

Chapter Six

Searching for the World of Light¹

*We have a history of people putting the **Maori** under a microscope in the same way a scientist looks at an insect. The ones doing the looking are giving themselves the power to define and describe.²*

Introduction.

In the previous chapter I examined the cultural formations of western approaches to research and linked research to the imperial and colonial enterprise. This chapter discusses the beginnings of a different type of involvement in research by **Maori**. Rather than accept the position either of 'victim' or of 'object,' **Maori** people began voicing resistance to research from the late 1960s and began to pose our own research questions. There were three incentives for this shift in approach to research; (i) the establishment of the **Waitangi** Tribunal³, (ii) the development of **Te Kohanga Reo**, and (iii) the spaces opened up in the

¹ This chapter is adapted from a series of papers which have the title **Te Rapunga ki te Ao Marama**. It includes some new material and the rejection of other material in order that the chapter sits well in relation to the other chapters in this section. There is considerable significance in **Maori** terms of the metaphors connected with 'searching' and with the 'world of light' as these relate to our creation stories and are part of our **whakapapa**. Smith, L.T., 1985. '**Te Rapunga ki te Ao Marama: The Search for the World of Light**' Education Department, University of Auckland. Smith, L.T., 1990. '**Te Rapunga ki te Ao Marama: The Search for the World of Light**', in *Growing Up The Politics of Human Learning*, eds. J. Morss, T. Linzey, Auckland, Longman Paul, pp.46-55.

² Mita, M., 1989. '**Merata Mita On...**', in *New Zealand Listener*, 14 October, p.30.

³ This was established through the Treaty of **Waitangi** Act 1975 to deal with claims by **Maori** that actions of the Crown from 1975 onwards had been prejudicial to them and had contravened the Treaty of **Waitangi**. This Act was amended by The Treaty of **Waitangi** Act 1985 which gave the Tribunal the right to hear cases which went back to 1840 when the Treaty of **Waitangi** and the **Maori** version, **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** was signed. The Tribunal was expanded from three members under the 1975 Act to several teams of members who are hearing cases across the country.

social sciences by more critical and reflexive approaches to research. This chapter tracks a remarkable transition from *Maori as the researched* to *Maori as the researcher*. Although this transition has occurred in the last twenty years, it would be wrong to claim either an overall change in attitudes by *Maori* to research or a steady progression of changes made. The intersecting spaces opened up by the development of research for the *Waitangi* Tribunal, the new enthusiasm shown for *Te Kohanga Reo*, and the critique of positivist research by feminist and critical theorists created a set of conditions from which culturally sensitive approaches to research were developed and from which a more sympathetic *Maori* approach started to emerge.

There are three distinct parts to this chapter. The first part examines the creation of a set of more favourable conditions for research involving *Maori*. There is a brief discussion of the spaces opened up through feminist and critical critiques of positivism, followed by a discussion of the impact of the *Waitangi* Tribunal and *Te Kohanga Reo* on setting the scene for establishing *Maori* research priorities. The second part of the chapter shifts the tone and picks up on matters raised at the end of the introduction to this section of the thesis, namely research of *Maori* and the ways in which research has been employed and/or represented as 'truth'. Also in the second part of the chapter, there is a very brief discussion of alternative *Maori* claims about knowledge and research which intersects with one assumption made of research, that is, that research extends knowledge. The question which begins part two asks, 'Whose knowledge has been extended by research?' This then leads into some general issues made in relation to *Maori* views about knowing. Part three of the chapter examines the parameters of 'culturally sensitive research' which is still an essentially western research model. It ends with a brief discussion on the limits of this model in relation to *Pakeha* research of *Maori*.

Part One: Western Critiques of Western Research.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the western cultural archive contained within it several traditions of knowledge and rules of practice for engaging in debates over knowledge. These rules enabled systems or methods of self-critique. The notion of research as an objective, value-free and scientific process for observing and making sense of human realities is taken

for granted by many social scientists. Philosophers of science refer to this attitude as 'positivism'. Differences in approach to research, however, have been the subject of continuous debate, as those engaged in attempts to understand human society grapple with the problematic nature of social science inquiry. Within the social sciences there have been a number of disputes over method, meanings and what constitutes 'good' research. Method is important because it is regarded as the way in which knowledge is acquired or discovered and as a way in which we can 'know' what is real. Each academic discipline is attached not just to a set of ideas about knowledge, but also to methodologies. Disputes over method occur both within disciplines and across disciplines. This is not surprising, considering that all academic disciplines, as defined by the west, are derived from shared philosophical foundations. Some disputes, however, have 'ragged' within the scientific world and have contributed to major schisms in theoretical positions.⁴ At one level, this debate has been concerned primarily with issues related to methodology and method.⁵ These issues focus upon the appropriateness of research design and analysis. Definitions of validity and reliability are of critical importance here as researchers attempt to construct and perfect scientific instruments for observing and explaining human behaviour and the human condition. At a broader level, however, the debate has been concerned with the wider aims and role of research. Social science fields of inquiry are dependent on the way society is viewed, and the body of knowledge which legitimates that viewpoint. The dispute at this level is over the validity of scientific methods within the positivist paradigm as an appropriate paradigm for understanding human society, that is, the 'social' world.

It was not really until the 1960s that critical theory took hold as a theory for research, although the death camps of Nazi Germany were seen by critics of positivism, to demonstrate

⁴ Adorno, T.W., et al., 1976. *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology*, trans G. Adey, D. Frisby, London, Heinemann.

⁵ I use Sandra Harding's definitions of methodology and method, that is, 'A research methodology is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed...' and 'A research method is a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence...' in Harding, S., 1987. *Feminism and Methodology*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, pp.2-3.

the ultimate irrationality of science and of modernity.⁶ However the 1960s are regarded as a period when fundamental questions about knowledge and power were being articulated not just through academic discourse, but through social movements such as the Civil Rights movement, the Anti-Vietnam War movement, the second wave of Feminism and widespread student unrest culminating for many observers in the student riots in Paris in 1968.

In the 1960s and 1970s other social events also took place for indigenous people. Protests over the Treaty of *Waitangi*, Bastion Point, land marches, tent embassies, sit-ins and petitions were the key events for *Maori*.⁷ These events were reflected in other parts of the indigenous world. The American Indian Movement (AIM), for example, began the formation of an international movement of indigenous peoples by calling a meeting in 1974.⁸ It is at this point that the critical questions asked by critical theory were also being asked by people on the ground. These people were not necessarily Marxists, but were asking similar sorts of questions about the connections between power and research. Such questions were based on a sense of outrage and injustice about the failure of education, of democracy, of research to deliver social change for people who were oppressed. These questions related to the relationship between knowledge and power, between research and emancipation, and between lived reality and imposed ideals about the other.

During this period social theory shifted, and in the global arena of scholarship, Marxist theorists challenged the whole theory of modernisation and development which had determined how the imperial world, (which had since renamed itself as the First World), dealt

⁶ For a historical summary of critical theory in relation to education read, Blackledge, D., B. Hunt, 1985. *Sociological Interpretations of Education*. London, Croom Helm. Gibson, R., 1986. *Critical Theory and Education*. London, Hodder & Stoughton.

⁷ See *Ranginui Walker's account of these events* in Walker, R., 1990. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou, Struggle Without End*. Auckland, Penguin.

⁸ This meeting was attended by about 5,000 people. It culminated in the formation of the International Indian Treaty Council, which then petitioned for consultative membership of the Economic and Social Council of the UN (ECOSOC) which was granted in 1977. In Canada similar moves were made which culminated in the World Council for Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), also affiliated to the UN. Read for an account of these movements *The 1987 Report for the Secretariat of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues, Indigenous Peoples, A Global Quest for Justice*. London, Zed Books. Jaimes, A.M., 1992. 'American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in North America', in *The State of Native America, Genocide, Colonization and Resistance*, ed. M.A. Jaimes, Boston, South End Press, pp.311-344.

with its former colonies, the Third World. Gunder Frank and others working in the South American and African contexts re-examined ideas of development and suggested that there was a causal relationship between First World economic policies and Third World under-development. In education, Marxist researchers also drew attention to the structural relationship between society and schooling, with schools seen as agencies which reproduce social inequalities.⁹ The links between imperialism, education and development were drawn by theorists such as Martin Carnoy.¹⁰ These views have been criticised for their heavy emphasis on deterministic models of analysis and denial of culture as a mediating force. However the central question of power and emancipation which was raised by Marxist theorists did connect with the radical aspirations of a number of indigenous communities and former colonies which were struggling for self-determination.

The Challenge by Feminism.

The debate over positivism which emerged from European academic tradition has been continued in the Anglo-American world by feminist and other radical critiques of the positivist position. While Marxism provided a powerful counter to liberal thought in the first part of the twentieth century,¹¹ in the latter part of this century, the second wave of feminism has been arguably far more important in its challenge of the epistemological foundations of western philosophy, academic practice and research. 'Old' philosophical themes about human nature, patriarchal accounts of the past, and taken for granted rules of practice within the academy of intellectuals, have been rigorously scrutinised and reformed by feminist theorists working across a wide range of disciplines and from a wide spectrum of philosophical orientations. Each field of study has been subject to a critique from feminist theorists.¹²

One of the more significant challenges to feminism has come from women variously

⁹ Bowles, S., H. Gintis, 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. United States, Basic Books.

¹⁰ Carnoy, M., 1974. *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York, D. McKay Co.

¹¹ And, is itself inextricably part of the modernist project.

¹² Fonow, M.M., J.A. Cook, 1991. *Beyond Methodology, Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

described as 'women of colour', third world women', 'black women' and 'indigenous women'. These women challenged the assumptions of the women's movement that all women shared some universal characteristics and suffered from universal oppressions which could be understood and described by a group of predominantly white, western trained women academics. The problems of 'voice' and 'visibility', 'silence' and 'invisibility', became important concerns at a concrete level, as women attended international conferences and attempted to come up with international policies over women's rights, population control, development and justice. For women interested in research and the emancipatory potential of research, there was considerable work to be done in terms of undoing or deconstructing the dominant paradigms by which most scientific research was bounded, and connecting the research enterprise to feminism and to a social reality with which feminism connects.¹³ This has involved critique, the development of new methodologies, and the possibility of alternative ways of knowing.¹⁴

Part of the feminist critique has also occurred within the field of critical theory. This critique has two aspects to it. One is in terms of the failure of critical theory to deliver emancipation for oppressed groups.¹⁵ The second aspect is in terms of the failure of critical theorists who belonged to the academy of scientists, to recognise their own patriarchal practices which continued to marginalise and silence women academics. This challenge has focused on the notion of reflexivity in research, a process of critical self awareness and evaluation and openness to challenge. Feminist scholarship has slowly moved into the academic world and, in the area of research in particular, feminist methodologies are widely accepted as having legitimacy as method and as breaking new ground in terms of research and scholarship.

Patti Lather has referred to this new ground research as postpositivism, a term which comes

¹³ Stanley, L., S. Wise, 1993. *Breaking Out Again, Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. 2nd Edition, London, Routledge.

¹⁴ See for example, Reinharz, S., 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York, Oxford University Press. Reinharz takes the reader through feminist methods for ethnography, survey research, experimental, cross-cultural, oral histories, case studies and action research.

¹⁵ Ellsworth, E., 1989. 'Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy', in *Harvard Educational Review*, v.59, no.3, pp.297-324.

out of poststructuralist and postmodern approaches to knowledge.¹⁶ Lather outlines some of these approaches in the following chart, with categories drawn partly from Habermas' categories of prediction, understanding and emancipation, and her own addition of deconstruction.¹⁷ This chart is useful because it sets out the different names by which various critiques of positivist science are known. These 'labels' are frequently used to describe different approaches to non-positivist research. What is significantly absent are the organic and indigenous approaches to research, which have led to the development of a world indigenous movement and to major constitutional claims on western states by indigenous peoples. Such approaches to research are often regarded as deriving from Freirian approaches, which are seen to be 'western'. As will be argued later, the possibility that approaches can be generated from very different value systems and world views, and therefore a different code, are denied even within the emancipatory paradigm of 'postpositivism'.

Postpositivist Inquiry			
Predict	Understand	Emancipate	Deconstruct
postivism	interpretive	critical	poststructural
	naturalistic	neoMarxist	postmodern
	constructivist	feminist	post-paradigm
	phenomenological	praxis-oriented	diaspora
	hermeneutic	educative	
		Freirian participatory	
		action research	
P Lather 1991			

However, the work being carried out by western feminists has been countered by the work of black women and other 'women with labels'. In fact, the very labelling of women

¹⁶ Lather, P., 1991. *Getting Smart, Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern*. New York, Routledge.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.6-7.

demonstrates the pluralism within the feminist world, and the multiple directions from which feminist theory has emerged and to which it may be heading. Black women have argued that oppression takes different forms, and that there are interlocking relationships between race, gender and class which makes oppression a complex sociological and psychological condition. Many have argued that this condition can not be understood or analysed by outsiders or people who have not experienced, and who have not been born into, this way of life. Patricia Hill Collins has argued that 'while Black feminist thought may be recorded by others, it is produced by Black women'.¹⁸ Further, she argues that 'Black women possess a unique standpoint on, or perspective of, their experiences.... [and]...while living life as Black women may produce certain commonalities of outlook, the diversity of class, region, age, and sexual orientation shaping Black women's lives has resulted in different expressions of these common themes'.¹⁹ This kind of position intersects with *Maori* attitudes to research, and the writings of African American women in particular have been useful for *Maori* women in legitimating, with literature, what *Maori* women have experienced.

The *Waitangi* Tribunal and *Te Kohanga Reo*.

The significance of the establishment of the *Waitangi* Tribunal in 1975 in relation to research was that it gave a very concrete focus for recovering and/or representing *Maori* versions of our colonial history and of situating the impact of colonialism in our own world views and value systems. Struggles over land issues had been on-going since the Treaty of *Waitangi* was signed in 1840 and land alienation was facilitated efficiently through the establishment of the Native Land Court in 1865.²⁰ Successive governments and local authorities had imposed a series of laws and regulations which were designed to alienate *Maori* land from *Maori*

¹⁸ Collins, P. H., 1991. 'Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought', in *Beyond Methodology, Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. eds., M. Fonow, J.A. Cook, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, pp.35-59, p.37.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.37.

²⁰ The Treaty of *Waitangi* gave pre-emptive right to the Crown to purchase *Maori* land, that is, before any individuals or companies. This practice ceased under pressure from companies interested in settlement by British settlers.

people.²¹ This approach continued throughout the 1950s and 1960s with what has been called a 'use it or lose it' philosophy.²² The 1975 Treaty of *Waitangi* Act gave limited powers to the Tribunal and could not hear claims to lands which went back to 1840. Most of the land subject to *Maori* discontent had been taken prior to 1975. However a forum through which *Maori* could legitimately voice concerns was regarded positively.

The Treaty of *Waitangi* Amendment Act 1985 broadened the scope of the Tribunal, and it is from this period that *iwi* started quite seriously to develop their own research programmes.²³ The research priorities were determined by the nature of the claim being made and driven by the sense of injustice felt by the *iwi* concerned. There were few *Maori* skilled in research and many of those available to do the work were unemployed or retired. Other *iwi* research programmes were reliant on one skilled researcher and many young and enthusiastic trainees. In general these early programmes were carried out with limited funding and with few skilled researchers. This often told when the evidence was finally presented and a number of claims required further substantiation. The first level of research which needed to be done required archival research, familiarity with Land Court records and oral histories. This was followed by another level of interpretative research, especially over contestible issues such as establishing prior ownership of lands or resources also being claimed by other *iwi* or contested by the Crown. In this process the Crown was not and is not neutral. After 1985 the state moved rapidly into economic reforms and the privatisation of state assets. It was the contention of *iwi* that most of the state's assets had been built upon *Maori* lands. Privatisation activities have continued unabated and the Crown's activities in relationship to

²¹ According to Asher and Naulls, 'Since the signing of the Treaty of *Waitangi* in 1840 the *Maori* tribal estates have declined from almost 27 million hectares to about 1.3 million. And what remains is often in the form of fragmented holdings with a multiplicity of owners, predominantly absentee.' For further background see Asher, G., D Naulls, 1987. *Maori Land*. Wellington, New Zealand Planning Council, p.46. Some of the legislation which was used as a device to alienate the land was, for example, The Public Works Act 1908 which authorised the taking of European land for railways and roads, with right of objection and compensation. No notice was required to take *Maori* land until the Native Land Act 1909, which authorised the Governor General to take *Maori* lands for railways and roads, with no compensation. See Temm, P., 1990. *The Waitangi Tribunal* Auckland, Random Century. There was a series of such legislation which enabled the systematic stripping of land away from its owners.

²² *Ibid.*, p.47.

²³ According to Margaret Mutu, for example, her *iwi* (Ngati Kahu) had started talking about doing their own research in the early 1980s but had no funding to help them. Their case had its first hearing in 1987 and in 1995 is still being heard. Personal communication.

the Tribunal are to subsume its importance and deal with what is politically acceptable.

Although at one level there was an impetus in terms of taking cases against the Crown, there was a much broader desire by *Maori* communities to regain or hold on to *Maori* language and cultural knowledge. This desire and mood is what *Te Kohanga Reo* captured and for which it provided a new and positive focus. While the claims to the Tribunal were being made on the basis of *iwi* interests, and even these were contested within *iwi*, then *Te Kohanga Reo* was built on the more fundamental unit of *whanau*. *Te Kohanga Reo* was represented and represented itself as 'the future'. *Te Kohanga Reo*, as a national phenomenon, did not depend on *iwi* structures for its credibility or financial support.²⁴ Although some *Te Kohanga Reo* are clearly situated within *iwi*, their administrative centre is the National *Te Kohanga Reo* Trust based in Wellington. The two developments therefore, the *Waitangi* Tribunal process and *Te Kohanga Reo*, were operating quite independently of each other and having an impact on communities in very different ways. *Te Kohanga Reo*, furthermore, discouraged research but encouraged autonomy amongst its individual units. A consequence of such autonomy is that there was space for *whanau* to problem solve for themselves and this process generated a wide range of activities, one of which was information gathering. It was also a process which committed parents to thinking far more seriously about education and schooling.

Part Two: Research as an Extension of Knowledge - Whose Knowledge?

Unlike the academic debate of Europe, which engaged university intellectuals, the critique from feminist theorists and ethnic minorities has emerged from the experience of people who have been studied, researched, written about, and defined by social scientists. It is from the position of being *the researched* that *Maori* also have resisted, and then challenged, social science research. This challenge has confronted both methodological issues and epistemological concerns: that is, both the techniques of research and the presuppositions about knowledge which underlie research. The criticisms raised by *Maori* people locate the theoretical debates of the wider world within a local New Zealand context.

²⁴ Although obviously *iwi* support helped.

Research is about satisfying a need to know, and a need to extend the boundaries of existing knowledge through a process of systematic inquiry. Rationality in the western tradition enabled knowledge to be produced and articulated in a scientific and 'superior' way. As Europeans began to explore and colonise other parts of the world, notions of rationality and conceptualisations of knowledge became the '*convenient tool for dismissing from serious comparison with Western forms of thought those forms of "primitive" thought which were being encountered*'.²⁵ As Salmond has argued, this view has led to '*European evaluations of **Maori** knowledge ... [which] have characteristically been ideological*'.²⁶ For **Maori** people, European conceptions of knowledge and of research have meant that, while being considered 'primitive', **Maori** society has provided fertile ground for research. The question of whose knowledge was being extended by research was of little consequence, as early ethnographers, educational researchers and occasional 'travellers' described, explained and recorded their accounts of various aspects of **Maori** society. Distortions of **Maori** social reality by ethnocentric researchers overly given to generalisations, were initially apparent only to **Maori** people.²⁷ While this type of research was validated by 'scientific method' and 'colonial affirmation', it did little to extend the knowledge of **Maori** people. Instead, it left a foundation of ideologically laden data about **Maori** society, which has distorted notions of what it means to be **Maori**.

This in turn has entrapped **Maori** people within a cultural definition which does not connect with either our oral traditions, or lived reality. **Maori** women, for example, are caught between the written accounts of **Pakeha** male writers and the assertions of the few **Maori** women who are contesting those early accounts. For example, Elsdon Best says of his research among the **Tuhoe** tribe, '*As in most other barbaric lands, we find that women were looked upon here as being inferior to man*'.²⁸ Compare that with what **Rangimarie Rose**

²⁵ Egan, K., 1987. 'Literacy and the Oral Foundations of Education', in *Harvard Educational Review*, v.57, no.4, pp.445-472, p.446.

²⁶ Salmond, A., 1985. 'Maori Epistemologies', in *Reason and Morality*, ed. J. Overing, London, Tavistock, p.240.

²⁷ Smith G.H., 1986. '*Nga Kete Wananga - Akonga Maori: Maori Teaching and Learning*', Auckland, **Maori Studies Department**, Auckland College of Education.

²⁸ Best, E., 1934. *The Maori As He Was*, Wellington, **Maori Purposes' Fund Board**, p.93.

Pere, herself a descendant of *Tuhoe Potiki*, has to say, 'As a female, I have been exposed to very positive, female role models from both my natural parents' descent lines. The most senior men and women ... made it quite clear from the legacy they left that men and women, adults and children, work alongside each other and together'.²⁹ The problem is not simply about redressing the past. Much of what was written about *Maori* people last century and in this century has become part of a taken for granted body of common knowledge. Hence the uphill task for *Maori* women seeking to reconstruct traditional roles is that they are having to challenge existing 'knowledge' which is primarily ideological or false. Consider the following three examples:

(i)

*Culturally, the role of women was made clear in the account of their creation. The first woman was formed out of a mound of earth and impregnated by her male creator with a life spirit. From this, woman was regarded as being a passive receptacle for the dominant male spirit.*³⁰

There are three points which can be made in relation to this account. Firstly, *Maori* would claim that we were created by a *tipuna*, of 'god-like' status, who also impregnated most other living things on earth with 'life spirits'. The problem lies in the reduction of our creation myths to a story of 'man' and 'woman', like a Judaeo-Christian account of 'Adam and Eve'. The second problem with this interpretation lies with the concept of male and female 'spirits'. Humans as well as plants, animals, stones, carvings and other animate and inanimate objects (according to western classifications) have a 'life force' or *mauri*. In many oral accounts I have heard, both male and female 'essences' reside in that life force. While the life force in people and animals may be manifested in physically 'male' or 'female' characteristics, *mauri* is not itself gendered. The third problematic aspect of this quote is the concept of a 'passive receptacle'. There are enough examples in oral histories to demonstrate that women were always considered more than 'passive receptacles'.

²⁹ *Pere, R.*, 1988. 'Te Wheke: Whaia te Maramatanga me te Aroha', in *Women and Education in Aotearoa*. ed. S. Middleton, Wellington, Allen and Unwin, p.9

³⁰ Heuer B., 1972. *Maori Women*. Wellington, The Polynesian Society, A.H. & A. W. Reed, p.55.

(ii)

*In Maori attitudes towards a woman's place, there was, on the surface, little conflict with the Victorian espousal of a limited domestic sphere.*³¹

The difficulties with this quote are its comparative appeal to Victorian attitudes and the concept of a 'limited domestic sphere'. The comparison is a dangerous one in two respects; it reduces and decontextualises *Maori* values and practices on one hand (in order to make the comparison), and secondly it poses unproblematically the normative 'reality' of notions such as 'woman's place' and 'domestic spheres'.

(iii)

*[Maori] women suffered a social oppression typical of all societies that reject the fatherhood of God.*³²

The third quote reduces all previous quotes (research) into one almighty generalisation which is used to justify a new form of colonialism (fundamentalist christianity). No sources are acknowledged for this information and, in a sense none are required, because it is posited as 'common sense'. This has been the danger of ethnocentric research paradigms.

The quotes above were not written by *Maori*, but by people who, for the most part, were informed by the research and material which has been written and recorded by other non-*Maori* about *Maori* society. The effect of a process which tends to give greater legitimacy to written sources is that the most accessible material was not written by *Maori*. Therefore, the potential to reproduce colonising ideologies and colonising perspectives is always present. However, as argued by *Merata Mita*, '*paternalism doesn't work and as soon as we reject it we're the ones seen to be causing the 'problem' when in fact the problem is created by whoever is looking through the microscope*'.³³

³¹ Fry, R., 1985. *It's Different for Daughters: A History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools 1900-1975*. Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, p.156.

³² Drake, M., 1989. *The New Maori Myth*. Auckland, Wycliffe Christian Schools, p.20.

³³ Mita, p.30.

The reassertion of *Maori* aspirations and cultural practice which came about through *Te Kohanga Reo*, the *Waitangi* Tribunal and other forms of *Maori* activism, has demonstrated a will by *Maori* people to make explicit claims about the validity and legitimacy of *matauranga Maori* or *Maori* knowledge. This will has been expressed through programmes such as *Te Kohanga Reo*, *Kura Kaupapa Maori* and *Wananga*. Government policies on devolution and the retraction of state assets have also stimulated *iwi* to carry out research on their own behalf.³⁴ In many cases *Maori* organisations have been reluctant to allow research to be carried out until they have developed a sufficiently strong base. This has meant the development of a powerful *kaupapa* (philosophy or rationale), a committed membership and, in the case of *Te Kohanga Reo* and *Kura Kaupapa Maori*, a tried and tested pedagogy. While perceived by some as being 'separatist', this stance has been about self-protection in an unjust world; a world where mistakes by *Maori* organisations are ammunition for political and ideological warfare. The position of self-protection has enabled *Maori* people to reclaim past knowledge and place it in a contemporary context.

When Cook arrived here in the eighteenth century, he found a thriving and complex society. Later voyagers and travellers, including Christian missionaries, were fascinated and heartened that *Maori* concepts relating to cosmology and spirituality were so sophisticated. Missionaries, for example, were reported to have had little difficulty in talking about spiritual concepts with *Maori* people.³⁵ Although later settlers saw little that was civilising in *Maori* beliefs or practice, earlier visitors, including many missionaries, were appreciative of the breadth and sophistication of *Maori* epistemology. Because of the way *Maori* society was structured, because of its unique world-view, and because of its strong oral tradition, knowledge itself was never held to be universally available. *Maori* society valued knowledge highly, to such

³⁴ Every claim to the *Waitangi* Tribunal requires substantial amounts of research by *Maori*. This research includes searching through Native Land Court records, archival research, written accounts of family records, *whakapapa*, the gathering of oral histories. In most cases this requires a team of researchers who have skills in *Maori* language, can find their way around legal documents, who already have a sound historical understanding of the context, who have the means to travel, are computer literate and can interpret different sorts of data.

³⁵ In fact some, like Kendall, became very involved in discussions about *Maori* spirituality. See Binney, J., 1968. *The Legacy of Guilt: A Life of Thomas Kendall*. Auckland, Oxford University Press.

an extent that certain types of knowledge were entrusted to only a few members of the *whanau*. Some knowledge was considered to be '*tapu*' and there were sanctions that ensured that it was protected, used appropriately, and transmitted with accuracy.

In *Maori* traditions one of the first 'research projects' was the journey by *Tane-nui-a-rangi*, one of the children of the first parents, to the twelfth 'universe' to gain *wananga* or knowledge.³⁶ Two points to emphasise in this story are that *Tane-nui-a-rangi* sought *wananga* on behalf of everyone else, and secondly, the *wananga* he gained came in three separate kits; *Te kete tuauri*, *Te kete tuatea*, and *Te kete aronui*.³⁷ These kits contained different types of knowledge. Knowledge, then, was perceived as being highly specialised, but each aspect was essential to the well-being of the whole *whanau* and *iwi*. It was also perceived as being hierarchical. There was knowledge that all people needed to carry out their daily activities. It was acquired through observation, practice, and the guidance of *kaumatua*. Sloppiness, laziness and the non-completion of tasks were not tolerated. These faults were sanctioned in stories or *pakiwaitara* and *whakatauki* (proverbs). For example, when referring to the collective efforts at the planting of the *kumara*, it would be said, '*I hea koe tangi ana o te pipiwharauoa?*'³⁸

In flax work, for example, mistakes had to be undone and corrected. The whole ritual complex associated with *raranga* (weaving), such as saying *karakia* when taking flax, covering unfinished work, not weaving after sunset, and giving away one's first finished piece, were ways of sanctioning, preserving and protecting 'accepted' knowledge.³⁹ There

³⁶ An English language account of one version of this story can be found in Buck P., 1949. *The Coming of the Maori* Wellington, Maori Purposes Fund Board, Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd. pp.443-472. Buck identifies the 'baskets of knowledge' as *kete uruuru matua* (peace and goodness), *kete uruuru rangi* (prayers and incantations) and *kete uruuru tau* or *tawhite* (war, agriculture woodwork).p.449. Another account is to be found in the manuscript by *Te Matorohanga* which was translated by Percy Smith as Smith, P. 1913. *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*. New Plymouth, Polynesian Society, Thomas Avery.

³⁷ As well as three kits of knowledge, *Tane-nui-a-rangi* also collected two *mauri* stones, *Te Hukatai* and *Te Rehutai*.

³⁸ 'Where were you when the *pipiwharauoa* (shining cuckoo) called?' in other words, where were you during the planting season when there was work to be done? There are several variations on this theme.

³⁹ See for example, Mead, S.M., 1969. *Traditional Maori Clothing*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed, pp.169-172. Knowledge about weaving was often imparted to young girls through the singing of *oriori* or 'lullabys'

was also knowledge that pertained to the interests of the whole *iwi*; knowledge of *karakia*, *whakapapa*, *waiata*, for example. Some knowledge had popular, more secular versions such as creation mythologies, and more esoteric versions which were passed on to only selected students. Knowledge was also regarded as the 'property' of an *iwi*, coming under its *mana* or protection. Fishing grounds, places where flax was dyed, *whakapapa* and other specialised skills belonged to the people. They were essential to the physical and spiritual survival of the group and to its *mana*. Although there were skills and knowledge that could be gained by all members of the community, there was also knowledge that could be gained only by its being given, and because specialised knowledge contributed to a person's *mana*, it was unlikely that a more learned *kaumatua* would give away too much at once. Knowledge in this context was a *taonga*, or precious gift, which was bestowed only on those who had demonstrated a gift or skill in this area and who had shown readiness to receive and respect such knowledge.⁴⁰

In a pre-literate society, what was learned through oral transmission had to be learned exactly. The security, survival and *mana* of the people depended on it. Knowledge of *whakapapa*, for example, was important in establishing individual relationships and rights and in asserting influence or credibility. Individuals who could establish themselves as being in a *tuakana* (older) relationship with others were able to claim rights and responsibilities on behalf of their *teina* (younger) relations. On an *iwi* level, *whakapapa* was used to maintain more political relationships, to assert dominance, to sort out allegiances, to lay claims, to remember significant past events and to maintain a time scale.⁴¹ The *tuakana* line in a *whakapapa* could also be used to establish prior rights at the tribal level. Descendants of a younger brother or sister could be reminded of their *teina* status, in a more political context, by descendants of the older line of descent. While being a part of most normal inter-tribal debate and rhetoric, in more heated contexts the reminder could be more barbed and designed to

which instructed a girl on the values, and rituals associated with weaving. Some of these can be found in Ngata, A.T., P. Te Hurinui, 1961. *Nga Moteatea, The Songs. Parts I and II*, Wellington, The Polynesian Society.

⁴⁰ See Salmond's account of the ways Eruera Stirling decided to give out his knowledge to her in Salmond, A., 1980. *Eruera, The Teachings of a Maori Elder*. Wellington, Oxford University Press.

⁴¹ *Whakapapa* is discussed further in section three chapter eight.

sting the audience.⁴² *Whakapapa* is still used in these ways, although the *Waitangi* Tribunal and more significantly, the *Maori* Land Court, have used *whakapapa* in a juridical sense. It was important when given knowledge of this nature that the *tauiira* (learner) got it right and used it for the good of the *whanau*. To make mistakes and to misuse it would take away *mana* from the whole *whanau*, and would certainly reduce a student's chances of gaining more knowledge.⁴³

The whole process of colonisation can be viewed as a stripping away of *mana* (our standing in our own eyes), and an undermining of *rangatiratanga* (our ability and right to determine our destinies). Research is an important part of the colonisation process because it is concerned with defining legitimate knowledge. In *Maori* communities today, there is a deep distrust and suspicion of research. This suspicion is not just of *Pakeha* researchers, but of the whole philosophy of research and the different sets of beliefs which underlie the research process. Even in very recent studies, this hostility or negative attitudes to research in general has been noted.⁴⁴ Research methodology is based on the skill of matching the problem with an 'appropriate' set of investigative strategies. It is concerned with ensuring that information is accessed in such a way as to guarantee validity and reliability. This requires having a theoretical understanding either explicitly or implicitly, of the world, the problem, and the method. When studying how to go about doing research, it is very easy to overlook the realm of common sense, the basic beliefs that not only help people identify research problems that are relevant and worthy, but also accompany them throughout the research process. Researchers must go further than simply recognising personal beliefs and assumptions, and the effect they have when interacting with people.⁴⁵ In a cross-cultural context, the questions that need to be asked are ones such as: *Who has helped define the research problem? For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so? Which cultural group will be the one*

⁴² More often these 'barbs' are delivered in very subtle ways, for example the use of a particular *whakatauki* or proverb or a metaphor could invoke past occasions or memories.

⁴³ The point being, that if a learner proved to be inept or lacking in concentration, then it was unlikely that they would be considered as adequate recipients of important knowledge.

⁴⁴ *Teariki, C., P. Spoonley, 1992. Te Whakapakari Te Mana Tangata - The Politics and Process of Research for Maori. Palmerston North, Department of Sociology, Massey University.*

⁴⁵ Which is the point at which some definitions of reflexivity actually stop.

to gain new knowledge from this study? To whom is the researcher accountable? Who will gain most from this study? Moreover, it is also important to question that most fundamental belief of all, that individual researchers have an inherent right to knowledge and truth. We should not assume that they have been trained well enough to pursue it rigorously, nor to recognise it when they have 'discovered' it. An analysis of research into the lives of *Maori* people from a *Maori* perspective would seem to indicate that many researchers have not only not found 'truth' or new knowledge; rather, they have missed the point entirely and, in some cases, drawn conclusions about *Maori* society from information that has only the most tenuous relationship with how *Maori* society operates.⁴⁶

The social settings of the *Pakeha* into which *Maori* people ventured, the school, the health system, the welfare system, the justice system, have at the same time provided researchers a point of entry into *Maori* society. This has been essentially crisis research, directed at explaining the causes of *Maori* failure and supposedly solving *Maori* problems. On the basis of research carried out on these sites of encounters, researchers sometimes made huge inferential leaps and generalisations about how the rest of *Maori* society functioned, and which elements of this society were inhibiting successful development.⁴⁷ To return to the story of *Tane-nui-a-rangi* and the three kits of knowledge, these gifts were all essential to the survival and well-being of the group. Because knowledge was conceived from the beginning as being highly specialised, it had to be distributed among the members of the group. Individuals who held specialist skills, held them on behalf of the group. However they were also dependent on other members of the group, with other types of knowledge, to carry out the other interdependent activities. When a researcher uses individual informants and interviews individuals in a one-to-one context, the resulting information may be a long way from the full picture. The connection of knowledge with *mana* could mean that an informant is not going to reveal too much, is not going to admit lack of knowledge, but conversely, is going to assert influence or a picture of dominance by what is revealed, and is going to give

⁴⁶ Which is the point made by Toby Curtis. Curtis, T., 1983. 'A *Maori* Viewpoint Related to Research in Education in *Maori* Education', republished in *The Issue of Research and Maori*. Research Unit for *Maori* Education, University of Auckland.

⁴⁷ See for example, the discussion of Beaglehole & Beaglehole and the Ritchie studies in the introduction to this section.

an individual view, from an individualist perspective, of group knowledge and activities. Although many people would argue that, under the influence of the *Pakeha*, much of this tradition has been eroded, there is still a strong belief held by many *Maori* people that there is a uniquely '*Maori*' way of looking at the world and learning. The growth of *Te Kohanga Reo* would seem to bear this out. The different ways in which knowledge is perceived by *Maori* and *Pakeha* is complicated further by the intersection with imperial power. They are not held to be equally valid or commensurate views of reality, let alone of research.

The colonisation of *Maori* culture has threatened the maintenance of that knowledge and the transmission of knowledge that is 'exclusively' or particularly *Maori*. The dominance of *Pakeha* culture, and the history that underpins the relationship between *Maori* and *Pakeha*, have made it extremely difficult for *Maori* forms of knowledge and learning to be accepted as legitimate. By upholding the validity of *matauranga Maori*, *Maori* people have reclaimed greater control over the research which is being carried out in the *Maori* field. 'Traditional' world views provide an historical example of the complexity of *Maori* beliefs and understandings of the world. They also provide ample examples of *Maori* efforts to seek knowledge, to organise it and to learn from it. It might be said that this historical knowledge is irrelevant in a contemporary context.⁴⁸ But from a *Maori* perspective, it is only as irrelevant as the thoughts of western philosophers such as Plato or St Augustine, whose ideas have been of such central importance to western epistemology. *Matauranga Maori* represents the body of knowledge which, in today's bicultural society, can be extended, alongside that of existing western knowledge.

Part Three: Developing Culturally Sensitive Research.

A parallel to the problems of research into the *Maori* way of life is to be found in the 1988 Cartwright Inquiry into cervical cancer treatment at National Women's Hospital. It challenged

⁴⁸ In fact it is said, quite frequently, that *Maori* knowledge is irrelevant. As this is being written there is a public outcry about the teaching of 'cultural safety' to nursing students and the irrelevance to nurses of *Maori* knowledge.

the ethics of researchers in a public and dramatic way.⁴⁹ Although many researchers involved in social science may confidently assert that their research does not endanger lives, many lessons can be learned from such an inquiry. Although most researchers would believe sincerely that they wish to improve the conditions of their research participants, this has not always happened. Research projects are designed and carried out with little recognition made of the people who participated - '*the researched*'. *Maori* people and other groups in society have frequently been portrayed as the powerless victims of research which has attributed a variety of deficits or problems to just about everything they do. Years of research have frequently amounted to no improvement to the conditions of the people who are researched. This has led many *Maori* people to believe that researchers are simply intent on taking or 'stealing' knowledge in a non-reciprocal and often underhand way. The Cartwright Inquiry highlighted the notion of 'informed consent' by those who participate in research. This process implies a sharing of knowledge and a form of negotiation between those who do research, and those who are being researched. It acknowledges the fact that, when investigating aspects of people's lives, research is a social and political interaction, which must involve an interchange of information and a positive change in both the outlook of the researcher and the life circumstances of the researched.

Research in itself is a powerful intervention, even if carried out at a distance, which has traditionally benefited the researcher, and the knowledge base of the dominant group in society. When undertaking research, either across cultures or within a minority culture, it is critical that researchers recognise the power dynamic which is embedded in the relationship with their subjects. Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical framework, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate and to draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgements, and often downright misunderstandings. They have the potential to extend knowledge or to perpetuate ignorance.

⁴⁹ See for example, Coney, S., 1988. *The Unfortunate Experiment*. Auckland, Penguin. According to Coney when this experiment was approved the ethical obligations were still framed by the Helsinki Agreement (1964, 1975, 1983) which developed in response to the clinical trials of Nazi doctors in concentration camps.

Culturally sensitive research covers a range of attempts to take cognisance of the problems and issues which concern the people involved in the research. For *Maori*, this has involved efforts by researchers to inform the 'researched' about themselves in a way which respects the *mana* of people. This has not meant a lack of rigour in the research or in its analysis. Rather, the informed consent and participation of the researched, in a project which has meaning for them (as well as the researchers), has been viewed positively, as a means to add to the layers of analysis that good research draws upon. Often the people involved in carrying out research are not the same people who have designed the project, or who will ultimately have a say in its analysis. Culturally sensitive research has had to be infused throughout the research project; from the conceptualisation of the research question, to its design, its delivery and its final analysis and presentation.

The challenge by *Maori* (and other groups) to the research community, demanding that they 'keep out' of researching *Maori* people or *Maori* issues, has led to several different approaches and strategies for carrying out further research. It did not mean that academics simply took notice of *Maori* and stopped all research, but that they sought other ways of thinking about their projects and proceeded with far more caution when entering *Maori* concerns.⁵⁰ There were different ways 'around the problem'. In a previously published paper I listed some of the following strategies which characterise the shifts towards becoming more culturally sensitive.⁵¹ These are:

- (i) *the strategy of avoidance whereby the researcher avoids dealing with the issues or with Maori,*
- (ii) *the strategy of 'personal development' whereby the researchers prepare themselves by learning Maori language, attending hui and becoming more knowledgeable about Maori concerns,*

⁵⁰ This is a very positive gloss as there are many anecdotal examples of researchers who just carried on with little regard for *Maori* concerns.

⁵¹ Smith, L.T., 1989. 'On Being Culturally Sensitive: The Art of Gathering and Eating *Kina* Without Pricking Yourself on the Finger', keynote address to the New Zealand Psychological Society Annual Conference, University of Auckland. Reprinted in *The Issue of Research and Maori*. Research Unit for *Maori* Education, University of Auckland. A *kina* is a sea urchin, very prickly on the outside and not very attractive on the inside, except to those of us who regard them as a summer delicacy.

- (iii) *the strategy of consultation with **Maori** where efforts are made to seek support and consent,*
- (iv) *the strategy of 'making space' where research organisations have recognised and attempted to bring more **Maori** researchers and 'voices' into their own organisation.*

These strategies have various kinds of consequences, positive and negative, for the researchers and the researched. They each involve different ways of making changes, although the first strategy of avoidance may not be helpful to anyone. In association with other shifts in social science theory and the development of feminist critiques of research, the move towards research which is more ethical and concerned with outcomes as well as processes, has meant that those who choose to research with **Maori** people have more opportunities to think more carefully about what this undertaking may mean. This does not necessarily guarantee it, however.

Graham Smith has posited four models by which culturally appropriate research can be undertaken by **Pakeha** researchers.⁵² The first model he refers to as the '*tiaki*' or mentoring model in which authoritative **Maori** people guide and sponsor the research. Two examples given of this model are the mentorship by **Tuhoe kaumatua** John **Rangihau** of anthropologist Peter Cleave and **Tainui** leader Robert **Mahuta** of James Ritchie.⁵³ Other examples include the sponsorship by **Kara Puketapu** of Canadian doctoral student, Augie Fleras, who wrote his thesis on the **Maori** wardens and who has also written about **Te Kohanga Reo**.⁵⁴

⁵² Smith, G.H., 1992. 'Research Issues Related to **Maori** Education', in *The Issue of Research and **Maori***. Research Unit for **Maori** Education, University of Auckland.

⁵³ **Tuhoe** is a tribe in the Bay of Plenty, John **Rangihau** was a very well known **kaumatua**. **Tainui** is a confederation of tribes who claim descent from the **Tainui waka**, although the term **Tainui** is also used in the narrower sense for the tribes of the **Waikato**. Robert **Mahuta** is a senior member of the **Kingitanga** or 'Royal' family and is Director of the **Waikato** Research Centre. **Kara Puketapu** was the Secretary for the Department of **Maori** Affairs, it was during his term that **Te Kohanga Reo** began.

⁵⁴ Fleras, A., 1987. 'Aboriginality as a Language Issue: The Politicization of **Te Reo Maori** in New Zealand', in *Plural Societies*, v.17, no.2, pp.25-51. Fleras, A., 1980. 'From Village **Runanga** to the New Zealand **Maori** Wardens Association, A Historical Development', paper presented to The **Maori** Wardens, Wellington, **Maori** Studies Department, Victoria University.

The second model Smith refers to as the '*whangai*' or adoption model.⁵⁵ The two most well known of these, as classified by Smith, are Anne Salmond's 'adoption' by *Eruera* and *Amiria* Stirling and Joan Metge's 'adoption' by the community of *Ahipara*.⁵⁶ The *whangai* model differs from the '*tiaki*' model in that the *whangai* researchers are incorporated into the daily life of *Maori* people, and sustain a life long relationship which extends far beyond the realms of research. Joan Metge completed her initial study of *Ahipara* in the 1960s and yet still maintains close ties with the community. She has a home there, her home in Wellington is also a home for members of the community who travel to Wellington, she attends meetings of the local *runanga*, and is accorded the respect of the community.⁵⁷ Anne Salmond writes of her relationship with the Stirlings, '*They have been friends and grandparents to me, teachers and guides in the Maori world, and my love for them is beyond words*'.⁵⁸ '*Our meetings,*' she writes, '*were not interviews, but more like formal classes. I asked questions but mostly Eruera talked, explaining customs, telling traditions, and recounting the main events of his life. He told me that when I first came to his house in 1964, he had looked to see if I had the 'right spirit', and he wove a metaphor of kinship and apprenticeship between us that made our work together peaceful and unworried*'.⁵⁹ Both Metge and Salmond are anthropologists, and they are *Pakeha* women.

Smith's third model is a 'power sharing model' where researchers 'seek the assistance of the community to meaningfully support the development of a research enterprise'. One of the examples given by Smith, in relation to this model, is Jim Marshall and Michael Peters and their work with the '*Taitokerau* Language Project, *Te Reo o Te Taitokerau*. In this project Marshall and Peters worked with *Maori* language teachers in the *Taitokerau* region (north of Auckland city) to develop an intervention into the teaching and evaluation of *Maori*

⁵⁵ Both terms '*tiaki*' and '*whangai*' define types of relationships which are considered positive and appropriate under certain constraints.

⁵⁶ *Eruera* Stirling was a respected *kaumatua* from *Whanau a Apanui* on the East Coast, his wife *Amiria* was from *Ngati Porou*, also on the East Coast. *Ahipara* is a community in the Far North.

⁵⁷ *Runanga* are councils or gatherings in which formal business is addressed.

⁵⁸ Salmond, p.245.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.247.

language. The intervention was aimed at the policy level and at the community level. The two researchers had a commitment to an emancipatory model of research, which involved them in a collaborative style of research with *Maori* teachers. This project has also involved the two researchers in an ongoing relationship with the communities and people they met. This has included supervising postgraduate students from the area and looking after individuals.

The fourth model Smith refers to as the 'empowering outcomes model', which addresses the sorts of questions *Maori* people want to know and which has beneficial outcomes. In this he includes the work of Richard Benton, Judith Simon and Richard Harker. Whilst these researchers were carrying out different kinds of research, the outcome has been beneficial for *Maori* in so much as the information and analyses provided have been sympathetic for *Maori* and have lead to positive outcomes. Benton's survey, for example, helped fuel the revitalisation of *Maori* language. Simon's research on early *Maori* schooling confirmed the lived experiences of many *Maori* in the Native or *Maori* school system and in the state system.

All these models imply a culturally sensitive and empathetic approach, but go beyond that approach to address the issues which are going to make a difference for *Maori*. Bishop critically discusses some of the problems associated generally with emancipatory research and empowering models of research.⁶⁰ As Bishop argues, espousing an emancipatory model of research has not of itself freed researchers from exercising intellectual arrogance or employing evangelical and paternalistic practices. This applies also to methods which appear to be qualitative or ethnographic. These approaches may sound more sensitive in the field, but often the assumptions behind the research focus and the translation into text, can be just as problematic as other forms of research.

Another model of research is subsumed under the label of 'bicultural' or partnership research. Although Smith's four models could also be claimed as bicultural in some form, the latest interetation of bicultural research involves both *Maori* and *Pakeha* researchers working on a research project and shaping that project together. Sometimes this involves *Pakeha*

⁶⁰ Bishop, R., 1994. 'Initiating Empowering Research?' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* v.29, no.1, pp.175-188.

researchers taking responsibility for interviewing *Pakeha*, and *Maori* researchers interviewing *Maori*. In other projects it involves a more complex structuring of a research programme, its design and methodology. *Teariki* and Spoonley write that research as a partnership involves working through a process which is inevitably political.⁶¹ They argue that research needs to be carefully negotiated, and that the outcomes of research need to be thought through before the research is undertaken.

Setting the Limits of Research by *Pakeha*.

All of the above models assume that *Pakeha* people are involved in the research in key and often senior roles. With very few trained *Maori* researchers available, one of the roles *Pakeha* researchers have needed to play is as mentors of *Maori* research assistants. Increasingly however, there have been demands by *Maori* communities for research to be undertaken exclusively by *Maori*. There are limits to the research activities of *Pakeha*. These limits relate in particular, but not exclusively, to questions of *Maori* knowledge and *tikanga*. The continued empowerment of *Pakeha* with these forms of knowledge is viewed in many *Maori* circles, especially amongst younger *Maori*, with resentment. This resentment is related to schooling policies which denied the validity of *Maori* language and knowledge from several generations of *Maori* and then to a secondary denial of that knowledge by *kaumatua* or elders who have chosen instead to give it to 'outsiders'. This combination consequently has led to many younger *Maori* having to learn about *Maori* things, including, for example, *Maori* language and customary practices, from *Pakeha*. When this process is handled badly or insensitively by *Pakeha*, it reinforces the sense of powerlessness and alienation from their identity that many *Maori* feel. When *Pakeha* knowledge about *Maori* is used to deny the possibility even of alternative accounts of history, or when they are told that what they were taught by their grandparents is wrong then that reinforces even further the consequences of a history of being *the researched*.

It is thought that *Maori* people need to take greater control over the questions they want to address, and invest more energy and commitment into the education and empowering of

⁶¹ *Teariki, C., P. Spoonley, 1992.*

Maori people as researchers. Some organisations, for example, have made it very clear that research is 'off limits'. The most well known of these is the *Te Kohanga Reo* National Trust. This anti-research stance has applied to all researchers, *Maori* and *Pakeha*. In practice, however, research has been carried out in local *Te Kohanga Reo* because final approval has rested with each autonomous *whanau* of *Te Kohanga Reo*. The National Trust has also empowered researchers to carry out projects on its own behalf in order to facilitate policy. In contrast to this model, however, *Kura Kaupapa Maori* have had an explicit interest in developing research which supports the wider *kaupapa*. Projects are still monitored through individual schools or, at a national level, through the *Runanga O Nga Kura Kaupapa Maori*, the national body representing *Kura Kaupapa Maori*, and several pieces of research have been carried out. In *Maori* organisations and communities there is no set stance, about research although there is still, in my view, an overwhelmingly negative attitude to past research which influences the ways in which contemporary research is regarded.

There are other kinds of limits also being set, as more *Maori* begin to work in the various fields of social science research. For example, many *Maori* now attend both national and international conferences and have been known to question and challenge the material of New Zealand *Pakeha* academics on such occasions.⁶² In education, there are increasing numbers of *Maori* academics, researchers, policy analysts and administrators who keep track of research on *Maori*, and who disseminate research results very quickly to the wider community. The more radical limits to *Pakeha* research, however, is being set by the developing field of *Maori* research and the increasing numbers of *Maori* researchers in both the social sciences and physical sciences, and in the area of tribal histories and land claims. The development of new ways of thinking about *Maori* research, and approaches to the way this research should be framed, has emerged in the last decade under the rubric of *Kaupapa Maori* Research. The following chapter will address this topic.

In Summary.

What I wanted to discuss in this chapter was the shift which occurred between *Maori* people

⁶² They will also challenge academics from other countries, especially if it is thought that they have ignored the situation of indigenous people in their own countries, or worse, misrepresented them.

being viewed as research objects and *Maori* people becoming our own researchers. This shift, I have argued, was not simply an evolutionary development. It came about through other changes, some of which occurred within *Maori* cultural politics, some of which were brought about by state intervention, and other changes occurred through the spaces opened up within the field of social science. I have not addressed individual disciplinary methodologies or methods, but have kept the discussion at a broader level of social science. Clearly there were significant changes in approach which developed out of ethnographic research and other qualitative methods. In the following chapter I draw upon this chapter, and previous discussions, to map out the development of *Kaupapa Maori* Research.

•
•
•
•