

DOCTORAL THESIS RESEARCH PROPOSAL
Department of Political Studies

Provisional title of the thesis: Contemporary Māori Political Participation

Abstract:

This PhD thesis seeks to examine the contemporary methods of political participation used by Māori to influence central government policy. The research has three main objectives. Initially it seeks to understand the current political practices of Māori people and what influences and informs their method of political participation. Secondly it will examine any changes in political participation over time by entering into a historical overview of Māori civic engagement. Thirdly, it seeks to understand how the existing theories on political participation are able to account for the case of Māori as an indigenous minority group. In particular it will focus on whether or not the process of colonisation experienced by Māori has impacted on their political behaviours, and how the notion of colonisation fits within the current theories. This research is primarily qualitative, guided by Kaupapa Māori methodology, although aspects of quantitative research will be used to determine the current state of Māori political participation.

Names, ranks and positions of supervisors/advisors:

Primary Supervisor: Associate Professor Raymond Miller
Department of Political Studies
The University of Auckland

Secondary Supervisor Associate Professor Ann Sullivan
Department of Māori Studies
The University of Auckland

Objectives and aims:

This PhD thesis seeks to examine the contemporary methods of political participation used by Māori to influence central government policy. The research has three main objectives. Initially it seeks to understand the current political practices of Māori people and what influences and informs their method of political participation. Secondly it will examine any changes in political participation over time by entering into a historical overview of Māori civic engagement. Thirdly, it seeks to understand how the existing theories on political participation are able to account for the case of Māori as an indigenous minority group.

Political participation in its broadest sense encapsulates any action by an individual which either directly or indirectly influences the selection of government personnel and/or the actions they take.¹ For the purposes of this research project I will only be examining methods of participation that are targeting central government actions and actors through the following avenues:

1. Participation through voting
2. Participation through political party membership and activism
3. Participation through interest group membership and activism
4. Participation through direct contact with government officials
5. Participation through protest

This list is representative of both conventional and unconventional methods of participation. It also covers the primary avenues for participation as discussed in the current literature in this area. Conventional methods are those democratic methods of participation that allow people to influence government through avenues such as voting, petitions, interest group and political party membership and activism; There is contention over the definition of unconventional participation. Some authors argue that unconventional methods are those that are considered to be initiated outside of the usual methods of participation such as protest movements and other forms of activism.² Other authors argue however, that protest (at the very least legal forms of protest) are accepted as being part of the State mechanism and are therefore also considered to be conventional. For the purposes of this research, I have chosen to use the distinction between conventional and unconventional as offered by McAllister³ because it provides a clear distinction between insider/State initiated processes and those which could be considered forms of activism instigated by the activists. It is important that this project examine both forms of participation to assess the nature, scope and extent of Māori political behaviour.

The primary thrust of this research is on contemporary political participation, and therefore the examination of this issue related to Māori shall begin from 1996 onwards, the year that Mixed Member Proportion (MMP) was first used in a central government election in New Zealand. Due to the emphasis of this research being on understanding why and how Māori use particular methods of participation, it is important to note that issues related to Māori indigenous status, and rights of citizenship associated with this status cannot be explored without providing historical context, thus a brief examination of historical issues as related to the overall theme of this thesis will be examined, to place these contemporary practices in context.

¹ Verba, S. & Nie, N., *Participation in America*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1972, p2.

² McAllister, I., *Political Behaviour*. Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1992, pp 51-53

³ Ibid pp 51-53

The nature of the research requires that issues related to democracy, citizenship, participation and representation be examined, thus these key bodies of knowledge will provide theoretical context through which this examination will be conducted. This theoretical basis shall be further supported through empirical research which will take the form of qualitative research interviews to gauge, with confidence, the current Māori political consciousness. In addition to this, access to New Zealand Electoral Study data will allow me to conduct some quantitative research to provide a broad overview of some aspects of electoral participation in New Zealand.

It is my primary intention that this thesis explore important issues around Māori participation within the political system. The questions I hope to answer through this examination are:

- Why do Māori choose to participate within the political system, or equally importantly why not?
- What shape or form does this participation take?
- What informs the method and form of political participation?
- What are the mobilising factors associated with Māori political participation?
- Has Māori political participation changed over time?

Despite voter-turnout being consistently lower for Māori than for non-Māori⁴, I hypothesise that Māori are highly engaged in political activities. These activities however fall outside of the conventional forms of participation such as voting and move into the area of unconventional activism. This thesis would therefore support the argument put forward by Norris that civic engagement is not declining, rather it is changing form.⁵

I further advance that current theories on political participation only partially account for Māori political behaviours. The Resource model developed by Brady, Verba and Lehman Schlozman advances that socio-economic and cultural factors impact on the resources that individuals have which in turn affect the method of participation they choose to engage in.⁶ The Mobilisation model developed by Rosenstone & Hansen embeds participation in a social context arguing that citizen engagement happens as a result of mobilisation and social pressure.⁷ The theory of modernization advances that political participation is inherently linked to cultural, economic and institutional changes and as society evolves so too do their methods of participation.⁸ The Social learning model argues again that social context be taken into account and that experiences of the individual, including parental socialisation impact on political participation.

These models offer some explanation of Māori political participation as they do account for socio-economic status, social context and some aspects of culture. I

⁴ <http://www.elections.org.nz/Māori-research-rfp-jan06.html>

⁵ Norris, P., *Democratic Phoenix*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

⁶ Brady, H., Verba, S., & Lehman Schlozman, K., 'Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation' in *The American Political Science Review*, June 1995; 89,2,pp271-294

⁷ Rosenstone, S. & Hansen, J, *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York, Longman Publishers, 1996, pp22-24

⁸ Lerner, D., *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the East*. New York, Free Press, 1958.

believe however that the process of colonisation which may have informed Māori methods of participation is not adequately articulated through these existing theories in that they do not seem to acknowledge the role of the state and government itself in shaping the way in which groups and or individuals choose to participate. Norris argues that the state structure is important in establishing the avenues for participation, and gains significance in political participation theory through this purpose.⁹ In the case of indigenous minorities the State structure is also the issue that is contested, therefore adding another dimension to the role of the state in motivation and method of political engagement. At this stage of the research this is no more than a radical theory, however it is one that I wish to further investigate through this research.

So far there has been very little critique of these theories from an indigenous minority perspective and I believe there is scope for an investigation of this nature. It is my intention that this PhD thesis not only extend our knowledge of Māori political behaviour, but also test the current theories of participation and how well they fit in the case of indigenous minority groups.

Political Participation Theory

Democracy is based on the notion that all citizens have the right to participate in the managing of political affairs, and that every citizens input is of equal importance. This basic assumption clearly places emphasis on public participation in maintaining a stable democracy.¹⁰ The level of public participation, however, is highly contested, with many theorists arguing that too much public participation would overwhelm and ultimately cripple democratic systems.¹¹ On the other hand, others who favour high levels of participation argue that more citizen involvement leads to greater representation.¹²

Regardless of these disagreements over the utopian level of participation, there is widespread agreement amongst scholars that, at the very least, *some* participation is necessary to maintain democratic systems. The ways in which citizens participate vary greatly and depending on the method used, influence political decision making at varying levels. The method of political participation is key in controlling public influence over political affairs, and therefore is also an integral part of maintaining democracy, whether it be ‘thin’ (low levels of participation) or ‘robust’ (high levels of participation).¹³

High levels of participation or ‘robust’ democracy is argued by some theorists to enhance democracy through providing the opportunity for more issues to be represented during decision making.¹⁴ The notion of widespread participation was first advanced by classical theorists Rousseau, Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau in the development of the concept of ‘general will’ argued that there should

⁹ Norris, P., op. cit. pp 25-26

¹⁰ It is not the only requirement of a stable democracy, however it has been argued by many scholars of political participation to be of central importance.

¹¹ Vowles, J. ‘Electoral Participation’ in Vowles, J., Aimer, P., Catt, H., Lamane, J., Miller, R. (eds.) *Towards Consensus..* Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1995, p 151.

¹² Ibid p 151.

¹³ Ibid p 151.

¹⁴ Vowles, J., op. cit. p 137.

be equal participation by all citizens, and that education was a key component in the raising awareness of civic duty and obligation.¹⁵

Tocqueville & Mill, while also proponents of popular political participation, feared tyranny of the majority, and therefore sought to devise mechanisms to control participation in order to avert any potential tyrannical tendencies.¹⁶ While Mill advanced control mechanisms such as plural voting for the educated, literacy tests for voter eligibility and restrictions of votes to taxpayers,¹⁷ Tocqueville pursued pluralism through the decentralisation of power, and the promotion of public participation through interest groups, voluntary organisations and other associations that allowed for local decision-making.¹⁸

In contrast to these theories promoting increased public participation, are those that promote limited participation. For proponents of 'thin' democracy high levels of citizen participation can saturate political leaders with demands that they should not and can not meet, therefore putting pressure on the political system.¹⁹

Some theorists emerged in opposition to widespread political participation, arguing instead that democracy is maintained through elite competition. This followed from the realisation that many citizens and voters were socialised through their families, and many had little knowledge of policy, parties & candidates.²⁰ Democratic elitism (which became popular following the rise of fascism after the first world war and the demise of democracy in Italy and Germany), therefore favours elections between parties as competing elites. It argues that government is best left for those elites who are knowledgeable about political affairs; those with little knowledge about politics should be discouraged from voting; and stable democracies are those where there is little public participation, favouring public apathy over activism.²¹

Despite tensions around the optimum level of public participation, there is widespread acceptance that there should be some level of participation in order to ensure stable democracy, as of course the notion itself is founded on the premise that all citizens be able to input into political decision making. Studies in recent years have therefore moved away from the examination of implications to democracy and have focused on the question of how and why citizens participate politically. Understanding the 'why' and 'how' variables of political participation has required some understanding of the notion of political participation itself. Different definitions lend themselves to different understandings of how people participate, or in other words the *forms of participation*.

Verba & Nie in the first major study on political participation defined it as "those activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take."²² Subsequently, the

¹⁵ McAllister, I., op. cit. pp 51-53.

¹⁶ Ibid, pp 52-53.

¹⁷ Mill, John Stewart, *Utilitarianism, Liberty & Representative Government* London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1910, p 276.

¹⁸ Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*. New York, Vintage Books, 1990, p 323.

¹⁹ Vowles, op. cit. p 137

²⁰ Schumpeter, J., *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*. London, Unwin University Books, 1954.

²¹ Bachrach, P., *The Theory of Democratic Elitism: A Critique*. Boston, Brown, 1967.

²² Verba, S., & Nie, N., op. cit. p 2.

definition of participation was altered to include only those *legal* acts by private citizens to influence government.²³ The second, a more limited view of participation that included voting, campaign activity and particularised contacts.²⁴

Rosenstone & Hansen put forward the definition that “political participation is action directed explicitly toward influencing the distribution of social good and social values.”²⁵ A broad definition which includes not only the actions of individual citizens, but also actions of public officials, direct and indirect methods of exerting pressure, and legal and non-legal²⁶ forms of participation. One such form of participation included within this definition is the membership and involvement in interest groups. These modes of participation fall within the category of *conventional* forms of participation.²⁷ *Unconventional* forms of participation include protest movements, and forms of political action that are considered to be semi-legal to illegal.²⁸

All these forms of participation are used in varying levels across and within democracies. They also have varying levels of influence over public policy or government action. The most common act of political participation is voting. Voting uses a majority of citizens, and is considered to be a direct method of influencing political process.²⁹ Despite this, voting is arguably not the most influential form of participation that an individual may exercise. The measure of influence over government action has been articulated by McAllistair as follows:

Political influence is considered to be the degree of pressure that the method places on decision-makers to comply with the demands placed on them, together with the amount of detail information that is conveyed to decision-makers about the particular demands.³⁰

McAllistair provides a framework through which modes of participation can be measured by influence, with unconventional methods of participation (i.e. protest) wielding more influence than other forms of participation such as personal contact, voting and community and campaign activity.³¹

Despite the low level of influence associated with voting, there has been much research into voter-turnout and voting patterns. This is because voting is the most common form of participation. One theory which attempts to explain why people vote is the *rational choice* theory, initially developed by Downs (1957).³² The theory

²³ Verba, S., & Nie, N., & Kim, J., *Participation and Political Enquiry*. London, Cambridge University Press, 1978, p 46.

²⁴ Ibid pp 53-55.

²⁵

²⁶ The use of the term non-legal is deliberate, as this term is intended to include both illegal acts as well as semi-legal.

²⁷ McAllister, op. cit. pp 51-53.

²⁸ Barnes, S., & Kaase, M., *Political Action*. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1979, pp 27-57.

²⁹ McAllister, op. cit. p 54.

³⁰ Ibid p 56.

³¹ Ibid p 57.

³² Downs, A., *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York, Harper and Row, 1957.

argues that a citizen decides to vote if the benefit of voting outweighs the cost.³³ Riker and Ordeshook extended this theory in 1968 by stating:

...that the net benefit of voting to any individual is equal to the benefits of the preferred election outcome to that individual times the probability that his or her vote will affect that outcome less the cost of voting, or

$$R = BP - C.^{34}$$

This Riker and Ordeshook model assumed that the only benefits of significance, are those benefits to the individual who is considering the act of voting. The theory however was challenged as further research discovered a need to account for the social context in which the individual was embedded.³⁵ The rational choice theory has been repeatedly challenged and extended several times. Despite this, the rational choice model remains a prevalent theory to explain why people vote.

There are other theories that attempt to explain why people vote, however these theories have been developed to describe political participation at large. One theory known as the *resource* model argues that political participation is dependent on resources at the disposal of the individual.³⁶ These resources specifically include time, money and civic skills. The resources that an individual has will dictate how, and how much they choose to participate politically.

In essence, this theory argues that differential access to resources ultimately results in some citizens possessing more political influence than others.³⁷ For example, an individual who is literate and possesses civic skills will have the ability to write to a member of parliament, make a submission to a select-committee, organise interest groups etc. An illiterate person, or someone who does not possess the same level of civic understanding will not be able to participate in the same way. On the other hand, an illiterate person may possess time or money which they may choose to donate to a political party or cause. The individual may still participate although how they participate is different. A political party illustrates this model through its members. Some party members donate time, others donate money, and others civic skills. The rate at which each of these three things are donated vary from party to party. For example the Māori Party has a high number of active members, although it has very little financial resources. Another political party may have fewer active members and significantly more financial resources, such as ACT.

The resource theory has been criticised by Blais 2000 as over-emphasising the cost of participation without due consideration of the benefits of participation (as the rational choice model takes into account). I would argue however, that the resource model itself does not seek to understand why people choose to participate, but rather how. In addition, I also believe that another resource has been ignored by this model, that being political interest, as this as a variable may also influence the individual to choose a particular method of participation. While one might argue that civic skill,

³³ Blais, A., *To Vote or Not to Vote*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000, p 1.

³⁴ Franklin, M., *Voter Turnout and Dynamics of Electoral Competition*. London, Cambridge University Press, 2004, p 38.

³⁵ Ibid p 41.

³⁶ Brady, H., Verba, S., & Lehman Schlozman, K., op. cit. pp 271-294.

³⁷ McAllistair, op. cit. p 55.

lends itself to political interest, it is not articulated in the original resource model, secondly an individual may lack civic skills totally and yet still possess political interest which does not feature in the other two resources required by the model (time and money).

The notion of political interest however, does have relevance in the model of *psychological involvement*. This model asserts that the more interested a person is in politics, the more likely they are to participate. Again scholars have dismissed this particular model as being trivial and unclear. I believe that in isolation the model is somewhat trivial, however it does articulate an issue that has been ignored by the other theoretical models of participation. The theory has the potential to be more clear and significant if used in conjunction with, or merged in some way with other models such as the resource model (above) and the mobilisation model (below).

A further theory that seeks to explain why people participate politically is the theory of *mobilization*. Developed by Rosenstone & Hansen (1996), it argues that a citizen cannot be viewed in isolation, and that their social networks including friends, family, community, neighbours, co-workers, political parties, activists and interest groups must all be taken into account. Individuals are seen as being under pressure to behave as members of a group, and therefore participate politically as required by that particular network.³⁸ Individuals are mobilised both directly and indirectly by political parties and social networks.

This is closely related to the *social-learning* model that argues that cultural factors are significant influences on political participation, and that individuals are socialised to behave in a certain way. This particular model has two distinguishable strands. The first argues that there is social pressure placed on an individual to behave or participate in a certain way (which is similar to the mobilisation model). The second encapsulates a sense of duty to support the well-being of their communities or networks. Blais (2000) argues that it is this model that directly challenges the rational choice theory, as it is based on the notion that individuals do not act in their own self-interest (as rational theory implies) but rather for a collective interest (again, as related to the mobilisation model), and are also socialised to behave or participate in a certain way. This could be true for the case of Māori political participation, however would need to be further tested.

In the same vein, Franklin (2004) advances an interesting thesis on generational change and voter turnout.³⁹ He argues that the experience of new voters will affect life-long voting behaviours. Theorists have argued that if an individual votes the same way three times in a row, it is likely that the individual will become resistant to changing their voting behaviour. Franklin extends this argument by stating that the experience of new voters in their first few elections will dictate their future behaviour. If their experience of voting is positive in their first few elections, then they are likely to vote in subsequent elections.⁴⁰ While this particular theory is based on voter turnout and voting behaviour, as part of political participation as a whole it has some interesting implications, as it also relates to a number of alternative theories including the social learning and mobilisation theories.

³⁸ Rosenstone & Hansen, op. cit. pp 22-24.

³⁹ Franklin, op. cit. pp 59-90.

⁴⁰ Ibid pp 59-90.

Thus far, the models listed above are able to be applied to conventional methods of participation. While some theories (such as the resource and mobilisation theory) lend themselves to the inclusion of unconventional methods of participation as well (political protest), it is perhaps worth mentioning these specifically as they are embedded in the emergence of new politics issues and movements.⁴¹ This relates to work by Norris, who argues that the apparent drop in political participation in some countries is not indicative of declining participation per se but rather evolving participation. Modernization and the introduction of new methods of communication have introduced new avenues for participation, greater scope for mobilisation and have resulted in evolutionary forms of citizen engagement.⁴²

McAllistair defines political protest as “*those activities which depart from orthodox forms of participation, and which involve direct as opposed to indirect methods of exerting political pressure.*”⁴³ Political protest can also be classified in three ways, legal forms of protest (for example abstaining from participation in an event), semi-legal (such as protest marches) and radical (such as deliberate damage of property etc.).

There are also three other ways in which political protest differs from conventional forms of participation. The first is that the initiative for implementing the protest or unorthodox activity lies with the activist (rather than methods of participation that are pre-determined by the political institutions such as elections, making submissions etc.). The second is that the protest movements require considerable initiative and cooperation amongst the activists. Finally these forms of participation exert much more pressure on decision-makers than conventional methods.⁴⁴ According to McAllistair, while political protest has been a tactic used in many countries, the use of this method is increasing. He argues that it signals a change in political participation in advanced industrial societies, as a result of post-materialism and those individuals who adopt unconventional methods in order to espouse their goals in protest not only for their particular issue, but also against old politics, ideologies and divisions.⁴⁵ One example could be environmentalists who choose to occupy land sites.

Another example could be seen amongst minority ethnic/cultural groups who choose to protest not only for their issues but also against a political system that does not account for their epistemologies and cultural political processes. This may be illustrated in some Māori protest movements that have sought ‘Tino Rangatiratanga’ or self-determination. Tino Rangatiratanga is often misunderstood as being a notion solely based on absolute authority for Māori, however one may argue that self-determination is also a challenge to allow Māori epistemologies to shape the democratic processes in our political institutions. This illustrates the point made by McAllister that protest movements are linked to goals that transcend traditional political divisions and structure.⁴⁶

⁴¹ McAllistair, op. cit. p 66.

⁴² Norris, P., op. cit.

⁴³ McAllistair, op. cit. p 65.

⁴⁴ Ibid p 66.

⁴⁵ Ibid p 66.

⁴⁶ Ibid p 67.

Another point of interest is that conventional political activities appear to be a precursor to unconventional activities. Those who engage in protest have at some point attempted to participate through conventional means such as voting, party and interest group membership and particularised contact. An interesting example then arises with Māori, who arguably participate highly in unorthodox forms of participation, but traditionally have not had high rates of participation in conventional forms of participation such as voting.⁴⁷ This also highlights the stark contrast between unconventional forms of participation and conventional forms of participation. Although, neither a mutually exclusive and most people who participate politically utilise a number of methods of participation.⁴⁸

The area of political participation covers a diverse range of activities, and sparks interesting debate. There appears to be an ‘agree to disagree’ policy in regard to the issue of political participation and its impact on stable democracy. Proponents of thin and robust democracy seem to sit at polar ends of a spectrum, which is in direct contrast to the models put forward that seek to explain why and how people participate politically. These models are not as polarised, and in my opinion are closely related. Each of these theories account for a particular aspect of political participation, and in my opinion none of them are absolute. From my perspective they sit on a continuum, the only outlier being the rational choice theory on voting behaviour. This is because all other theories have taken the citizen participant as embedded in a social context, the rational choice theory, despite its revisions and extensions is still very limited in its view because it is focused too heavily on the individual. It has become apparent through this literature review that social context is important and must be accounted for in any theory on political participation. I intend to further explore the relevance of social context in political participation by studying Māori, as an indigenous minority.

Māori Political Participation

A large collection of research and literature already exists on the issue of Māori politics and Māori attempts at ‘tino-rangatiratanga’ or self-determination. Dating back to the year 1840 and the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi Māori have been actively and consistently engaged in politics and the struggle for power. Power is a central theme of this research project which seeks to understand how Māori attempt to gain access to political power in the current New Zealand context. This small literature review shall discuss historical political initiatives by Māori leading up to contemporary times. It is intended to provide an overview of Māori political participation in order to establish the context for a contemporary examination of the issue, as well as to identify the gaps in the current literature where further research may be conducted.

Māori Electoral Participation

Traditionally Māori have tried many avenues to pursue their goal of tino-rangatiratanga through both conventional methods of participation (such as voting, joining political parties and interest group membership) and unconventional methods

⁴⁷ Further research needs to be conducted in the area of Māori political participation. It is my intention to undertake research on this issue through my PhD research.

⁴⁸

(such as protest movements and attempts at alternative government). Access to voting for Māori was a long-term struggle. While Māori were granted the right to vote from the very beginning of representative government in New Zealand in 1852, there were strict conditions set on voter eligibility. Only Māori (and Pakeha) men over the age of 21 who held land in individual title could vote. This presented a dilemma for many Māori as land was held in collective title amongst whanau (families) and hapu (sub-tribes). Those who sought the right to vote moved to individualise land title, although many Māori did not and were therefore excluded from voting.

The restrictions around eligible voters did not change until 1867 and the introduction of the Māori Representation Act which set up separate parliamentary representation for Māori, in the shape of four seats in a parliament of 91.⁴⁹ At the time Māori were the majority population and many academics view the establishment of the four seats as a means of constraining Māori representation rather than fostering it.⁵⁰ Other ways in which Māori were disenfranchised from political participation can be seen in the method of voting. Although European voters were given the secret ballot in 1870, Māori continued to vote verbally until 1938. There were also no official records on Māori elections recorded until 1949, meaning a lack of concise data on Māori voter-turnout and participation before this time.⁵¹

Despite the lack of statistics and records on voter-turnout and participation, there is information available on the various Māori political movements during that period. A number of political groups were formed during the late 1800's leading up to today for the purpose of pursuing the Māori seats. Some of the more notable initiatives included the Young Māori Party, which started in 1897 to promote Māori social development and cultural revival. One of its priorities was the promotion of increased Māori political participation and representation in parliament. Although it was not a political party many of its members were members of parliament including Sir Maui Pomare, Sir James Carroll, and Sir Apirana Ngata.⁵²

Another notable political group Nga Koata e Wha (The four quarters) came out of the Māori prophetic movement/religion Rātana. Established in 1928 in alliance with the Labour Party it stood candidates in all four Māori seats and used them as a mechanism for pursuing their larger goals of Māori social and economic development. While Nga Koata e Wha eventually disappeared the Labour-Rātana relationship remains strong with Rātana candidates standing for the Labour Party right up until this present time.

In 1960, The independent Māori Group was established. As the name suggests, it wanted Māori representation in parliament to be independent and free from the influence of party politics, hence its opposition to the Rātana/Labour alliance. The group was primarily focused on promoting Māori land ownership. In essence, it paved

⁴⁹ This was the size of parliament in the 1880's however, parliament changed size in the 1890s' being reduced to 70, and then further adjusted to 76 from 1902 onwards. Williams, J. *Politics of the New Zealand Māori: Protest and Cooperation, 1891-1909*, Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1969, pp13-15.

⁵⁰ Ibid p 14.

⁵¹ Electoral Commission, <http://www.elections.org.nz/study/history/Māori-vote.html>

⁵² Williams, op. cit. pp. 151-4

the way for independent Māori representation. Following on from this movement the first ever Māori political party was established.

Mana Motuhake was established by disaffected Labour MP and former Minister of Māori Affairs, Matiu Rata. The party was concerned with the protection and representation of Māori interests, promoting Māori autonomy and diminishing Māori dependence upon the state.⁵³ Despite the strong community support that the party received as evidenced by Hazelhurst,⁵⁴ Mana Motuhake failed to win any seats in parliament. In 1991, Mana Motuhake joined a coalition of other left leaning minor parties to create the Alliance Party. Although Mana Motuhake's coalition with the Alliance strengthened the party's electoral chances, many Māori were still searching for autonomy⁵⁵ and viewed the five-party Alliance as an impediment to the achievement of that goal.⁵⁶ Thus, following the coalition between Mana Motuhake and the Alliance a number of other minor Māori parties were established to fill the void that Mana Motuhake had left. One such party was Mana Māori, which was founded in 1991 by Eva Rickard, a political activist and former Mana Motuhake supporter with the specific goal of pursuing an independent Māori voice in parliament.

In 1996 New Zealand underwent electoral reform moving from the First Past the Post system of government to Mixed Members Proportional (MMP). The change was welcomed by many Māori who immediately took advantage of proportional representation by setting up more Māori political parties. MMP resulted in the increasing number of Māori seats in parliament proportional to the Māori population from four to five, and eventually to seven seats in the 2005 election.⁵⁷ The Royal Commission on the Electoral System in its report on electoral reform stated:

“We expect Māori political participation would rise under an MMP system. There would be strong incentives for Māori to become involved politically in established parties or in a Māori Party.”⁵⁸

This prediction came true with the establishment of more Māori political parties such as Te Tawharau 1995, Mana Wahine Te Ira Tangata 1998, Mauri Pacific 1998, Nga Iwi Morehu 2002, Aroha Ngia Tatou 2002 and the Derek Fox Party 2002 all committing themselves to the advancement of Māori interests. Despite the increased number of Māori political parties, none were able to muster sufficient support to reach the 5% threshold required under MMP to see them into parliament, and only two Māori political parties enjoyed short bursts of parliamentary representation (Te Tawharau⁵⁹ established by former NZ First MP Tuariki Delamere among others; and

⁵³ Walker, R. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle without end*, Revised Edition, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, 2004, p.228.

⁵⁴ Hazelhurst, K. *Political Expression and Ethnicity: Statecraft and Mobilisation in the Māori World*, London, Praeger Publishers, 1993.

⁵⁵ Walker, op. cit. p 228.

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ Currently the Māori electoral option has just ended for 2006 and New Zealand is currently waiting to see if there will be a new Māori seat created for the next election in 2008.

⁵⁸ The Royal Commission on the Electoral System, *Towards a Better Democracy*, Wellington, Government Printer, December 1986, p.102.

⁵⁹ Te Tawharau was established in 1998 by Tuariki Delamere, Wharekaihua Coates and Rangitukehu David Paul. The party was founded on the beliefs of the ringatu (up raised hand) faith and sought to

Mana Motuhake). As a result, all of these political parties fore-mentioned petered out over time. Mana Motuhake who paved the way for these other Māori political parties lasting the longest.

The reasons why these Māori political parties have failed to make a greater impact has been the subject of debate. Some possible explanations may be the lack of understanding by Māori during that time, of the MMP environment; the limited appeal of party's with policy agendas focused exclusively on perceived Māori issues, especially given the widely varying needs and aspirations of the Māori voter; lack of unity on party policies and direction; and finally the 80 year strong relationship between the Rātana Faith and the Labour Party, and a loyalty by Māori that may have proved too hard to sever.⁶⁰ This final explanation sits well with Franklin's theory on voting behaviour that life-long voting patterns are developed as a result of the experience of the first three elections of a voter's life.⁶¹ If Māori as a cohort of voters were Labour supporters in early years (as the statistics show that mostly they were⁶²) then the likelihood is that they will vote for Labour for the rest of their lives. In most instances this has proven to be correct,⁶³ with the outlying case of New Zealand First in the 1996 election, and more recently the election of the Māori Party⁶⁴ MP's in 2005.⁶⁵ Regardless of these assumptions, there is no definitive answer as to why these Māori political parties failed to make a lasting impression or appearance in New Zealand's party system.

More recently however, one Māori political party has managed to successfully enter parliament. The Māori Party was established in 2004 following a protest march known as the 'hīkoi' against proposed legislation that would grant ownership of the New Zealand foreshore and seabed to the government. In lead up to the hīkoi Māori used various approaches to lobby government to have their concerns over the Foreshore and Seabed Bill heard, and also to have their customary rights over the foreshore and seabed recognised and clarified. The government however, refused to change their stance, and the Bill was passed into law in 2004. The hīkoi acted as a catalyst for Māori unification, and out of the protest came the Māori Party which contested all seven Māori seats in the election the following year 2005, four of which they won.

The establishment of the Māori party had many political commentators expecting an increase in voter-turnout by Māori. While the votes cast as a percentage from those enrolled in the Māori electorates did increase by 9% on the previous election, overall there has been little change in Māori electoral participation over the last six elections. As can be seen in the chart below, voter participation for Māori has fallen in the last two elections compared to the first few elections under MMP.

demonstrate to Māori the increased power they had under an MMP system, particularly through the holding of balance of power as exemplified by Delamere's former political party New Zealand First in 1996. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Te_Tawharau

⁶⁰ Durie, M. *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*. Auckland, Oxford University Press 1998.

⁶¹ Franklin, op. cit. pp 59-90.

⁶² Elections New Zealand, www.elections.org.nz/elections/results

⁶³ Ibid

⁶⁴ To be discussed in detail further below.

⁶⁵ Elections New Zealand, http://www.elections.org.nz/elections/results_1996.html

Votes Cast as Percentage of Enrolled Voters⁶⁶

	2005	2002	1999	1996	1993	1990
All seats	81	77	85	88	85	85
Māori seats	67	58	71	78	68	66
highest Māori seat	70	59	73	81	70	69
	Te Tai Tokerau	Te Tai Tokerau	Waiariki	Te Tai Rawhiti	Northern Māori	Eastern Māori
lowest Māori seat	62	54	67	74	65	61
	Tamaki Makaurau	Tamaki Makaurau	Hauraki	Te Tai Hauauru	Western Māori	Western Māori
lowest general seat	73	71	77	86	80	80
	Mangere	Mangere	Mangere	Mangere	Matamata	Mangere
highest general seat	87	83	90	93	90	91
	Wellington Central	Coromandel	Wellington Central	Wellington Central	Wellington-Karori	Wellington Central

The data above has been taken as a percentage of votes cast from those enrolled, however electoral enrolment is yet another area where Māori participation is lacking. The 2006 Social Report by the Ministry of Social Development has identified that Māori are among those groups who are least likely to be enrolled on the electoral roll along with Pacific Islanders and young people aged under 25 years.⁶⁷ Furthermore the Māori electoral option closed in August of this year, during which 10,280 Māori enrolled for the first time and 21,588 Māori switched rolls either from General to Māori or vice versa. These enrolment figures being significantly lower than those from previous Māori electoral options.

⁶⁶ Elections New Zealand, <http://www.elections.org.nz/Māori-research-rfp-jan06.html#gen9>

⁶⁷ Ministry of Social Development, *The Social Report 2006*, Wellington, Ministry of Social Development, 2006, p.72.

2006 Māori Electoral Option Results⁶⁸

Year	Changes to Electoral Roll Type		New Enrolments of Māori Descent		Impact on Rolls to Date	
	Māori Roll to General Roll	General Roll to Māori Roll	General Roll	Māori Roll	Māori Roll + / (-)	General Roll + / (-)
2006	7,294	14,294	2,366	7,914	14,914	(4,634)
2001	4,866	13,872	3,436	15,138	24,144	(5,570)
1997	7,040	14,471	2,664	10,517	17,948	(4,767)

One possible reason for the significantly lower rate of enrolment may be due to the general election being held only the year before, whereas in the case of the last Māori electoral option the election had been held two years prior to the campaign. The introduction of the Māori Party in the 2005 race possibly added another dimension to this phenomenon, as a key part of their election strategy was to actively enrol Māori onto the Māori electoral roll. An increased number of Māori may have enrolled just prior to the election and therefore new enrolments during the Māori electoral option may have been lessened.⁶⁹ Another possibility could be the socialisation of the particular cohort of voters included within the eligible voting group. If Māori have become used to non-enrolment, or enrolment on the general roll perhaps this habit has been fixed and therefore difficult to influence and change. Of course, another more simplistic reason for this phenomenon could be an ineffective campaign that did not reach the target Māori group. Further research into Māori electoral participation (or lack thereof) needs to be conducted in order to more fully understand this phenomenon.

Māori Unorthodox Participation

Despite the low rates of electoral participation, one might argue that Māori may still be participating politically at a rate equal to non-Māori although through different avenues. Māori may be highly engaged in unorthodox methods of political participation such as protest and other activist movements. These forms of alternative action have been used by Māori since the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. For example

⁶⁸ Elections New Zealand, <http://www.elections.org.nz/Māori-option-results.html>

⁶⁹ Wicks, M., National Manager of the Electoral Enrolment Centre, personal communication July 16th 2006.

the Kingitanga⁷⁰ 1858 at the time of its inception could be viewed as an unconventional method of participation. It was a response to the constitutional alienation of Māori from participating in national government, on-going issues of land alienation and the lack of recognition for iwi autonomy.⁷¹ The movement in itself was a product of Māori dissatisfaction with the political process and policies related to Māori and Māori land. Although the Māori King was instituted to deal directly with the King in England (and therefore bypass New Zealand government), the level of policy they wished to influence was within the domain of central government. Conversely, the Kingitanga movement could also be classified as an interest group who were set up to put pressure on the political system. This particular movement could be viewed as being representative of both protest movement and interest group and therefore both conventional and unconventional political participation. Another example of Māori political activism which straddles the same dilemma is the Kotahitanga movement which established the Māori parliament in 1892. 'Paremata Māori' was again modelled on the British parliamentary system and was a means of dealing with Māori issues that were being unsatisfactorily handled (or not handled at all) by the New Zealand government of the time.

Other examples of unconventional forms of participation can be seen in the Māori prophetic movements that sought to unify Māori across tribal lines through religious and spiritual mysticism.⁷² One such movement was the Pai Marire founded by the prophet Te Ua Haumene in the 1864, set up as a consequence of Māori land confiscations. Te Ua Haumene preached that if iwi could present a united front, the colonising Pakeha (European) could be overthrown. The Pai Marire followers entered into guerrilla warfare known now as the Hauhau struggle.⁷³ The hauhau rebellion was radical and brutal and they murdered many Crown agents during the period of the 1860's as an expression of dissent.

Another such movement was Ringatu founded by the prophet Te Kooti Arikirangi in 1868. Again, the mission of this prophetic movement was to unite Māori and fight against Pakeha domination.⁷⁴ Te Kooti engaged in a number of battles against agents of the Crown in order to advance his mission of fighting against Pakeha government. While he was a fugitive from the law during his prophetic period, Te Kooti's war did not end until 1872. The Māori King Tawhiao made peace with the New Zealand government in 1881, which later resulted in Te Kooti's pardon as a fugitive in 1883.

Another prophetic movement which pursued a political agenda was the Rātana Faith.⁷⁵ In contrast to the fore-mentioned prophetic movements the Rātana faith pursued their political objectives through the Māori electoral seats in parliament.⁷⁶ The religion did however espouse a number of similar goals as previous prophetic movements such as the pan-tribal unification of Māori, and the restoration of the Māori socio-economic base.

⁷⁰ Discussed in more detail above.

⁷¹ Cox, L. *Kotahitanga: The Search for Māori Political Unity*, London, Oxford University Press, 1993, pp44-62

⁷² Walker, op. cit. p 130.

⁷³ Ibid p 130.

⁷⁴ Ibid p 131.

⁷⁵ Discussed in further detail above.

⁷⁶ As mentioned above.

The 1970's saw the rise of more modern protest movements, influenced to some extent by the civil rights movement of the 1960s. The period of the 70's and early 80's⁷⁷ can be considered a period of protest not only for Māori but for New Zealand in general, with feminist, liberation, and other movements taking place alongside Māori protest movements. A group called Nga Tamatoa that formed during this period modelled themselves on the Black Power movement in the United States of America who espoused notions of 'brown-power', Māori liberation and separate Māori government. While Nga Tamatoa initially began as an activist movement concerned with protecting Māori culture, tamed by the more conservative members of the group, they soon turned their attentions to social service provision, such as assisting migrants to find employment, and offering legal aid and assistance to young Māori offenders.

One of the more notable achievements of Nga Tamatoa was as a result of a petition they instigated which called for the inclusion of Māori language teaching in the New Zealand education system. The petition was signed by thousands of people and circulated the entire country. The group was challenged on the issue by the government who argued that the initiative was not feasible due to a deficiency of teachers able to provide the service. Nga Tamatoa responded by arguing for the implementation of a one-year teaching programme for Te Reo Māori. In a form of demonstration, the activists took a group of young youths to a Marae to learn the Māori language. As a result of their actions, both initiatives were instituted by the third Labour Government. Nga Tamatoa set up a Māori language day to assist in the on-going development of the language learning initiatives, the administration of this event was eventually taken over by the education system and extended to one week. This Māori language week is still celebrated widely amongst all New Zealanders to this day.

Despite this particular case being an example of conventional politics, Nga Tamatoa also engaged in sit-ins, land marches and other radical forms of protest to express their views on various government policies. The method of participation varied depending on the issue at hand, and also which members of the group were involved.⁷⁸ Nga Tamatoa would provide an interesting case study example on Māori political participation due to the varied nature of political activities in which they engaged.

Other more well known Māori protest movements followed on from Nga Tamatoa. The 1975 land march was a protest staged against a number of government policies (including 1967 Māori Affairs Amendment Act, 1967 Rating Act, 1953 Town and Country Planning Act, 1928 Public Works Act, 1971 Mining Act and others) that continued to erode the Māori ownership of land in New Zealand. According to Walker,⁷⁹ the protest was seen as the last option for Māori, who through interest groups such as the Māori Council and the Māori Womens Welfare League had continually made submissions to parliament, petitioned and attempted to affect change through conventional forms of participation leading up to 1975. 'Not one

⁷⁷ Once the reform period set in 1984 other influences dominated.

⁷⁸ Lind Smith pers.comm 23 Aug 2006. Nga Tamatoa was made up of a mix of young Māori from academic to radical, conservative to ex-convicts. It also had satellite branches all over New Zealand through which they organised both political and social activities.

⁷⁹ Walker, op. cit. p 131

more acre of land' was the catch-phrase of the protest led by Dame Whina Cooper that marched from the tip of the North Island to the steps of parliament. Other significant protests included the Bastion Point sit-in by Ngati Whatua in 1977 and the Raglan golf-course sit-in in 1978. In 1978-79 a small number of radical groups were established in Auckland, the Waitangi Action Committee (WAC), He Taua, Māori Peoples Liberation Movement of Aotearoa, and Black Women. These groups had a considerable overlap of membership, and used many different methods to push their issues of liberation against racism, sexism, capitalism and government oppression. Walker (1990) articulates how the methods used by one of these groups WAC as follows:

“The rhetoric of WAC in their newsletters is couched in terms of revolutionary struggle, but their practice of social transformation stopped short of armed struggle. The tactics in their repertoire for change included circulating newsletters, establishing networks with Māori and Pakeha organisations, mounting demonstrations and marches, and challenging politicians in public places. As they gained experience in radical action they carried their activism to the edge of the law, and when they were arrested for doing so, they challenged in court the veracity of the law and the judicial system itself.”⁸⁰

He Taua was another notable political Māori group to emerge in the same period. The name was given to a group of young Māori students who protested against the University of Auckland Engineering students mock performance of the haka at graduation ceremonies in the 70's that was considered culturally offensive and derogatory.⁸¹ While the group had tried many avenues to stop the engineering students from performing the haka (including making submissions to the Auckland University Students Association, and to the University newsletter), as a final resort they turned to physical violence, abusing members of the engineering haka party. While this protest was not aimed at government directly, the incident is considered to be a turning point in race relations in New Zealand, the effects of which were felt throughout New Zealand society and reflected in government action and policy during the time.⁸² While the members of He Taua were charged by police for their actions, many Māori organisations such as the Māori Womens Welfare League and the National Māori Council united to support the group⁸³. A later report into the incident reported the following:

We are at a turning point in regard to harmonious race relations.....Since Bastian Point, the Haka Party Incident and the recent disturbances at Waitangi, there has been heightened awareness regarding racial conflict...Pakeha New Zealanders cannot understand why, after all these years, ill-feeling is developing and their institutions are under attack.⁸⁴

McAllister⁸⁵ states that these forms of protest (which can also be classified as unorthodox methods of participation) are not only about expressing dissatisfaction at a particular issue or policy alone, but are also targeted at wider issues regarding political systems. This particular statement rings true for the case of He Taua and for

⁸⁰ Walker, op. cit. p 220.

⁸¹ There is some overlap in members amongst Nga Tamatoa and He Taua.

⁸² Ibid p 220.

⁸³ Ibid p 220.

⁸⁴ Race Relations Conciliator, *Race Against Time*, Wellington, Human Rights Commission. 1980, p.12.

⁸⁵ McAllister, op. cit. p 64

many Māori protest movements. This is possibly due to tino-rangatanga being an underlying goal for Māori that motivates them into political action. The notion of tino rangatiratanga in itself is about self-determination and the desire to establish Māori solutions to Māori problems and also Māori governance systems and structures.

Furthermore, McAllister⁸⁶ argues that protest is usually a ‘last resort’ for those activists who have exhausted other avenues of participation without satisfaction. Activists who resort to political activism of this nature have often tried most other forms of participation including voting, joining interest groups, making government submissions and signing petitions. Many also use multiple methods simultaneously to advance their issue. While this statement may be true generally, as yet there has been little evidence and research to justify this statement in the case of Māori. The likelihood is that this statement is true in this case, however the lack of evidence leaves this particular theory open to further investigation, an area that I intend to examine within my research.

A more recent example of Māori protest that could test this theory could be seen in the ‘hīkoi’ of 2004. This protest march was instigated by a group of Māori following a controversial Bill proposed by parliament (and later passed) to vest all ownership of the foreshore and seabed with the Crown (thereby removing any opportunity for Māori to argue a case for title over these areas). In the lead up to the hīkoi there were a number of consultation meetings held with various Māori interest groups such as iwi runanga (tribal governance boards) and other Māori groups, the reaction from Māori was unanimous in its stance against the Bill. Māori individuals and groups also made contact with their Māori electorate MP’s and made clear their stance on the Bill, along with the expectation that they represent the wishes of their constituency in parliament by voting against the bill. Only two of the seven Māori Labour electorate MP’s crossed the floor during the second reading of the Bill, creating further discontent amongst the Māori community.

Despite the countless efforts by Māori to stop the Bill (which included writing submissions, signing petitions, contact MP’s, consultation hui and other forms of activity⁸⁷), the Foreshore and Seabed Bill made it through select committee stage and on its way to final reading in parliament. Exhausting all possible outlets Māori finally moved towards protest by staging small sit-ins and rally’s. As a final expression of their discontent they staged a ‘hīkoi’ reminiscent of the 1974 land-march, marching from the tip of the north island right to the steps of parliament.⁸⁸ One of the Māori Labour MP’s and member of the executive, Tariana Turia, resigned during the protest as a show of defiance against the Bill and her party who were government at the time.⁸⁹ While the march culminating at parliament took the place as the largest protest in New Zealand history (reported numbers between 10,000 – 30,000 protesters⁹⁰), the Bill was still passed in to law in November 2004. While the desired outcome to which

⁸⁶ McAllister, op. cit. p.63

⁸⁷ See Foreshore and Seabed submissions and consultation minutes at <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/foreshore/>

⁸⁸ The seabed and foreshore legislation was viewed by some to be modern day land confiscation. <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0404/S00062.htm>

⁸⁹ Many other Labour MP’s were opposed to voting for the Bill such as Nanaia Mahuta and Georgina Beyer however both remained in the Labour Party.

⁹⁰ See NZ Herald ‘Hikoi size estimates from 10,000-30,000’ 6 May 2004, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/topic/story.cfm?c_id=350&objectid=3564792

the hīkoi had been directed had not been achieved, the protest provided momentum for the rise of another political movement, led in part by Tariana Turia – The Māori Party.⁹¹

The 2004 hīkoi, and the events leading up to it support the statement given above regarding protest as being a last resort for political pressure. Many avenues were exhausted before the protest movement took place, and many different means of pursuing the issue were utilised throughout the entire process. The formation of a political party following the hīkoi can arguably be viewed as a new vehicle through which the protest participants or ‘activists’ can further attempt to affect the change in government policy they desire. The Māori Party which was successful in winning four seats in the 2005 election continues to promote the issue of indigenous rights as afforded to Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi. Although the Foreshore and Seabed Act is now in legislation, the Māori Party policy explicitly states their opposition to the act and seeks its removal from law.

Conclusion

The history of Māori political movements and engagement are important in terms of identifying the context for an investigation into Māori political participation today. I would argue that the methods that Māori use to participate today have been informed and shaped by their experiences in the past. From the very beginnings of government in New Zealand, Māori have not had equal access to conventional methods of participation such as voting. Despite the fact that equality of voting was achieved for Māori in the early 1900’s, the early experience by Māori of marginalisation from electoral participation have resulted in ingrained negative attitudes towards electoral participation which have been passed down through generations. This negative attitude may also be fuelled by a sense of frustration with the “Pakeha” political system. Despite the formal avenues of participation that do exist for the purpose of maintaining democracy, arguably in the experience of Māori they have not worked. As a result of these experiences, I hypothesise that Māori are more open to participating through unconventional methods such as protest, as it is these avenues which exert more pressure on government, and therefore wield more influence.⁹² This is in-line with theories regarding parental socialisation and electoral (and in this case political) participation such as the Social Learning theory.

⁹¹ As described in further detail above.

⁹² McAllister, op. cit. pp 56-57.

Methodology:

The proposed research is quite broad in its scope. Because I seek to answer not only what the current state of Māori political participation looks like currently, but also why it is in this current state, I will need to employ a number of different methods in order to analyse this topic. The methodology will also be guided by a ‘Kaupapa Māori’ approach to research that will guide the way in which I interact with the participants of the research and in some cases how these participants are chosen.

The methods I intend to employ will be discussed in depth below these are; to review and critique the current literature; to obtain official records and statistics on Māori electoral participation and behaviour; to access NZES data for quantitative analysis; to conduct qualitative research interviews.

An overview of Kaupapa Māori Research

Kaupapa Māori theory is based on tikanga Māori (ethics) and is a means of analysing the world from a Māori perspective. To apply Kaupapa Māori within the context of research (Kaupapa Māori Research) is to take the current western ideologies from which the notion of research was derived, and supplement them with Māori epistemologies, ideologies and knowledge.⁹³

Kaupapa Māori assumes that:

1. Māori knowledge, and Māori ways of ‘doing’ or behaviour are valid and legitimate in their own right.
2. Tikanga Māori (ethics, philosophies and principles) informs the process of research, and the theoretical foundations of the research.
3. Research undertaken with or about Māori is for the benefit of Māori and in-line with Māori aspirations.⁹⁴

In the context of this research, a Kaupapa Māori approach is important in establishing this thesis as beneficial for Māori themselves. To understand Māori behaviours, particularly in the process of interacting with the State is important as it enhances Māori knowledge about themselves and the world around them, and provides the opportunity for new knowledge to be created. It is also an intention of mine to provide a tool for Māori communities, individuals or groups to use so that they may better understand how to participate within the political system.

Kaupapa Māori is also important in informing the process of the research. As I, the researcher am Māori, I am privy to ‘insider knowledge’ in regards to Māori behaviours and actions. This provides me with three advantages. In the first instance, it provides me with a means of gaining access to Māori knowledge, and Māori people that may otherwise be wary of participating in such a research project. Secondly, the principle of whakawhanaungatanga (or the acting out of familial procedures) allows me to utilise my own Māori networks within this research, such as the identification

⁹³ Nepe, T., *E hao nei e tenei reanga: Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna; Kaupapa Māori, An Educational Intervention System*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of Auckland, 1991.

⁹⁴ Smith, Graham. ‘Research Issues Related to Māori Education’ paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Massey University, reprinted in 1992, *The Issue of Research and Māori*. The Research Institute for Māori Education, Auckland, The University of Auckland, 1990.

of the qualitative research participants.⁹⁵ Finally, being Māori means that I am better able to interpret some of the behaviours, knowledge and processes that I will be immersed in and observing.

These three principles will be an inherent part of the research process that I will undertake and are important in mentioning here. This is due to the often taken for granted notion that the researcher should *not* be personally involved in the research. It is often assumed that an outsider is better able to observe and interpret behaviours as being of interest, or important. I would argue however, in line with Kaupapa Māori theory that this outsider approach to research does not work when working with Māori people. This is due to Māori mistrust of researchers, the inability to correctly interpret certain behaviours, the possibility of missing certain subtleties which do signify issues of importance and finally due to the inability to relate to the participants at the very basic level of ‘whanau’ (family) or in other words whakawhanaungatanga.⁹⁶

As the participants in this research will all be Māori it is thus important that I clearly state my intention to use a Kaupapa Māori approach to this research project. In many ways the methodology of this research will be similar or identical to other research processes, and the quality of the outcome of this research will not be compromised due to the utilising of this theoretical framework.

The methods to be used in this particular research will be outlined as follows:

Literature Review

I will conduct an extensive review of the current literature related to the thesis topic. As mentioned previously, the key theoretical areas that I will be exploring will be cached within the theory of democracy. In particular I will be focusing on the literature concerned with political participation, representation, citizenship and civic education. In some ways this particular research topic strays outside of the study of Political science or Māori studies alone and moves into the areas of Psychology and Sociology and Anthropology, it thus becomes important to survey some literature of relevance within these areas with particular emphasis on political socialisation, political behaviours and other such issues that may arise.

Without a doubt, an extensive review will also be conducted for literature related to Māori Politics. Within this area I will be concerned both with historical documents that give detailed accounts of Māori interaction and engagement with the State; as well as more contemporary writings on Māori politics. This body of literature is relatively small in comparison to the vast library of political theory and therefore it shall be my intention to scope as much of this literature, and related documents as possible.

This research, although focused primarily on Māori political participation cannot be written in total isolation from the experiences of other cultural groups. I shall therefore draw on information related to indigenous peoples’ political participation where it is possible. I will not discriminate from which indigenous group this

⁹⁵ To be discussed further below.

⁹⁶ Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. London, Zed Books, 1998.

literature is sourced so long as it meets certain criteria to which I believe places their situation in a similar context to that of the Māori case. These are:

1. That the collective group be acknowledged as the first, or indigenous people of the land.
2. That the indigenous culture is a minority in their country, presenting them with a similar experience of difficulty in affecting change within their political context.
3. That the State who governs over the territory in which these indigenous cultures reside be under democratic rule.

These criteria are the basic rules in determining which cultural groups I will use for comparison to the Māori case in this research. This is not to exclude or to diminish the rights of other indigenous cultures, but rather to provide comparisons of value due to the burgeoning of similar circumstances. This will enable me to make assumptions where necessary based on the experience of these other cultures, as the possible variables which may affect the outcomes of these experiences have been diminished as much as possible. Although I acknowledge here, that there will always be differences in the context of different indigenous people and groups.

The overall intention of the review and critique of these bodies of literature is to provide me with a full understanding of the field of study, and also to enrich the proposed research with lessons learnt by others.

Official Records and Statistics

As it is my intention to examine the state of Māori political participation, I will need to obtain statistics and information that is truly representative of the total Māori population. The limited resources at my disposal will not always make it possible for me to carry out large quantitative surveys and analysis on the population required in order to gauge the data required for this study. In this case, I will thus use any official records and statistics related to Māori voting patterns, behaviour and social status to their full extent. The main sources for this information will come from the Electoral Commission, Statistics New Zealand, Political parties and organisations, opinion polls and the New Zealand Electoral Study. These records will be able to provide me with some of the quantitative data required to assist in creating a portrait of the Māori people and political behaviours, though it cannot account for the full picture that I propose to convey.

Qualitative Data and Analysis

I intend to conduct 40 individual interviews, and 10 focus group interviews. The reason for conducting qualitative interviews is to gain a deeper level of insight into why Māori participate politically, and why they have chosen to participate in the way that they do. The reason I have chosen to conduct a mixture of both focus group interviews and individual interviews is because each of these processes provides a different means of understanding the issues that may be raised. Focus groups will provide me with the opportunity to observe and analyse social interactions which may be important to the thesis topic, while the individual interviews allow me to seek an

even deeper understanding of the issues through the exploration of issues in a focused one-on-one environment.

Focus Groups

The focus group approach allows for groups of people to discuss issues amongst each other and are a means of establishing dialogue amongst participants, giving the researcher insight into group patterns or behaviour. It will allow any social issues related to Māori political participation to come to the surface. Within this type of interview there is also a certain level of observation that needs to be undertaken by the researcher as there are often means of expressing feelings such as awkwardness, eagerness, discomfort etc that are unspoken, but still very relevant to the research.

At this stage I propose to undertake the following focus groups:

- Māori Party members
- Other political party members
- Political Activist group
- Interest group members
- Rangatahi or Youth (18-25 years of age)
- Pakeke (24 – 50 years of age)
- Kaumatua or elderly (50 + years)
- A three generation family group i.e. Kaumatua, Matua (parent), tamaiti (child)
- 2 x interesting others (A group of people who participate through alternative means such as art, dance, hip hop etc)

At this stage I envisage that there will be between 4 to 6 people in each group and that the interviews will be of 60-90 minutes in duration. A schedule of proposed group interview questions have been attached to this proposal.

Once the focus group interviews have been collected, I will then transcribe the interviews and carry out the analysis of the data. These focus group interviews will be conducted before the individual interviews, so that any issues of interest that arise out of the focus group discussions may be further explored during the individual interviews. The focus group data will undergo both a thematic analysis as well as a certain amount of discourse analysis. It is important to keep in mind that in a focus group dynamic there are often times of silence where there are issues that are not discussed, it is therefore important to be able to accurately interpret these alongside the language used, the level of social interaction and of course the content of discussion.

Individual In-depth Interviews

The individual in-depth interviews will allow me the opportunity to speak one-on-one with the interviewees, *kanohi ki te kanohi*⁹⁷ (face to face). This is useful in drawing

⁹⁷ This concept of *kanohi ki te kanohi*, which literally translated means face to face is an important Māori process. It is believed that when there is work to be done, it should be done face to face. There are many levels on which this is significant. It is important for the participant to know who is using the information they give them, it is important that a relationship be established so that the participant feels more comfortable to give their knowledge to the interviewer, and it is a sign of respect of each other to meet *kanohi ki te kanohi*. This concept is very much in line with *Kaupapa Māori* which is why I have included this particular phraseology.

out a depth of information and also allows for a more open discussion regarding issues that may be of a sensitive nature. I would like to conduct 40 individual in-depth interviews, with a variety of people from different backgrounds who participate politically through different avenues.

The objective in these in-depth interviews is to get a deeper understanding of what motivated these people to behave as they have, and also to give the opportunity to participants to look back on their experiences and offer some unique perspectives on political participation. It is important to note that I do have some level of access to the proposed participants as my whanau networks extend to include a number of potential participants.⁹⁸ In Māori terms this could be termed 'whanaungatanga', however in methodological terms, it is known as snowballing. I intend to select participants through various means, such as advertising, snowballing (utilising existing networks) and through approaching key informants.

The individual in-depth interviews will be transcribed on completion, and the data drawn from the interviews will be analysed.

Proposed thesis structure:

At this stage I propose to have 8 Chapters.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|
| Chapter 1 | - | Methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An outline of the research project• A description of the methodology and method |
| Chapter 2 | - | Terms of Reference | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is political participation• Existing theories on political participation and democracy |
| Chapter 3 | - | A History of Māori Political Participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An overview of Māori political movements and attempts to engage with the State up until 1996 |
| Chapter 4 | - | Contemporary Māori Political Participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Māori political participation since the introduction of MMP in 1996• What does Māori political participation look like currently?• What has informed the current methods of participation chosen by Māori?• Māori participators vs. Māori non-participators. Why?• Māori Mobilisation |
| Chapter 5 | - | Comparative Chapter | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has Māori participation changed over time?• How do aspects of participation compare to the rest of New Zealand?• How do aspects of Māori participation compare to international examples of indigenous minority groups in other democracies? |

⁹⁸ This is a relevant point, as it is important that the researcher have access to the resources that they require.

Chapter 6 - Findings/Conclusion

- Do current theories on participation accurately account for the Māori case
- Could a theory of political participation be drawn for indigenous minority groups based on the Māori example
- Is there anything unique about Māori participation
- Recommendations on how to mobilise and increase participation amongst Māori

Schedule or timeline of the research:

Completed Work:

- Full Proposal
- Literature Review on theories on political participation
- Published chapter on the Māori Party
- Ethics Approval

On-going commitments

- Bi-monthly meetings with supervisor

Year 2 2006 - 2007	Objective	Milestones
November	- Chapter 2 on theories of political participation draft completed	Draft Chapter given to supervisors
December	- Chapter 3 on the history of Māori participation draft completed	Draft Chapter given to supervisors
January	- Qualitative Interviews to be conducted over 2-3 month period	
February	- Qualitative Interviews to be conducted over 2-3 month period	
March	- Qualitative Interviews to be conducted over 2-3 month period	
April	- Transcriptions over 2 month period	
May	- Transcriptions over 2 month period	
June	- Chapter 1 Methodology chapter draft completed	Draft Chapter given to supervisors
July	- Analysis of collected data from interviews - Analysis of NZES data - Review of international case studies	
August	- Analysis of collected data from interviews - Analysis of NZES data	

	- Review of international case studies	
September	- Draft Chapter 4 on contemporary participation completed - Review of international case studies	Draft Chapter given to supervisors
October	- Analysis of collected data - Review of International case studies	
November	- Analysis of collected data - Review of International case studies	
December	- Draft Chapter 5 completed	Draft Chapter given to supervisors
January – March	- Editing Chapters 1-5 - Writing chapter 6	
March	- Draft Chapter 6 completed	Draft chapter given to supervisor
April	- Draft thesis completed	Draft thesis given to supervisors
May – June	- Thesis editing	
June	- Final version of thesis finished	Final thesis given to supervisors

Ethics approval:

Ethics approval was granted by The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee. The reference number for the ethics approval related to this project is 2006/130. Approval was granted for a period of three years.

Resources:

At this point in time, I already have access to most of the resources required to carry out this research. For the literature review aspect of my research I have access to the University of Auckland library and its resources, including journal databases and portals. For the qualitative aspect of the research, I have ethics approval from the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee which will allow me to begin interviews. I also have all of the physical material required to conduct interviews including dictaphone, transcriber, tapes and batteries.

In terms of working space, I am still in the process of finalising an on-site computer and work room, although I have been offered a potential work-space in the political studies department, sharing a computer with another PhD student. I also have a home office and computer which I can work from if needed.

The one area in which I am lacking resource is financial assistance. At the moment I have not been successful in obtaining a scholarship, although I will continue to look for further sources of funding. As a result of this, I have been working throughout my provisional PhD year in order to support myself and my studies. I hope that this year I will be more successful in finding financial support that will allow me to be a full time student.

Bibliography

- Aimer, P. & Vowles, J. 2004 'What happened at the 2002 election?' in J.Vowles, P. Aimer, S. Banducci, J. Karp & R. Miller (eds.) *Voters Veto*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Almond, G. & Verba, S. 1963, *The Civic Culture*. (Princeton, Princeton University Press)
- Bachrach, P. 1967, *The Theory of Democratic Elitism: A Critique*. (Boston, Brown)
- Barnes, S. & Kaase, M. 1971, *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. (Beverly Hills, Sage Publications)
- Bennett, S. & Bennett, L. 1986, 'Political Participation.' In *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol 1.
- Blais, A. 2000, *To Vote or Not to Vote: The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory*. (Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press)
- Blais, A., Loewen, P. & Bodet, M. 2004, 'Strategic Voting' in J.Vowles, P. Aimer, S. Banducci, J. Karp & R. Miller (eds.) *Voters Veto*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Brady, H., Verba, S. & Lehman Scholzman, K. 1995, 'Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation' in *The American Political Science Review*, June 1995; 89, 2.
- Conway, M. 1991, *Political Participation in the United States*. (Washington, CQ Press)
- Cox, L. 1993, *Kotahitanga: The Search for Māori Political Unity*. (London, Oxford University Press)
- Downs, A. 1957, *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. (New York, Harper and Row)
- Evans, J. 2004, *Voters & Voting*. (London, Sage Publications)
- Franklin, M. 2004, *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- Hazelhurst, K. 1993, *Political Expression and Ethnicity: Statecraft and Mobilisation in the Māori World*. (London, Praeger Publishers)
- Karp, J. & Banducci, S. 2004, 'Political Parties and Voter Mobilisation' in J.Vowles, P. Aimer, S. Banducci, J. Karp & R. Miller (eds.) *Voters Veto*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Lerner, D. 1958, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the East*. (New York, Free Press)
- Levine, S. & Roberts, N. 2003, 'Consistent Patterns and Clear Trends: Electoral Behaviour in 2002.' in J. Boston, S. Church, S. Levine, E. McLeay & N. Roberts (eds.) *New Zealand Votes: The General Election of 2002*. (Wellington, Victoria University Press)
- Luskin, R. 2006, 'The Heavenly Public: What Would a Fully Informed Citizenry Be Like?' in M. MacKuen & G. Rabinowitz (eds.) *Electoral Democracy*. (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press)
- McAllistair, I. 1992, *Political Behaviour*. (Melbourne, Longman Cheshire)
- McCarthy, J. & Zald, M. 1977, 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory' in *American Sociological Review* 82
- McLeay, E. 2003, 'Representation, selection, election: The 2002 Parliament' in J. Boston, S. Church, S. Levine, E. McLeay & N. Roberts (eds.) *New Zealand Votes: The General Election of 2002*. (Wellington, Victoria University Press)
- Milbraith, L. & Goel, M. 1977, *Political Participation*. (Chicago, Rand McNally)

- Mill, J. 1910, *Utilitarianism, Liberty & Representative Government*. (London, J.M.Dent & Sons)
- Miller, R. 2004 'Who stood for office, and why?' in J.Vowles, P. Aimer, S. Banducci, J. Karp & R. Miller (eds.) *Voters Veto*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Ministry of Social Development, 2006, *The Social Report 2006*, Wellington, Ministry of Social Development.
- Nagel, J. 1987, *Participation*. (New Jersey, Prentice Hall)
- Nepe, T. 1991, *E hao nei e tenei reanga: Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna: Kaupapa Māori, An Educational Intervention System*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of Auckland.
- Norris, P. 2002, *Democratic Phoenix* (New York, Cambridge University)
- Race Relations Conciliator, 1980. *Race Against Time*. (Wellington, Human Rights Commission)
- Riker, W. & Ordeshook, C. 1968, 'A Theory of the Calculus of Voting' in *American Political Science Review* 62: 25-42
- Rose, R. 2002, *Electoral Participation: A comparative analysis* (London, Sage)
- Rosenstone, S. & Hansen, J. 1996, *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America*. (New York, Longman)
- Royal Commission on the Electoral System, 1986. *Towards a Better Democracy*. (Wellington, Government Printer)
- Schumpeter, J. 1954, *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*. (London, Unwin University Books)
- Smith, G. 1990. 'Research Issues Related to Māori Education' paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Massey University, reprinted in 1992, *The Issue of Research and Māori*. The Research Institute for Māori Education. (Auckland, The University of Auckland)
- Smith, L. 1998. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. (London, Zed Books)
- Sullivan, A. 2002, 'Coming Home? Māori Voting in 1999' in J.Vowles, P.Aimer, J.Karp, S.Banducci, R.Miller, A.Sullivan (eds..) *Proportional Representation on Trial*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Tocqueville, A. 1990, *Democracy in America*. (New York, Vintage Books)
- Verba, S. & Nie, N. 1972, *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. (New York, Harper & Row Publishers)
- Verba, S., Nie, N. & Kim, J. 1978, *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- Verba, S., Nie, N., Scholzman, K. & Brady, H. 1993, 'Citizen Activity: Who Participates? What do they Say?' in *American Political Science Review* 87: 303-318
- Verba, S., Lehman Scholzman, K. & Brady, H. 1995, *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press.)
- Vowles, J. 1995, 'Electoral Participation' in J.Vowles, P.Aimer, H.Catt, J. Leman, R. Miller (eds.) *Towards Consensus*. (Auckland University Press, Auckland)
- Vowles, J. 2002, 'What happened at the 1999 election?' in J.Vowles, P.Aimer, J.Karp, S.Banducci, R.Miller, A.Sullivan (eds..) *Proportional Representation on Trial*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Vowles, J. 2002, 'The Puzzle of Turnout' in J.Vowles, P.Aimer, J.Karp, S.Banducci, R.Miller, A.Sullivan (eds..) *Proportional Representation on Trial*. (Auckland, Auckland University Press)
- Walker, R. 1990, *Ka Whawhai tonu mātou*. (Middlessex, England, Penguin Books)

Walker, R. 2004, *Ka Whawhai tonu mātou: The Revised Edition*. (Middlessex, England, Penguin Books)
Williams, J. 1969, *Politics of the New Zealand Māori: Protest and Cooperations, 1891-1909*. (Auckland, Oxford University Press)

Electronic Sources

Elections New Zealand website: www.elections.org.nz

New Zealand Herald

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/topic/story.cfm?c_id=350&objectid=3564792

Scoop News <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0404/S00062.htm>

The Beehive <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/foreshore/>

Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Te_Tawharau