twin crises of qualitative research; representation and legitimation by suggesting that rather than there being distinct stages in the research from gaining access to data gathering to data processing, there is a process of continually revisiting the agenda and the sense-making processes of the research participants within the interview. In this way, meanings are negotiated and co-constructed between the research participants within the cultural frameworks of the discourses within which they are positioned. This process is captured by the image of a spiral. The concept of the spiral not only speaks in culturally preferred terms, the fern or koru, but it also indicates that the accumulation is always reflexive. This means that the discourse always returns to the original initiators where control lies.

Mishler (1986) and Ryan (1999) explain these ideas further by suggesting that in order to construct meaning it is necessary to appreciate how meaning is grounded in,
FREEING OURSELVES FROM NEO-COLONIAL DOMINATION

and constructed through, discourse. Discursive practice is contextually, 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” (Mishler, 1986, p. 65). Or to put it another way, “meaning is constructed in the dialogue between individuals and the images and symbols they perceive” (Ryan, 1999, p. 11). A ‘community of interest’ between researchers and participants, call them what you will, cannot be created unless the interview, as one example, 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 realized 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).

This analysis suggests that when interviewing, perhaps one of the most commonly used qualitative methods, there needs to be 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 maximizes researcher interpretation, editorial control and ownership by introducing researcher coding and analysis in the form often referred to as “grounded theory” (after Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This chapter suggests there is a third position where the ‘coding’ procedure is established and developed by the research participants as a process of storying and restorying, that is the co-joint construction of further meaning within a sequence of interviews. In other words, there is an attempt within the interview or rather within a series of in-depth, semi-structured interviews as “conversations” (see Bishop, 1996, 1997), to actually co-construct a mutual understanding by means of sharing experiences and meanings.

The three examples of research outlined at the start of this chapter all used research approaches associated with the process of Collaborative Storying so that the research participants were able to recollect, reflect and to make sense of their experiences within their own cultural context and in particular their own language, hence being able to position themselves within those discourses wherein explanations/meanings lie. In such ways their interpretations and analyses become ‘normal’ and ‘accepted’ as opposed to those of the researcher being what is legitimate.

Indeed when indigenous cultural ways of knowing and aspirations in this case for self-determination are central to the creation of the research context, then the situation goes beyond empowerment to one where sense making, decision making and theorizing takes place in situations that are ‘normal’ to the research participants rather than constructed by the researcher. Of course, the major implication for researchers is that they should be able to participate in these sense-making contexts rather than expecting the research participants to engage in theirs, emphasizing, as Tillman (2002, p. 3) suggests, the centrality of culture to the research process and identifies “the multi-dimensional aspects of African-American cultures(s) and the
possibilities for the resonance of the cultural knowledge of African-Americans in educational research” (p. 4).

This is not to suggest that only interviews as Collaborative Stories are able to address Māori concerns and aspirations for self-determination. Indeed, Sleeter (2000) has even argued that “quantitative research can be used for liberatory as well as oppressive ends” (p. 240). Indeed, this author’s experiences when researching within secondary schools demonstrates that given that the level of negotiation that is described here as occurring through the process of spiral discourse occurs “with full regard for local complexities, power relations and previously ignored life experiences” (Sleeter, 2001, p. 241), then powerful outcomes are possible using a variety of research approaches. What is fundamental is not the approach per se, but rather establishing and maintaining relationships that address the power of the participants to self-determination.

Hence the usefulness of the notion of Collaborative Storying as a generic approach, not just as a research method that speaks of a re-ordering of the relationships between the researchers and research participants. An understanding that Sidorkin (2002) suggests addresses power imbalances because “[r]elations cannot belong to one thing: they are the joint property of at least two things” (p. 94). In this way deconstructing research practices that Scheurich and Young (1997) describe as arising out of the “social history and culture of the dominant race” [that] “reflect and reinforce that social history and the controlling position of that racial group” (p. 13) and as a result are epistemologically racist in that they deny the relational constructedness of the world in order to promote and maintain the hegemony of one of the supposed partners.

APPROACHES TO AUTHORITY AND VALIDITY

Many of the problems identified above arise from researchers positioning themselves within modernist discourses. It is essential to challenge modernist discourses with their concomitant concerns regarding validity, including strategies such as objectivity/subjectivity, replicability, and external measures for validity. These discourses are so pervasive that Māori/indigenous 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. As bell hooks (1993) explains, the Black Power movement in the United States in the 1960s 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 the ways they affected the condition of Black people, issues such as patriarchy were left un-addressed within the Black Liberation movement. bell hooks insists that unless Black people 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 color” would prefer.

Indeed, Linda Tillman (2002) promotes a culturally sensitive research approach for African-Americans that focuses on “how African Americans understand and experience the world” (p. 4) that promotes the use of an approach to qualitative research wherein “interpretative paradigms offer greater possibilities for the use of alternative
frameworks, co-construction of multiple realities and experiences, and knowledge that can lead to improved educational opportunities for African Americans (p. 5).

Yet historically, traditional forms of non-reflective research conducted within what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) term as positivist and post-positivist frames of reference perpetuate problems of outsiders determining what is valid for Māori. This occurs by the very process of employing non- Māori methodological frameworks and conventions for writing about such research processes and outcomes. For example, Lincoln and Denzin (1994) argue that 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 externalized rules are the criteria by which the validity of a text is then judged. 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 re-presenting the text as an authoritative re-presentation of the experiences of others by using a system of researcher-determined and -dominated coding and analytical tools.

Ballard (1994) referring to Donmoyer’s work, suggests that formulaic research procedures are rarely in fact useful 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” (pp. 301–302). Further, personal knowledge and personal experience can be seen as crucial in the application of research findings is filtered through the prior knowledge, feelings, and intuitions we already have. Donmoyer (as cited in Ballard, 1994) proposes that experience compounds, and this compounded knowledge/experience, when brought to a new task, provides for the occurrence of an even more complex process of understandings. Experience builds on and compounds experience, and, as Ballard suggests, this is why there is such value placed on colleagues with experience in the Pākehā world and on kaumatua (elders) in the Māori world.

A related, and somewhat more complex danger of referring to an existing methodology of participation is that 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, take control over what constitutes legitimacy and validity, that is, what authority is claimed for the text will be removed from the participants- thus, with such recipes comes the danger of outsiders controlling what constitutes reality for other people.

It is important to note, though, that the Kaupapa Māori approach does suggest that all knowledge is completely relative, but rather suggests, as Heshusius (1996) does, that:

the self of the knower and the larger self of the community of inquiry are, from the very starting point, intimately woven into the very fabric of that which
we claim as knowledge and of what we agree to be the proper ways by which we make knowledge claims. It is to say that the knower and the known are one movement. Moreover, any inquiry is an expression of a particular other-self relatedness (p. 618).

Kaupapa Māori research, based in a different world-view from that of the dominant discourse makes this political statement while at the same time rejecting a meaningless relativism by acknowledging the need to recognize and address the ongoing effects of racism and colonialism in the wider society.

Kaupapa Māori rejects outside control over what constitutes the text’s call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Māori position promotes what Lincoln and Denzin (1994) term 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” (p. 578). Such an approach to validity locates the power within Māori 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 in reference to the cultural context within which it operates.

As was explained above, Māori people have always had criteria for evaluating whether a process or a product is valid for them. 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-honored and proven principles. 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, as described earlier, the meeting of two groups of people at a hui on a marae involves acknowledgment 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 customs, which are the correct ways to address these principles of kawa. Tikanga (customs) 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.

Just as Māori practices are epistemologically validated within Māori cultural contexts, so are Kaupapa Māori research practices and texts. Research conducted within a Kaupapa Māori framework has rules established as taonga tuku iho which are protected and maintained by the tapu of Māori cultural practices, such as the multiplicity of rituals within the hui and within the central cultural processes of whanaungatanga. Further, the use of these concepts as constitutive research metaphors is subject to the same culturally determined processes of validation, the same rules concerning knowledge, its production, and its representation as are the literal phenomena. Therefore, the verification of a text, the authority of a text, the quality of its
representation of the experiences and perspective of the participants are judged by criteria constructed and constituted within the culture.

By using such Māori concepts as whānau, hui, and whakawhanaungatanga as metaphors for the research process itself, Kaupapa Māori research invokes and claims authority for the processes and for the texts that are produced in terms of the principles, processes, and practices that govern such events in their literal sense. Metaphoric whānau are governed by the same principles and processes that govern a literal whānau and, as such, are understandable to and controllable by Māori people. Literal whānau have means of addressing contentious issues, resolving conflicts, constructing narratives, telling stories, raising children, and addressing economic and political issues, and, contrary to popular non-Māori opinion, such practices change over time to reflect changes going on in the wider world. Research whānau-of-interest also conduct their deliberations in a whānau style. Kaumatua preside, others get their say according to who they are, and positions are defined in terms of how this will benefit the whānau.

Subjectivities/Objectivities

As was identified above, an indigenous Kaupapa Māori approach to research challenges colonial and neo-colonial discourses that inscribe “otherness.” Much quantitative research has dismissed, marginalized, or maintained control over the voice of others by insistence on the imposition of researcher-determined positivist and neo-positivist evaluatory criteria, internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Nonetheless, a paradigm shift to qualitative research does not necessarily obviate this problem. Much qualitative research has also maintained a colonizing discourse of the “other” by seeking to hide the researcher/writer under a veil of neutrality or of objectivity or subjectivity, a situation where the interests, concerns, and power of the researcher to determine the outcome of the research remain hidden in the text (Davies & Harré, 1990).

Objectivity, “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, as cited in Tripp, 1983, p. 32) is a denial of identity. Just as identity to Māori people is tied up with being part of a whānau, a hapu, an iwi, in the research relationship, membership in a metaphoric whānau of interest also provides its members with identity and hence the ability to participate. In Thayer-Bacon’s (1997) view, “we develop a sense of ‘self’ through our relationships with others” (p. 241). For Māori researchers to stand aside from involvement in such a sociopolitical organization is to stand aside from one’s identity. This would signal the ultimate victory of colonisation. For non-Māori researchers, denial of membership of the research whānau of interest is, similarly, to deny them a means of identification and hence participation within the projects. Further, for non-Māori researchers to stand aside from participation in these terms is to promote colonization, albeit participation in ways defined by indigenous peoples may well pose difficulties for them. What is certain is that merely shifting one’s position within the Western-dominated research domain need not address questions of interest to Māori people,
because paradigm shifting is really a concern from another world-view. Non-Māori researchers need to seek inclusion on Māori terms, in terms of kin/metaphoric kin relationships and obligations, that is, within Māori constituted practices and understandings in order to establish their identity within research projects.

This does not mean, however, that instead, researchers need to try to control their subjectivities. Heshusius (1994) suggests that managing subjectivity is just as problematic for qualitative researchers as managing objectivity is for the positivists. Esposito and Murphy (2000) similarly raise this problem of the preoccupation of many researchers who while ostensibly locating themselves within critical race theory for example, remain focused “strictly on subjectivity” and employ analytic tools “to interpret the discursive exchanges that, in the end, silence the study participants… [because] The investigator’s subjectivity replaces the co-produced knowledge her research presumably represents” (p. 180).

This 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 (1994) argues that the displacement of “objective positivism” by qualitative concerns about managing and controlling subjectivities perpetuates the fundamental notion that knowing is possible through constructing and regulating distance, a belief that presumes that the knower is separable from the known, a belief that is anathema to many indigenous peoples’ ways of knowing. 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. Intellectualizing “the other’s impact on self” perpetuates the notion of distance, validates the notion of “false consciousness” in others, emancipation as a project, “othering” as a process, and reduces the self-other relationship to one that is mechanistic and methodological.

Operationally, 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?” (p. 15). Both these positions address “meaningful” epistemological and methodological questions of the researcher’s 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 Māori schooling experiences 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? The message is that you have to ‘live’ the context in which it happens. For example, the third study referred to before, Te Kotahitanga (Bishop et al., 2003), attempts to provide teachers with a means of critically reflecting on their positioning in respect to deficit thinking and racism by providing them with previously unheard testimonios of students’ experience.

Preoccupations with managing and controlling one’s subjectivities also stand in contrast with Berman’s historical analysis (as cited in Heshusius p. 16), which
suggests 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 states 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” (Heshusius, 1994, p. 16).

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). The three examples of Kaupapa Māori research projects identified earlier demonstrate that the researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in a group process, a process whereby the researcher becomes part of a research whānau, limiting the development of insider/outsider dualisms. To be involved somatically means to be involved bodily, that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually, not just in one’s capacity as a ‘researcher’ concerned with methodology. Such involvement is constituted as a way of knowing that is fundamentally different from the concepts of personal investment and collaboration as suggested in traditional approaches to research. For, while it appears that ‘personal investment’ is essential, this personal investment is not on terms determined by the ‘investor’. The investment is on terms mutually understandable and controllable by all participants, so that the investment is reciprocal and could not be otherwise. The ‘personal investment’ by the researcher is not an act by an individual agent but emerges out of the context within which the research is constituted.

The process of colonization developed an alienated and alienating mode of consciousness and, thus, has tried to take away a fundamental principle of life from Māori people- that we do not objectify nature, nor do we subjectify nature. 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 know that there is a way of knowing that is different from that which was taught to those colonized into the Western way of thought. We know about a way that is born of time, connectedness, kinship, commitment, and participation.

EPILOGUE

Throughout this chapter, a number of issues of power relations have been canvassed. Table 2 provides a series of critical questions as a means of evaluation that researchers and research participants can use to evaluate power relations prior to and during the research activity.

The text identified that researchers and research participants need a means whereby they can critically reflect upon the five issues of power that are identified in Table 1. This table provides such a means through a series of critical questions that can be considered prior, during and after a research project.
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Table 2. A means of evaluating research

| Initiation | Researchers and research participants need to critically reflect upon modes of initiation including the processes of defining and determining the research questions, the goals of the project, who sets the goals and who designs the work. Above all the research participants need to critically consider whose agendas, concerns and interests have generated the research and how and in what way this has been negotiated. |
| Benefits | Researchers and research participants need to critically question what benefits will there be and who will actually benefit from the research and in what way. How will this research support and promote Māori/indigenous people’s cultural and language aspirations? Above all, will this research make a difference for Māori/indigenous people? How and in what ways? |
| Representation | This concern is about whose ‘voice’ is heard; about who has the power to define the lived realities of Māori/indigenous peoples. Researchers and research participants need to consider whose interests, agendas and concerns the text represents. How were the means of depicting cultural realities generated? And by whom? With what knowledge? Further considerations include what agendas do the participants have? And what are they really saying? |
| Legitimation | Researchers and participants need to consider who has the authority to produce research texts, and who defines what is accurate, true and complete in a text. Who is going to gather and process the data? Who is going to be involved in the analysis of the data? Who is going to theorize the data. |
| Accountability | Who are researchers accountable to? What are the protocols of accountability? Who is to have access to the research findings? And for what purpose? Who has control over the distribution of the new knowledge? And what systems of control are there for research participants? |

NOTES
1 This chapter is reproduced with permission from Bishop, 1998a; 1998b and 2005.
2 Two peoples created Aotearoa/New Zealand when in 1840 Lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the chiefs of New Zealand signed the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of the British Crown and the Māori descendants of New Zealand. The Treaty is seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision-making processes of this country and for Māori determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand (Walker, 1990). The history of Māori and Pākehā relations since the signing of the Treaty has not been one of partnership, of two peoples developing a nation, but one of domination by Pākehā and marginalization of the Māori people (Bishop, 1991b; Simon, 1990; Walker, 1990). This has created the myth of our being “one people” with equal opportunities (Hohepa, 1975; Simon, 1990; Walker, 1990). Results of this domination are evident today in the lack of equitable participation by Māori in
all positive and beneficial aspects of life in New Zealand and by their over-representation in the negative aspects (Pomare, 1988; Simon, 1990). In education for example, the central government’s sequential policies of Assimilation, Integration, and Multiculturalism (Irwin, 1989; Jones et al., 1990) and Taha Māori (Holmes, Bishop, & Glynn, 1993; G. Smith, 1990), while concerned for the welfare of Māori people, effectively stress the need for Māori people to subjugate their destiny to the needs of the nation-state, whose goals are determined by the Pākehā majority.

Traditional is used here to denote that “tradition” of research that has grown in New Zealand as a result of the dominance of the Western world-view in research institutions. Māori means of accessing, defining, and protecting knowledge, however, existed before European arrival. Such Māori cultural processes were protected by the Treaty of Waitangi, subsequently marginalized, but are today legitimised within Māori cultural discursive practice.

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 behaviors 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).

Irwin (1992a) argues that prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the colonisation of New Zealand there existed a “complex, vibrant Māori education system” which had “Māori 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 Māori 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 (Davies & Nicholl, 1993; Jones et al., 1990). 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, 1992a), have been unable to “successfully validate matauranga Māori, leaving it marginalised and in a precarious state” (Irwin, 1992a, p. 10). Further, while mainstream schooling does not serve Māori people well (Davies & Nicholl, 1993), the Māori schooling initiatives of Te Kohanga reo (Māori medium pre-schools), Kura Kaupapa Māori (Māori medium primary schools), Whare Kura (Māori medium secondary schools), and Whare Wananga (Māori tertiary institutions) “which have developed from within Māori communities to intervene in Māori language, cultural, educational, social and economic crises are successful in the eyes of the Māori people” (Smith, 1992, p. 1, emphasis added).

Whānau is a primary concept (a cultural preference) that underlies narratives of Kaupapa Māori research practice. This concept contains both values (cultural aspirations) and social processes (cultural practices). The root word of whānau literally means family in its broad “extended” sense. However, the word “whānau” is increasingly being used in a metaphoric sense (Metge, 1990). This generic concept of whānau subsumes other related concepts: whanaunga (relatives), whanaungatanga (relationships), whakawhanaungatanga (the process of establishing relationships), and whakapapa (literally, the means of establishing relationships). (The prefix “whaka” means “to make;” the suffix “tanga” has a naming function). It is important to emphasize at this point that the use of Māori cultural practices (literally and/or metaphorically) in research might lead those not familiar with New Zealand to question how relevant such an analysis is to the lived realities of Māori people today. As Māori people today are a fourth world nation or nations, that is, within a larger entity, it is more a matter of degree as to who participates and when they participate. So rather than being able to quantify which portion of the Māori population still acts in this way, it is perhaps more realistic to say that most do at some time. For some, it might be only at funerals or weddings; others, of course, (albeit a small proportion) live this way all the time, but increasingly more and more Māori people are participating in (for example) Kaupapa Māori educational initiatives, and these are all run in a Māori manner. So most people do sometimes, some all the time, others not so often. What is perhaps more critical is that most Māori people are able to understand the processes and are able to participate. Much is said of the impact of urbanization on Māori people and the removal of young people from their tribal roots and the consequent decline in language abilities and cultural understandings. It is a
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measure of the strength of the whānau (the extended family) and the strength of genealogical linkages, however, that when Māori people gather, the hui (formal meetings) process is usually the one that is used, almost as a “default setting,” despite more than a century of colonisation. Indeed, it is a measure of the strength of these cultural practices and principles that they have survived the onslaught of the last 150 years. It is to these underlying strengths that I turn also as inspiration for developing an approach to Māori research. So my argument is not an attempt to identify “past practices” or reassemble a romantic past, but rather to present Māori cultural practices that are guided by the messages from the past. Māori, along with many other indigenous people, are guided by the principle of guidance from the ancestors. It is not a matter of studying how people did it in the past but more an ongoing dynamic interactive relationship between those of us alive today as the embodiment of all those who have gone before. It seems to me that, in practice, Māori cultural practices are alive and well and that, when used either literally or metaphorically, they enable Māori people to understand and control what is happening.

7 Eminent Māori scholar, Rose Pere (1991) describes the key qualities of a hui as “respect, consideration, patience, and cooperation. 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 criticized 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).

8 People often use the term kawa to refer to marae protocols. For example, at the time of whaikorero (ritualized speechmaking), 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 follows. Other tribes prefer to follow a tikanga termed utuutu, where hosts and visitors alternate. 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 the practice of the kawa being handed down from those who have gone before about the need to recognize the tapu of people, their mana, their wairua, and the mauri of the place and events. See Salmond, *Hui: A Study of Māori Ceremonial Greetings* (1975) for a detailed ethnographic study.

9 Donna Awatere (1981) and Kathie Irwin (1992b) are two Māori 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 Māori feminisms they have critiqued modernist issues from a Māori world-view in Māori ways. Awatere critiqued white modernist feminists for hegemonically voicing Māori feminist concerns as identical to their own. Kathie Irwin’s critique addressed the question that is vexatious to non-Māori modernist feminists of “Why don’t women speak on a marae?” She responded with other questions such as “What do you mean by speaking? … Is a karanga not speaking?” and “Who is defining what speaking is?” She asserts that rather than taking an essentialist position, the validity of a text written about Māori women “speaking” on a marae is understandable only in terms of the rules established within Māori cultural practices associated with marae protocols. In this she is not only addressing a Māori issue but is also addressing modernist feminists in poststructural terms of epistemological validity.