Chapter Seven

Kaupapa Maori Research.

What happens to research when the insect looks back and the researched become the researchers?¹

Introduction.

As mentioned in previous chapters, research of Maori is marked by a history which has shaped the attitudes and feelings Maori people have held towards research. Research is implicated in the production of western knowledge, in the nature of academic work, in the production of theories which have dehumanised Maori and in practices which have continued to privilege western ways of knowing, while denying the validity for Maori of Maori knowledge, language and culture. Also previously mentioned, is the general legacy of Pakeha research on Maori attitudes towards theory and academic knowledge, attitudes which have led some Maori at least, towards the direction of being anti-ALL-theory and anti-ALL-research. One of the challenges for Maori researchers working in this context has been to retrieve some space, firstly to convince Maori people of the value of research for Maori, secondly to convince the various, fragmented but powerful Pakeha research communities of the need for greater Maori involvement in research, and thirdly to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research, and the parametres of both previous and current approaches to research. What is now referred to as Kaupapa Maori Research is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims. This chapter discusses Maori approaches to research and in

¹ The insect metaphor comes from a quote by Maori film-maker, Merata Mita (see previous chapter).
particular, the ways in which Kaupapa Maori has become a way of structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations and priorities in research.²

In February 1985, the general frustrations of Maori towards research were reframed in a discussion paper by Evelyn Stokes for the National Research Advisory Council. This paper was written for inclusion in the more general discussion relating to the formation of new national science objectives. Stokes’s paper argues for the acceptance of Maori knowledge and values, for the desirability and social significance of more Maori research, and for the need to train Maori researchers. The importance of Stokes’s paper was its audience and its timing. It was directed at the top policy level, where decisions were being made which would dictate the national priorities for research. Since then, those priorities, and the ways in which they have been institutionalised, have been radically restructured. The timing of the paper was therefore strategically well placed because it put Maori research interests on the national science policy agenda. Several writers had already raised many of the same issues and had voiced these concerns at conferences and seminars. However these occasions tended to be disciplinary based associations, which did little to engage either the political realities of social science research or the attention of the few Maori who may have been in a position to carry out research.³

Later on in the same year I set out as a postgraduate student to interview a group of Maori women whose children were in Te Kohanga Reo. My daughter attended the same Te Kohanga Reo and the women were well known to me and had willingly agreed to be interviewed. I had found little help in the standard methodological guide books for the issues I would confront when I was a Maori carrying out research with other Maori. Very little in the discussions of cross cultural issues was useful because I was not working cross-culturally. I was, at three levels at least, an 'insider', as a Maori, as a woman and as a mother, and at


³ Annual disciplinary conferences are often dominated with academic presentations and the 'political' nature of research is kept well away. In some cases it is regarded as a contaminant and people who raise or address political issues are seen as being polemists! On the second point there were and still are very few Maori with post-graduate qualifications which tend to be the prerequisite for most research positions. Even fewer of these attend conferences or belong to disciplinary societies.
another set of levels, an 'outsider', as a postgraduate student, as someone from a different tribe, as an older mother and as someone who actually had a partner. Much of the cross-cultural literature assumed that the researcher belonged to the dominant cultural group and was 'doing' research to, for, and sometimes with, a minority group. There were some studies which addressed the issues for women researchers who were going to study in remote villages in Africa or South America. And of course, there were the romantic National Geographic accounts of women who spent years studying primates in various isolated spots, which frankly did not appeal. This literature reinforced the idea that one needed special skills related to being culturally sensitive, and to effective ways of gaining entrance into the community being studied, and to gaining the confidence of 'informants'. There was a limited availability of literature which related to critiques of methodological approaches and these were primarily by African American scholars rather than other indigenous people. There was nothing which helped me think about and frame what I wanted to do within my own cultural context, or how I might go about doing some research in one of my own communities. Even previous research by other Maori academics appeared problematic to me, firstly because they wrote as if they were outsiders in their own world, and secondly because they were all men, fluent in Maori language and regarded as being deeply knowledgeable about Maori culture. I wrote a paper as a preamble to my research project, setting out the issues I faced and attempting to articulate what it was that made those issues so problematic. My concerns were also being voiced by other Maori in other contexts, however our isolation from each other meant that we struggled through these issues alone, and it took several years to bring what is still a small but active community of Maori researchers together.

4 Most of the parents in our Te Kohanga Reo were single mothers, very young and living in the state housing units down the street from the Kohanga Reo. I had a job as did my spouse, we had a car so there was also an issue of socio-economic circumstances.

5 I had always seen myself as belonging to the 'informant' community and thus felt well trained to inform on myself, but insufficiently trained to get others to do it for me! And of course, I 'read' what I was being told in the interviews, as if I were still a member of the 'informant' community and was very conscious of the way the words being given me were being carefully selected and framed.


7 None of which is how I saw myself.

8 The first of a series of papers, Smith, L.T., 1985. 'Te Rapunga Ki Te Ao Marama', Education Department, University of Auckland.
Mapping *Kaupapa Maori*.

At the outset it needs stating that not all those who write about or talk about *Kaupapa Maori* are involved in research. *Kaupapa Maori* has been applied across a wide range of projects and enterprises. Furthermore, not all *Maori* researchers would regard either themselves, or their research, as fitting within a *Kaupapa Maori* framework. So, not all research by *Maori* and not all *Maori* researchers claim to conduct *Kaupapa Maori* research. There are elements within the definitions of *Kaupapa Maori* which serve the purpose of selecting what counts and what does not count. One can ask, for example, 'Can a *Maori* researcher who is anti-*Maori* carry out *Kaupapa Maori* research?' The answer based on current definitions is 'definitely not'. Another question is less easy to answer, 'Can a *Pakeha* researcher carry out *Kaupapa Maori* research?' The answer on current definitions is more complex, perhaps it might read, 'a *Pakeha* can be involved in *Kaupapa Maori* research but not on their own, and if they were involved in such research, they would have ways of positioning themselves as *Pakeha*' , or the more radical interpretation might say, 'by definition, no, *Kaupapa Maori* research is *Maori* research exclusively'. From these two questions and answers, then, it is possible to say something more about what *Kaupapa Maori* research is, and what it is not. The following section of this chapter will map out the developing field of *Kaupapa Maori* research.

Irwin characterises *Kaupapa Maori* as research which is 'culturally safe', which involves the 'mentorship' of *kaumatua*, which is culturally relevant and appropriate while satisfying the rigour of research, and which is undertaken by a *Maori* researcher, not a researcher who happens to be *Maori*. This statement implies that other forms of research, that is culturally sensitive models, have not been satisfactory at the level of cultural safety. Irwin also grounds her work in 'a paradigm that stems from a *Maori* worldview and in *Te Reo Maori me ona tikanga*'. Bishop writes that *Kaupapa Maori* 'addresses the prevailing ideologies of

---


cultural superiority which pervade our social, economic and political institutions’. Bishop’s model is framed by the discourses related to the Treaty of Waitangi and by the development within education of Maori initiatives which are ‘controlled’ by Maori. By framing Kaupapa Maori within the Treaty of Waitangi, Bishop leaves space for the involvement of Pakeha in support of Maori research. He argues that Pakeha, generally speaking, have an obligation to support Maori research (as Treaty partners). And, secondly, some Pakeha, who have a genuine desire to support the cause of Maori, ought to be included, because they can be useful allies and colleagues in research. The issue of ‘control’ is linked, in Bishop’s argument, with the goal of empowerment, ‘In the context of research, empowerment means that Maori people should regain control of investigations into Maori people’s lives’. Bishop also argues that Kaupapa Maori research is located within an alternative conception of the world from which solutions and cultural aspirations can be generated. This alternative conception draws from an alternative code. Both Irwin and Bishop argue for the importance of the concept of whanau as a supervisory and organisational structure for handling research. Bishop refers to this as a ‘research whanau of interest’. Irwin refers to a ‘whanau of supervisors’. For both Bishop and Irwin, the whanau provides the intersection where research meets Maori, or Maori meets research, on equalising terms.

From these comments it is clear that under the rubric of Kaupapa Maori research, there are different sets of ideas and issues being claimed as important. Some of these intersect at different points with research as an activity. Some of these features are framed as assumptions, some as practices and methods, and some are related to Maori conceptions of knowledge. Smith summarises these by saying that Kaupapa Maori research is (i) related to ‘being Maori’, (ii) connected to Maori philosophy and principles, (iii) takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Maori, the importance of Maori language and culture, and (iv) is concerned with ‘the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well being’. He locates

---


12 Ibid., p.176.

Kaupapa Maori research within the wider project of Kaupapa Maori, and draws from the broader concept of Kaupapa Maori a set of elements which, he argues, can be found in all the different projects associated with Kaupapa Maori. Some of these principles will be discussed more fully later in this chapter. However, the general significance of these principles is that they have evolved from within many of the taken-for-granted practices of Maori as well as being tied to a clear and coherent kaupapa. In terms of research, particularly of attempting to develop actual empirical methods, and in a sense, operationalise the principles outlined by Smith, there is a another set of steps to take beyond the working principles, as identified by Smith.

Kaupapa Maori as Localised Critical Theory.

Most discussion about Kaupapa Maori is also located in relation to critical theory, in particular to the notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation. The previous chapter, for example, situates Maori research within the antipositivist debate raised by critical theory. Pihama suggests that;

intrinsic to Kaupapa Maori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Maori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist within society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of 'common sense' and 'facts' to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Maori people.

Bishop goes further to suggest that critical approaches to research have in fact 'failed' to address the issues of communities such as Maori, and the development of alternative approaches by Maori reflects a form of resistance to critical theory. Bishop makes this point in the context of the debate between Ellsworth and Giroux, about the failure of critical

---

14 In this sense kaupapa means 'project' or plan.

pedagogy in relation to its emancipatory goals.¹⁶

Smith, however, argues that Kaupapa Maori is a 'local' theoretical positioning which is the modality through which the emancipatory goal of critical theory, in a specific historical, political and social context, is practised. This 'localising' of the aims of critical theory is partly an enactment of what critical theory actually 'offered' to oppressed, marginalised and silenced groups. The project of critical theory held out the possibility, that through emancipation, groups such as Maori would take greater control over their own lives and humanity. This necessarily implied that groups would take hold of the project of emancipation and attempt to make it a reality in their own terms. Whilst western academics may quibble about the success or failure of the emancipatory project, and question the idealism which lies behind it, there is a tendency to be overly 'precious' about their project as a universal recipe that has to be followed 'to the letter' if it is to be effective. Furthermore, this stance assumes that oppression has universal characteristics which were independent of history, context and agency. At the level of abstraction, this is what has to be argued in a sense, but it can never be so on the ground. There is also a naivety about what Stuart Hall has called the 'dirtiness' of political projects, or what Fanon and other anticolonial writers would regard as the violence entailed in struggles for freedom. The end result can not be predetermined. The means to the end involves human agency in ways which are complex and contradictory. The notion of strategic positioning as a deliberate practice is partially an attempt to contain the uneven-ness and unpredictability, under stress, of people engaged in emancipatory struggles. The broader kaupapa of Kaupapa Maori embraces that sense of strategic positioning, of being able to plan, predict and contain, across a number of sites, the engagement in struggle.

Another dimension of Kaupapa Maori research is to be found clustered around issues of identity. Bishop, Irwin, Pihama, and G.H. Smith have all argued that being Maori, identifying as Maori, and as a Maori researcher, is a critical element of Kaupapa Maori research. Whilst this position is antipositivist, in that it is also saying that we look at the world through our
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grounding in Maori world-views, most Maori researchers would also argue that being Maori does not preclude us from being systematic, being ethical, being 'scientific', in the way we may approach a research problem.\(^{17}\) This positioning of the researcher and the views they bring to research has been well argued in terms of feminist research. Feminist research maintains its focus on issues of gender (not just of women), but has moved away from the idea that only women can carry out feminist research to one which is less essentialist.\(^{18}\) Kaupapa Maori research, as currently framed, would argue that being Maori is an essential criteria for carrying out Kaupapa Maori research. At the same time, however, some writers suggest that we exercise restraint in becoming too involved in identity politics because of the potential these politics have for paralysing development.\(^{19}\) This position is based on the specificities of our history and our politics. However, this does not preclude those who are not Maori from participating in research which has a Kaupapa Maori orientation.\(^{20}\)

This latter point connects with the concept of whanau, as raised earlier, as a way of organising research. The whanau principle is one identified by Smith as an important aspect of Kaupapa Maori approaches. Both Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori have attempted to organise the basic decision making and parent participation within each of these initiatives around the concept of whanau. It is argued that the whanau, in precolonial times, was the core social unit, rather than the individual. It is also argued that the whanau remains as a persistent way of living and organising the social world. In terms of research, the whanau is one of several Maori concepts, or tikanga, which have become part of a

---

\(^{17}\) Smith, L.T., 1995. 'Re-centering Kaupapa Maori Research', paper presented at Te Matawhanui Conference, Maori Studies Department, Massey University.

\(^{18}\) This is not without contention in that some feminist groups would still argue that men, because they are men, can not possibly articulate a feminist position or carry out feminist research. What I want to signal however is that feminist scholarship has moved from its early foundations and as a parallel the same possibility exists for Kaupapa Maori research.

\(^{19}\) For example, Kathy Irwin writes, 'There is still a destructive debate taking place in some quarters over who are 'real' and, heaven forbid, 'acceptable' Maori women.....Precious time is wasted debating amongst ourselves, who is and who isn't an 'acceptable' Maori'. Irwin, K., 1992. 'Towards Theories of Maori Feminisms', in Feminist Voices, Womens' Studies Texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand, ed. R. Du Plessis, Auckland, Oxford University Press, pp.1-21, p.3.

\(^{20}\) Nor does it preclude those who identify as Maori but can not speak Maori language, those who are Maori but do not know their whakapapa, nor those who are Maori but have lived away from their iwi or whanau territories.
methodology, a way of organising a research group, a way of incorporating ethical procedures
which report back to the community, a way of 'giving voice' to the different sections of
Maori communities, and a way of debating ideas and issues which impact on the research
project. It also has a very pragmatic function, in that the whanau is a way of distributing
tasks, of incorporating people with particular expertise, and of keeping Maori values central
to the project. In Bishop's model it would be at this level, for example, that Pakeha can be
involved. The whanau then can be a very specific modality through which research is shaped
and carried out, analysed and disseminated.

Whanau is one of several aspects of Maori philosophy, values and practices which are
brought to the centre in Kaupapa Maori research. Nepe argues that Kaupapa Maori is
derived from very different epistemological and metaphysical foundations and it is these
which give Kaupapa Maori its distinctiveness from Kaupapa Pakeha or Kaupapa Science
or any other kaupapa.21 In other words, there is more to Kaupapa Maori than our history
under colonialism or our desires to restore rangatiratanga. We have a different
epistemological tradition which frames the way we see the world, the way we organise
ourselves in it, the questions we ask and the solutions which we seek. It is larger than the
individuals in it and the specific 'moment' in which we are currently living. The significance
of Kaupapa Maori to Maori language is tied to the connection between language, knowledge
and culture. According to Sir James Henare, one of the architects of Te Kohanga Reo, 'Ko
teo reo te kakahu o te whakaaro te huarahi i te ao turoa o te hinengaro'.22 The
revitalisation of Maori language has brought with it the revitalisation of Maori forms of
knowledge and the debates which accompany those knowledge forms.23 Kaupapa Maori,
however, does not mean the same as matauranga Maori or Maori knowledge and
epistemology. The concept of 'kaupapa' implies a way of framing and structuring how we
think about those ideas and practices. Nepe argues that Kaupapa Maori is a 'conceptualisation


22 Trans. 'The language is like a cloak which clothes, envelopes, and adorns the myriad of ones thoughts'.
cited in Nepe, p.15.

Tavistock.
of *Maori* knowledge.\(^{24}\) It is a way of abstracting that knowledge, reflecting on it, engaging with it, taking it for granted sometimes, making assumptions based upon it, and at times critically engaging in the way it has been and is being constructed.\(^{25}\) There is the possibility within *Kaupapa Maori* research to address the different constructions of *Maori* knowledge. A good example of this is in the development of *Maori* women’s theories about *Maori* society which question the accounts of *Maori* society provided by men, including *Maori* men, but which still hold to a position that argues that the issues of gender for *Maori* do not make us the same as white women.\(^{26}\) The critical theory of *Kaupapa Maori* also applies, therefore, to *Maori* ways of thinking, but does not deny either the existence or fundamental legitimacy to *Maori* people of *Maori* forms of knowledge. It seeks to understand these forms, however, on their own terms and within the wider framework of *Maori* values and attitudes, *Maori* language, and *Maori* ways of living in the world.

There is another feature of *Kaupapa Maori* research which is becoming increasingly important as research funding is restructured around government priorities and policies. The state is the largest funding institution for research in New Zealand. The restructuring which occurred after 1994 separated the policy making functions of government from the allocation of resources for research. The largest amount of money is institutionalised through the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. Other ministries and government departments still fund research but this research is in the form of 'purchases' of specific reports which fulfil the 'outputs' of the ministry concerned, and which, in many cases, are written over (rewritten) and subjected to crown copyright. In this sense the research is not research it is a purchased product which becomes owned by the state. It becomes debateable then as to whether the purchased product is worth taking seriously outside government. The restructuring of research connects with the wider restructuring of the state in line with new right economic policies. These have emphasised the importance of government objectives, of

\(^{24}\) Nepe, p.15.

\(^{25}\) For example those involved in *Kaupapa Maori* projects question attempts to mystify *Maori* knowledge or use either their identity and knowledge of whakapapa or *Maori* language as a way of excluding other *Maori* from participation in decision making or other forms of involvement.

\(^{26}\) See for example, Te Awekotuku, N., 1992. *He Whiriwhiri Wahine: Framing Women’s Studies for Aotearoa*, in *Te Puā 1*, Puawaitanga, University of Auckland, pp.46-58.
competition and contestability, of the separation of policy from funding, of outputs which are purchased, and of outcomes. This shift towards the new right has very profound implications for *Maori* cultural values and practices. It also has major implications for *Maori* in terms of its reinscription of positivist approaches to scientific research.

*Kaupapa Maori* Research: in Which Fields?

In terms of *Kaupapa Maori*, the more important question is related to issues of social justice. The debate about this aspect occurs at several levels. Reconciling market driven, competitive and entrepreneurial research, which positions New Zealand internationally, with the need for *Maori* to carry out research which recovers histories, reclaims lands and resources and restores justice, hardly seems possible. This is precisely why the debates around *rangatiratanga* and the Treaty of *Waitangi* have been significant. The attempt by *Maori* to engage in the activities of the state through the mechanism of the Treaty of *Waitangi* has won some space in which *Maori* can argue for different sorts of research priorities. This space, however, is severely limited as it has not only had to be wrestled from the state, but from the community of positivistic scientists whose regard for *Maori* is not sympathetic. Furthermore the competitive environment created by the restructuring makes *Kaupapa Maori* research a competitor for resources with positivistic research. The problem is not just that positivist science is well established institutionally and theoretically, but that it has a connectedness at a common sense level with the rest of society who, generally speaking, take for granted the hegemony of its methods and leadership in the search for knowledge. As far as many people are concerned, research is positivist, otherwise it can not be anything else. *Kaupapa Maori* is a fledgling approach which is occurring within the limited community of *Maori* researchers, which in turn exists within a minority culture which continues to be represented within antagonistic colonial discourses. It is a counter-hegemonic approach to western forms of

---


29 For examples see the guidelines and policies for the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology and their application forms.
research and as such, currently exists on the margins of western research.

*Kaupapa Maori* research is imbued with a strong anti-positivist stance. However, its wider *kaupapa* is to include within it all those researchers who are attempting to work with *Maori* and on topics of importance to *Maori*. The outer edges of *Kaupapa Maori* are not necessarily sharply delineated although, as argued in the introduction to the thesis, there is, at the political level, something 'at stake'. One of the strands of a burgeoning *Maori* research community is the development of *Maori* health research. This development provides one interface between the more positivistic medical science approaches, to research, particularly epidemiology, and social science approaches such as sociology and policy analysis. The 'failure' of medical research to address the needs of *Maori* in health parallels the failure of educational research. Recognition of this has shifted some areas of health research towards firstly, developing more culturally sensitive research, and secondly, employing *Kaupapa Maori* approaches. These include the involvement of *Maori* researchers in large studies, and the establishment of *Maori* health research units which focus on issues of *Maori* health, are managed and organised by *Maori*, and which employ multidisciplinary approaches within a *Kaupapa Maori* framework.\(^{30}\) Hence large scale epidemiological survey work and ethnographic, qualitative studies sit alongside each other in the same centre. The connections between the two highlights yet another feature of *Kaupapa Maori* research. Getting the *kaupapa* 'right' is the first and major issue, the second issue is employing the most appropriate methods and people. So, sometimes a positivistic piece of research can be carried out by *Maori* researchers, but the questions it sought to answer, the problems it sought to probe and the data it sought to gather, have generally been priorities and debated by *Maori* working in a *Kaupapa Maori* framework. There are three different points to be drawn here. Firstly, there are politics attached to research which most researchers understand; quite simply positivistic research attracts funding. Secondly, there are accountabilities and pre-research discussions which have already framed, and to an extent, transformed the approach to research. Thirdly, most of the *Maori* health research units have developed strong ties with

---

\(^{30}\) Two such units, *Te Pumanawa Hauora* at Massey University and the *Eru Pomare* Research Centre the Wellington Clinical School, are funded by the Health Research Council, another unit exists at the University of Auckland Medical School and other units operate inside existing centres, for example, the Alcohol and Public Health Research Centre at the University of Auckland.
specific Maori communities. These are reflected in the way the centre is constituted and the geographical areas in which they work.

There may be a question as to whether Kaupapa Maori research is its own paradigm. Irwin suggests that it is. Others involved in Kaupapa Maori would quite deliberately be reluctant to engage in such a debate because it sets up comparisons with western science, which is exactly what Kaupapa Maori is resisting. Kaupapa Maori research is both less than and more than a paradigm. It does set out a field of study which enables a process of selection to occur, which defines what needs to be studied and what questions ought to be asked. It also has a set of assumptions and taken for granted values and knowledge, upon which it builds. In this sense it can be fitted into some of the ways a paradigm is defined. However, it is also more than the sum of those parts. Kaupapa Maori research is a social project, it weaves in and out of Maori cultural beliefs and values, western ways of knowing, Maori histories and experiences under colonialism, western forms of education, Maori aspirations and socio-economic needs, and western economics and global politics. Kaupapa Maori is concerned with sites and terrains. Each of these are sites of struggle. Each of these sites have also been claimed by others as ‘their’ turf. They are selected or select themselves precisely because they are sites of struggle and because they have some strategic importance for Maori. We are not at present interested in nuclear physics but we are becoming interested in genetic science. There are sound reasons we are interested in education, employment, health and history. Each of these domains situates us in crisis. They are more real and more pressing.

---

31 These include rural and urban communities and several iwi groups.

32 See quote on page four of this chapter.

33 See for a further discussion, Smith, G.H., 1995. ‘Falling Through the Cracks of the Constructivism Debate: The Neglect of the ‘Maori Crisis’ within Science Education’, in ACCESS, 14, soon to be published in ACCESS Education Department, University of Auckland.


35 It is not that nuclear physics is not thought to have an impact on our lives but it is not yet as real as the advances currently being made in genetic engineering and the possibility which now exists under GATT for ‘our’ genetic material to be copied and patented.
The Working Principles of Kaupapa Maori research.

Having mapped out some of the key points relating to Kaupapa Maori research, this section of the chapter will shift its focus to issues which are more methodological. This discussion draws together a range of experiences in research and work by other Maori in this area. It begins by defining some working principles based around the importance of Maori ways of knowing, Maori values, Maori processes and practices. Secondly, it addresses the sorts of critical questions which also frame Kaupapa Maori research, and thirdly, discusses issues arising from practices held to be important specifically for Maori researchers.

Graham Smith, in a series of papers on Kura Kaupapa Maori as an educational intervention, has argued that within the intervention are key elements which make it successful for Maori. These elements encapsulate Maori values and knowledge but also provide bridges through which other educational strategies can be put into practice. Briefly, Smith outlines six principles. These are as follows;

(i) (tino) rangatiratanga.
   (relative autonomy principle)
(ii) taonga tuku iho.
    (cultural aspirations principle)
(iii) ako Maori.
    (culturally preferred pedagogy)
(iv) kia piki ake i nga raruraru o te kainga.
    (mediation of socio-economic and home difficulties principle)
(v) whanau.
    (extended family structure principle)
(vii) kaupapa.
    (collective vision, philosophical principle)

---


This list is not claimed to be definitive, but it does capture the salient features of *Kura Kaupapa Maori* and these same principles can be said to operate in any *Kaupapa Maori* context. However, some of these principles get reframed in the context of research, or rather, the details are different but the basic principle remains the same. The following working principles for research have been taken, not just from Smith’s framework, but from the context of research projects in which I have been involved in a number of roles, and from discussions with *Maori* researchers at *hui* and conferences. Unlike Smith’s principles, the following ‘working’ principles are centred around issues which are being discussed at *hui* and other gatherings of the *Maori* research community.  

They incorporate the views, to some extent, of those who work in health, education, *Maori* Studies, policy analysis, history and *iwi* based research. In each case there is a set of recent politics around these ideas and, rather than ignore them and insert other concepts, I have taken each one and mapped it out in terms of its implications for *Kaupapa Maori* research.

The principle of *whakapapa*.

A number of *Maori* have identified *whakapapa* as the most fundamental aspect of the way we think about and come to know the world.  

*Whakapapa* is a way of thinking, a way of learning, a way of storing knowledge and a way of debating knowledge. It is inscribed in virtually every aspect of our world view. In terms of *Kaupapa Maori* Research, *whakapapa* is embedded in our own knowledge and is integral to what becomes ‘taken for granted’. *Whakapapa* intersects with research in a number of different ways. Furthermore, the shape it takes varies according to the context, the time, the people and the actual project.

---

38 Rather, say than in the context of *Kura Kaupapa Maori* or other types of *hui*. The ‘community’ of *Maori* researchers is a specialist community which includes health, policy, postgraduate students and educational researchers.


It is through *whakapapa* that Maori people trace our selves, our access to land, to a *marae* and to a *turangawaewae*.\(^{41}\) *Whakapapa* also positions us in historical relationships with other *iwi*, with our landscape, and within the universe. The ancient *whakatauki*\(^{42}\) tells us that we are the seeds or direct descendants of the 'heavens', and can trace our *whakapapa* back through time to the very beginning of time and of the creation of the universe:

*E kore koe e ngaro, he kakano i ruia mai i Rangiatea.*\(^{43}\)

*Whakapapa* also relate us to all other things which exist in the world. We are linked through our *whakapapa* to insects, fishes, trees, stones and other life forms.\(^{44}\) The concept of *whakapapa* embraces much of how we see ourselves in relation to everything else. It is the principle of a different code and as such is realised and elaborated through a wide range of practices.

John *Rangihau*, for example, wrote about the difficulty that the term 'Maori' actually presents for him as a person with specific *whakapapa* which locate him in *whanau*, *hapu* and *iwi*.\(^{45}\) The 'pan-Maori' approach to all things *Maori* was an identity imposed externally upon all *Maori* people.\(^{46}\) Other definitions of identity, such as race classifications, have been equally problematic. These definitions resulted in the working out of mathematic equations which determined 'how much *Maori* blood' you had, and did not take into account any notion of culture. The assumption was that the less you had, the more modern *Maori* were becoming.

---

\(^{41}\) *Marae* are generally complexes which include space to welcome and host visitors, hold *tangi* or mourning rituals and for people to work together either as *whanau*, *hapu* or *iwi*. *Turangawaewae* literally means a place to stand, a place which is yours through *whakapapa*.

\(^{42}\) *Whakatauki* are similar to proverbs or sayings.

\(^{43}\) Trans. You will never be lost, you were a seed planted at Rangiatea.


\(^{45}\) *Rangihau*, 1981.

\(^{46}\) This issue is discussed in more detail in Section Four.
The classification of identity means something different, however, for researchers who need some conceptual and empirical control over the classification systems which underpin their work. Statistical attempts to define just who is Maori are also fraught with problems. The last census attempt to record iwi statistics has ended up with a large pool of Maori who have not identified an iwi. People were asked to nominate a primary iwi, to choose one iwi. Maori can claim bilineal descent, and having to nominate just one counters the principle of whakapapa. However, these external measurements of identity and attempts to regulate identity are significant at an ideological level because they become normative, they set the norm for what it means to be Maori.

The importance to Kaupapa Maori research of the principle of whakapapa is based on a number of inter-related issues. Firstly, it needs to be regarded as an important way of thinking about Maori people generally. It is not the only way, gender, age and being able to speak Maori are just as important, but it is a culturally important way. It is about having a deep and thorough understanding of Maori society. Secondly, it is important if Maori people are the subjects of research, even in urban settings when one may not expect to be working with kinship based groups. Many of the contemporary institutions to which Maori people in urban areas belong, such as sports clubs, housie schools, networks and Kohanga Reo, still operate in some situations on the basis of whakapapa. This applies, for example, if they visit or receive visits from other Maori, it sometimes determines social support networks, access to a church Minister or a marae. It may even shape friendships. The point is that you can not assume that whakapapa is not 'working' when Maori people are involved.

A third issue is related to the role of Maori researchers. The recent trend to have more Maori researchers involved in projects often assumes that simply employing any Maori will be enough to satisfy the need to be culturally sensitive. However a Maori researcher also has a whakapapa, also belongs somewhere, also has an identity which goes deeper than simply being Maori. Maori researchers need to think critically about what that means for the way they may think about themselves as researchers, and about the Maori issues or Maori people they are researching. Being a Maori researcher does not mean an absence of bias, it simply means that the potential for different kinds of biases needs to be considered reflexively. It can not be assumed either that a Maori will be more sympathetic to Maori issues or other Maori.
Sometimes, in positioning themselves or being positioned as 'experts', they construct and apply a normative view of Maori culture based on their own experiences. Some Maori are perceived by other Maori as being more hostile to Maori than a Pakeha researcher might be. Some Maori are viewed as applying their own iwi belief systems over other iwi. One of the ways these issues are dealt with culturally is through the practise of 'kanohi ki te kanohi' in which the researchers 'front up' to the people and in the usual welcoming rituals of Maori, position themselves publicly on the marae in terms of their whakapapa.

The principle of te reo.

Maori language has been a site of struggle since the beginnings of state education. Practices to 'get rid of' Maori language in the home have been well documented. The struggle to revitalise the language was central to the politics of Maori in the 1960s and 1970s. A petition to have Maori language taught in primary schools was organised in the 1970s by Nga Tamatoa. The development of Te Kohanga Reo in 1982 has been the most innovative approach to saving the language. Maori language was the subject of a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985. Kura Kaupapa Maori the primary schooling alternative based on Maori philosophies and taught through Maori language first started in 1986. The Maori Language Act was passed in 1987. This Act declared Maori an official language, established a Maori Language Commission and gave limited rights to speak Maori in judicial proceedings. Protection of Maori language has also formed part of subsequent claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and cases taken to the High Court. The most recent case was taken to the Privy Council in 1995. 1995 has also been named by the Government as Te Tau O Te Reo Maori, (Maori Language Year) as part of the United Nations’ Decade of Indigenous Peoples.

As already mentioned Maori language/Te Reo Maori is significant as a principle in Kaupapa Maori research. The survival of Te Reo Maori is viewed as being absolutely crucial to the survival of Maori people. It is an issue which brings together a wide spectrum of Maori

---

47 Trans. 'face to face'.

people in support. There are several ways in which Maori language is regarded by Maori. The following whakatauki give an indication of its value:

\[ \text{Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Maori.} \]

\[ \text{Toku reo, roku ohooho} \]
\[ \text{Toku reo, roku mapiri maurea} \]
\[ \text{Toku reo, roku whakakai mariki}^{49} \]

In terms of research, Maori language is important in a number of different ways. Maori world views are embedded in the language. There are some social practices which are only ever conducted in Maori. There are rich forms of expression which make sense in Maori because they connect with histories, and values and other images. Many of the early researchers, such as Elsdon Best, did much of their interviewing in Maori, and gained access to whole bodies of knowledge which have still not been translated. The language, in this sense, is a window to ways of knowing the world.

However the language is also a way of interacting in the world. In this sense Maori researchers need to have a range of skills with Maori language. There are age, gender and iwi prescriptions on the ways in which they may use the language formally, but in most situations there are basic requirements which are expected when the researcher is Maori and is in conversation with a Maori speaking research subject. Not all Maori speakers choose to speak only Maori language, but sometimes, even when they use English, they are making connections and using expressions which in Maori make a lot more sense.

There is an issue of dissemination of research results and the extent to which they are available for Maori speakers and readers. This has not as yet been a priority. However, there are three areas in which research could be carried out and made available in Maori language; (i) the claims and findings of the Waitangi Tribunal, (ii) the recovered histories specific to whanau, hapu and iwi, (iii) the dissemination of information related to health, education and

\[^{49}\text{Trans. (i) The language is the life principle of Maori, (ii) My language, my inspiration, My Language, my special 'ornament'; My language, my precious 'treasures'.} \]
other social policy areas. This aspect is about sharing knowledge and the results of research so that people can become better informed and make better decisions. It has another consequence further down the track of promoting different forms of literature in Maori.

The principle of tikanga Maori.

Tikanga is regarded as customary practices, obligations and behaviours, or the principles which govern social practices. It is about being able to operate inside the cultural system and make decisions and judgements about how to interpret what occurs. The concept of tikanga can be used as a rigid set of rules by which actions are judged as 'tika', or correct although there are other values which mediate against that rigidity. One example is the concept of 'mana' which was sometimes gained by those who dared to take risks and exploit or change tikanga. Tikanga applies to a wide range of social practices, for example, in relation to land, to carving and the construction of carved meeting houses, to health practices, to use of marae, to the carrying out of tangi and unveilings, to whaikorero and waiata, to the hosting of manuhiri.50

The concept of tikanga may also be used to convey the sense that something feels and looks 'right', for example, the incline of the roof of a wharenui is of the 'right' angle, the aesthetics of a carved house has the right balance, the way a manuhiri enters on to the marae, the way people present themselves on formal occasions. The sense of correctness, of having things set right, is important, because the alternative of getting it wrong is considered to have consequences. This has direct implications for research. How researchers enter the research community, how they negotiate their project aims and methods, how they conduct themselves as a research project and as individuals, and how they engage with the people, requires a wide range of cultural skills and sensitivities. Maori researchers tend to take many of these skills for granted, but in doing so, tend to under-rate the importance of such skills. Others may be so much in awe of 'getting it right' that they end up getting it wrong. And, 'getting it wrong' in a traditional sense is viewed as having real (sometimes dire) consequences, for example, someone may fall ill. Obviously 'rational' science would not consider this as a

50 Manuhiri are guests or visitors, tangi are our mourning rituals which include the funeral, waiata are chants and songs often used to give 'relish' to a speech.
rational belief, but it is not important what the researchers think, it is important for what the researched think and their perceptions of the researchers. This is one of the primary reasons that even Maori researchers need a mentor or kaumatua when they are entering the more formal domains of Maori communities. One of the roles of the kaumatua is to look after or attend to the formal, ritual and spiritual dimensions of tikanga.

Intersecting this principle, and indeed all others, is the concept of tapu. Some forms of knowledge are regarded as tapu and therefore access to these forms of knowledge is restricted, and even when access is given, it needs to be treated with respect and care. Tapu knowledge generally relates to knowledge which is specific to hapu and iwi and is of a more esoteric nature. It impacts particularly on those researchers who work in the tribal history area. Some of these histories are actually written down and often it is the book they are written in which becomes tapu and restricted. One of the obvious problems, however, is that as Maori people have become less knowledgeable about their own specific histories, others have become more knowledgeable. This can lead to mystification of knowledge which is not about tapu but about power of a different sort, that is the power of an individual to claim resources and land and assert ‘traditional’ claims which can not be challenged. In general however, tapu is an important cultural way of regarding knowledge and in this sense needs to be incorporated as a principle of respect for the people who choose to share their knowledge with you. In the words of a whakatauki: Ahakoa he iti, he iti pounamu.\(^{52}\)

The principle of rangatiratanga.

The concept of rangatiratanga has been used throughout this thesis. In Smith’s framework, rangatiratanga is connected to the ‘goal of control over one’s own life and cultural well being’. This involves control over decision making processes. The usage of rangatiratanga is framed within the discourses related to the Treaty of Waitangi. In the Maori version of the

\(^{51}\) This is sometimes referred to as Te Kauwae Runga, or the ‘upper jaw’ form of knowledge, while more accessible forms of knowledge are referred to as Te Kauwae Raro, or the ‘lower jaw’. This can be found in the account by Te Matorohanga who was Percy Smith’s key informant. See Smith, P., 1913. The Lore of the Whare Wananga. New Plymouth, Polynesian Society, Thomas Avery.

\(^{52}\) Trans. Although small it is (like) a precious greenstone.
treaty, *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, Article Two says in part;

*...ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me a ratou taonga katoa.*\(^5^3\)

Although there is considerable linguistic and legal debate about the concept of *rangatiratanga* in relation to the text of the Treaty and the obligations of the Crown, its wider use by *Maori* encapsulates a wide range of beliefs and aspirations.\(^5^4\) These discourses alongside the increasingly 'expert' definitions of the *Waitangi* Tribunal and the Crown itself, have a major influence on the way research is 'governed'. At one level it is about control, control over the agenda for research, but also control over the resources and how they are distributed.

There are several sets of principles in use in relation to the way the Treaty of *Waitangi* is being interpreted by the Crown. These principles should not be confused with the general principle of *rangatiratanga* being proposed here. In this context, *rangatiratanga* owes as much to the discourses around the Treaty of *Waitangi* as it does to the shifts in social science research towards more sympathetic and emancipatory research aims and practices. Community control, ethical practices and research reflexivity have marked some aspects of this kind of research.

At a more pragmatic level the principles of *rangatiratanga* would govern the ways in which the following critical questions are answered;

(i) what research do we want to carry out?

(ii) who is that research for?

(iii) what difference will it make?

(iv) who will carry out this research?

(v) how do we want the research to be done?

(vi) how will we know it is a worthwhile piece of research?

---

\(^5^3\) Trans. [The Queen agrees to give] to chiefs and *hapu*, and all the people of New Zealand the full chiefship of their lands, their villages and all their possessions. (trans. from Project *Waitangi*).

who will own the research?
who will benefit?

The principle of *rangatiratanga* would consistently affirm the importance of addressing these questions to *Maori* people and not, as has previously happened, to *Pakeha* experts, with *Maori* being consulted on the side. Where discussions by *Maori* on these issues have occurred it has not meant that *Pakeha* researchers have been excluded or restricted. Many *Pakeha* researchers have found the process far more collaborative and exciting than if they had attempted to carry out their research without attempting to work through *Maori* groups.

The principle of *whanau*.

A *whanau* is an extended family. Smith suggests that the principle of *whanau* is important because it provides a support structure which has inbuilt responsibilities and obligations. The significance of *whanau*, especially as a way of organising and supervising research, has been raised earlier in this chapter. However there are other dimensions to *whanau* which also need mentioning here. One of these dimensions relates to *mana wahine* and *mana tane*, issues of gender. This is important on a number of grounds. At one level *Maori* women have been absent from the way research about *Maori* has been conducted, for example, tribal histories. In other ways *Maori* women have been present, but as a subtext to the major story.\(^55\)

Thirdly, *Maori* women have been the target of research and of subsequent interventions. This has been particularly the case in the health and education areas. At the same time however, it needs to be recognised that research into *Maori* boys' education and personal development has not been sympathetic either. In terms of recovering histories, there is a need to look again at the ways in which gender issues are discussed, privileged and/or silenced in the way we, as *Maori* researchers, think about research. Gender issues have become important for *Maori* women because of the exclusionary practices within *Maori* society, based primarily on gender, which seem to disadvantage women more than men. Many women would argue that these practices are recent ones, and are becoming more entrenched as new, younger and less

\(^{55}\) A good example of this is the *Maori* story which, in oral accounts, is a story in which *Maori* engaged in different ways with his grandmothers, for example, to acquire fire and wisdom and to attempt to gain immortality. However even in some recent written children's stories the grandmothers have been all transformed into men. It has become a story about men. For a discussion see, Jenkins, K., 1992. 'Reflections on the Status of *Maori* Women', in *Te Pua*, 1, Puawaianga, University of Auckland, pp.37-45.
secure groups of men take over positions of leadership within their *iwi*. These issues are frequently buried under *iwi* politics.\(^56\) In the following section of the thesis this issue is discussed in more detail.

If gender issues in the context of *whanau* are important, so are age issues. In attempts to operate within *Maori* contexts, the role of *kaumatua* has taken on a new significance. Irwin for example, sees their role as a mentoring and supportive role. Others have 'adopted' *kaumatua* as part of their research team, an official member who brings special expertise. Part of this exercise has been about gaining entry into a community. *Kaumatua* are also held to be those people who are knowledgeable about *Maori* things. This is based not simply on the fact that they are old and therefore wise, but that they have systematically gathered wisdom as they have aged. Not all older *Maori* are *kaumatua* in this sense of the term. Some *kaumatua*, for example, have kept written records and histories, they are experts in *whaikorero* and *waiata*, they can operate beyond their own immediate *marae*, they have earned respect, they have *mana* and can defend it if neccessary through their skills in *whaikorero*, their knowledge of *whakapapa* and their *matauranga*. Their status as *kaumatua* is linked directly to their knowledge and ability to use that knowledge for the collective good. *Maori* views about knowledge have been discussed in the wider literature, however, there are some aspects of knowledge which are important to *Maori* research. There exists the notion of levels or phases of knowledge which are helpful concepts for thinking about *Kaupapa Maori* research. The notions of *mohiotanga*, *wananga*, *maramatanga* and *matauranga*,\(^57\) for example, indicate levels and processes by which we gain insight and deep clarification of what we are seeking. *Matauranga* is said to be attained when it is held or comes to rest within us. *Eruera* Stirling defines *matauranga* as, 'a blessing on your mind, it makes everything clear and guides you to do things the right way'.\(^58\) One of the roles of *kaumatua*, then, is to make the pathways to knowledge clearer. This is achieved through their use of *karakia*, their involvement in the welcoming rituals and *mihimihi*, as well as their intellectual

\(^{56}\) See for example, Mead, A., 1994. 'Maori Leadership', in *Te Pua* 3. no.1, *Puawaitanga*, University of Auckland, pp.11-20.

\(^{57}\) Salmond, 1985, discusses these concepts in more detail. They are all terms for different sorts of knowing.

involvement in analysing data.

Within the dynamic of whanau there exist other sorts of social relations. Some of these will be discussed in the next section of the thesis. However, in terms of research, the whanau principle is generally regarded as an organisational principle, a way of structuring supervision, of working collaboratively, of ensuring that a wide range of Maori concepts are discussed rigorously, and a way of connecting with specific communities and maintaining relationships with communities over many years. The whanau can sometimes replace advisory committees, project teams and supervisory roles. It includes all those roles which are technical and roles which are about mentoring and support.

Maori Cultural Ethics.

Ethical issues have become increasingly significant as research communities across all disciplines have been held up for public scrutiny and found wanting. The idea of the self-monitoring community of professional scientists, who adhere to codes of good conduct and exert standards on their members fell apart with the National Women’s Hospital Cervical Cancer Inquiry. This Inquiry shocked women and ‘ordinary people’ as an exercise in academic, scientific arrogance. However, for Maori, the Inquiry simply reinforced the sense that we have been objectified by research since our first encounters with the west. The ethical issues for Maori, then, have come out of a long history of being researched by outsiders and then having that research flung back at us.

Research ethics for Maori communities extend far beyond issues of individual consent and confidentiality. In a discussion of what may constitute sound ethical principles for research in Maori communities, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku has identified a set of responsibilities which researchers have to Maori people.\footnote{Te Awekotuku, N., Manatu Maori, 1991. He Tikanga Whakaaro, Research Ethics in the Maori Community, Wellington.} Her framework is based on the code of conduct for the New Zealand Association of Social Anthropologists, which in turn is based on the American
Anthropological Association’s guidelines. Te Awekotuku sets out fairly basic guidelines aimed at the respect for and protection of the ‘rights, interests and sensitivities’ of the people being studied. There are, however, some culturally specific ideas which are part of Kaupapa Maori practices. These are not prescribed in codes of conduct for researchers, but tend to be prescribed for Maori researchers in cultural terms.

(i) aroha ki te tangata. (a respect for people)
(ii) kanohi kitea. (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face)
(iii) titiro, whakarongo.....korero. (look, listen....speak)
(iv) manaaki ki te tangata. (share and host people, be generous)
(v) kia tupato. (be cautious)
(vii) kau e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of people)
(viii) kaua e mahaki. (don’t flaunt your knowledge)

These ‘sayings’ reflect just some of the values that are placed on the way we behave. They are very different from the ‘public’ image of Maori society as a forum for ritual, oratory and chiefly leaders, but they are the kinds of comments which are used to determine if someone has ‘good’ qualities as a person. There are several other whakatauki which contain the ideals and aspirations which are worth seeking, as well as the moral messages for those who decide not to conform to the rules of practice.

There have been some suggestions that the way to carry out research in Maori communities can be reduced to a set of simple steps or procedures. These need not address the issues discussed here because they assume that the single most important issue is access to Maori communities. These ‘procedures’ for example, include; finding a kaumatua who is willing

---


61 I have selected these sayings, having heard them used on several occasions as evaluative comments on people. The saying ‘titiro, whakarongo, korero’ comes from Te Atarangi, the Maori language programme for adults. It seems to be a basic code of conduct in a number of situations for researchers. Actually these sorts of sayings are often made by the kuia, or older women, on a marae as they watch, very keenly, what people are doing.
to help, going to the local marae with the kaumatua, and being introduced to and employing local people as research assistants. There is a danger that such 'procedures' become fixed criteria for determining ethical practices and good conduct. But the reduction of Maori attitudes, values and experiences with research to simple procedures, while helpful to outsiders, masks the underlying issues, and is a deeply cynical approach to a complex history of involvement as research objects. For Maori researchers, the above steps are far too simplistic in that our choices, culturally, are much more flexible, the community networks are more established, there are more opportunities to discuss issues and to be seen. At the same time the accountabilities and feedback from the community are more immediate and last longer.

Questions of Method.

The main focus of this chapter has been the underlying aspects of Kaupapa Maori research and how it is situated as a theory about research. These final comments, then, are brief ones which address the actual practices of selecting how to gather 'data'. People engaged in Kaupapa Maori research have been trained in different disciplines, each with its own methods for carrying out research. To date, many of these researchers have had to develop a critique of their own disciplinary approach to research and to Maori issues, and then struggle to make space for their projects within the constraints of the methods imposed. How easy or difficult this is depends on the discipline, (and the particular orientation within the discipline), and the nature of the issues being researched. Increasingly Maori research projects have employed multidisciplinary approaches to a research 'problem'. Maori researchers have themselves developed methods and approaches which have enabled them to do what they want to do. They have gone into the field (that is, their own territory or rohe) to interview subjects (sometimes their own relations or whanaunga), which they have identified through various means (including their own networks), filled out their questionnaires or interview schedules, and gone back to the office to analyse and make sense of their data. During the course of their encounter they are often fed and hosted as a special guest, they are asked questions about their family backgrounds, they are introduced to other members of the family who

---

62 For example the New Zealand Doctor 9 June 1995 has a 15 step guide for visiting a marae. The Race Relations Office also used to publish ways to gain easy access to Maori communities.
sometimes sit in on the interview and participate. Sometimes, if the subject is fluent in Maori, they switch back and forth between the two languages, or if they think that the researcher can not understand Maori they try even harder to speak 'good' English, if the researcher is in their homes they may see photos of family members in the lounge. Sometimes it is hard to tell that the 'subject' is Maori, sometimes they say things a researcher may feel uneasy about, sometimes they come right out and ask the researcher to do something for them, sometimes they are cynical and hostile to the questions being asked. When the researcher leaves, it is with the silent understanding that they will meet again. The researcher may return to work and feel good about the interview they conducted. Or was it an 'interview', a conversation or dialogue perhaps? Or was it something more than that?

So much of the 'method' used in this kind of empirical research gets written out, the voices of the researched become increasingly silenced as the act of organising, analysing and interpreting the data starts to take over. Time passes by, because these processes take a very long time to work through. In Kaupapa Maori research, as a final point, there is the commitment to report back to the people concerned. It is part of the commitment to reciprocity and partly a process of accountability. Students who have written theses for example, have taken a copy back to the families they have interviewed, other researchers have invited people in to their centre for a presentation, others have made use of an occasion to publicly thank the participants concerned. The significance of these acts is that sometimes a written piece of work is passed around the whanau, other people phone and ask for their own copies, and others put it alongside the photos of family members which fill their sitting rooms. This final reporting closes off one part of an activity, it does not close off the relationships established.

In Summary.

This chapter has mapped out some of parameters of what is referred to as Kaupapa Maori Research. This has included a discussion on the concept and context of Kaupapa Maori and then a discussion on its application to research. I also discussed the connection between Maori cultural values, principles, priorities and the emancipatory aims which are seen by those who write in this area as a significant component of Kaupapa Maori Research. It is this
intersection of context and theory which makes Kaupapa Maori Research very different from other forms of research, for example models of cultural sensitivity. The connection between cultural systems and emancipatory goals gives what has been called a 'local' context for what critical theoretical approaches mean for Maori. This makes it unique. Also significant about these developments is the involvement of Maori conceptually, as well as in the field. This is a difference between other models of culturally sensitive research, where the space to be involved at the beginning is often not up for negotiation. Some critical tensions exist, one of which is the involvement of non-Maori researchers. Although there are some examples where non-Maori researchers have become involved through whanau organisation, this does not by any means open involvement. It is one issue which will continue to be contested and debated. 'Researching back', like 'writing back', is partly about talking back to the west, or in this case to Pakeha, and partly about talking to ourselves. Kaupapa Maori Research is a way of organising such processes.
A Brief Synopsis to Section Two.

In section two I transformed the idea of 'writing back' to one of 'researching back'. I critically discussed the ways in which imperialism, science, discovery and research are interconnected. In the introduction to this section I explored how that formation of research, science and colonialism influenced western encounters with *Maori* people. In chapter five the links between research and imperialism are situated within the western tradition. I used the metaphor of the cultural archive to unpick some of the layers of western knowledge and to show the ways in which they are imbued with ideas about the other. In chapter six I discussed *Maori* attitudes towards social science research, which coincided with shifts in the way critical and feminist theorists had developed critiques of their own. I showed how the spaces opened up by the critique of research, positivist research in particular, were filled with attempts to conduct culturally sensitive research. I suggested that there are limitations, even within this approach, to research on *Maori* being carried out by *Pakeha*. In chapter seven I mapped out the development of *Kaupapa Maori* research and the ways in which *Maori* researchers have begun to develop our own methodologies. In the second part of this chapter I discussed some of the informing principles of *Kaupapa Maori* research. In this section the underlying code of imperialism is tracked out in relation to the way research as knowledge is distributed to the colonies through scholarly, imaginative and adventurous pursuits, and is institutionalised in the local context. I have also shown the ways in which *Maori* have resisted total appropriation and misrepresentation, and have developed our own priorities and the alternative methodologies incorporated within the concept of *Kaupapa Maori* research.