

CHAPTER THREE

UNDERSTANDING AND DOING RESEARCH – A MAORI POSITION

Introduction

Prior to beginning study for the thesis, I had been working as a researcher based at the University of Waikato. Contracted by the tribal authority being examined in the thesis, I was involved in areas of Maori and tribal education. Before then, I had spent seven years completing two degrees that should have been completed in five. The question why do Maori students succeed was derived partly from my own experiences as a university student. My undergraduate experience was fraught with failed papers, missed assignments and poor subject choices. At one stage I almost pulled out, five papers short of finishing. Yet I managed to get through – how? Was my experience similar to those of other Maori students studying at university? Is the climate at university conducive to learning for a Maori person, incorporating and encouraging Maori culture and identity? What support mechanisms are in place to stop students from dropping out? What influences students to stay on and complete?

These questions were further developed through the work I was doing for the Tainui Maori Trust Board. Specifically, I was involved with the activities of the Education Committee, assisting with the administration and processing of tribal scholarships. I had also completed an analysis on the status (socio-economic, education, age) of tribal groups within the University of Waikato catchment area. My exposure to this line of work helped formulate more ideas for the study. In particular, I became interested in how effective tribal scholarships were in ensuring that Maori students graduated from university. Was money the only way that tribal authorities could assist their tribal members to succeed? What use was an education to tribal communities? In particular, what role did education play in determining the future development of the Waikato tribe?

As a university employee, contracted by the Tainui Maori Trust Board, I also became familiar with the ways in which the University of Waikato operated. For example, the University of Waikato was not required (by the Ministry of Education) to collect information on tribal affiliations despite having a group, Te Roopu Manukura, which represented the interests of some 19 tribal groups that fell within its catchment area. Therefore, information about tribal members enrolled at the University of Waikato was not available. This, to me, was a perplexing situation, particularly since the University had the largest Maori student population of all universities in New Zealand. How was an institution like the University of Waikato supposed to cater for the needs of the different tribal groups represented? Did it cater for Maori/tribal needs at all? This led to the question of how much policy had been developed since the University's establishment that reflected the needs and aspirations of Maori. Furthermore, I also wanted to know how effective such policies (if any) were in ensuring Maori students completed their university education. In short, how responsive was the University of Waikato in recognising and helping realise Maori/tribal aspirations or tino rangatiratanga?

In order to try and answer these questions, the focus of this thesis seeks to identify how the University of Waikato and the Tainui Maori Trust Board have attempted to develop policy to implement change that addresses Maori aspirations; and what a group of Tainui graduates made of these attempts.

My limited experience working for a tribal institution enveloped me within the intricate networks of the tribe itself. As a tribal member I was also connected to the outcomes of any research I was involved in, thus I was engaged in what Linda Smith (1999:137) describes as "insider/outsider research." Indeed, L. Smith (1999:5) identifies this as a problematic location in that:

there are a number of ethical, cultural, political and personal issues that can present special difficulties for indigenous researchers who, in their own communities, work partially as insiders, and are often employed for this purpose, and partially as outsiders, because of their Western

education or because they may work across clan, tribe, linguistic, age and gender boundaries.

Therefore, contrary to western, positivistic research notions that assume objectivity, my positioning within this research assumes a number of subjective roles – researcher, employee, student, and tribal member. In this sense, I am therefore part of the weaving process that comprises kaupapa Maori practice, as L. Smith (1999:190-191) has identified.

In this chapter, I use this notion of weaving to draw together the methodological and theoretical frameworks on which the study is based. Furthermore, I identify the methods used within these frameworks to investigate the various aspects of the study, as outlined above. I examine the notion of re/presenting the research, in particular, examining the location of power in research, and the struggles indigenous and minority researchers face in acknowledging and managing power in their relationships with their research communities (Bishop 1996, 1998b; Bishop & Glynn 1999a; G. Smith 1992; L. Smith 1999; Teariki & Spoonley 1992; Te Awekotuku 1991; Te Hennepe 1993; Lomawaima 2000).

From this examination of how research is re/presented, my positioning as an insider researcher becomes clearer. I describe my position as an insider researcher within the context of this study, highlight some of the problems associated with such a position and how I have addressed these problems throughout the course of the study. I also examine the positioning of the study within the kaupapa Maori paradigm, and specifically examine the relationship between kaupapa Maori and tribal research, which, in my opinion have very distinct but connected aspirations and objectives. From this, I examine the notion of power and how it relates not only to the researcher/researched position, but also how it relates to knowledge (after Foucault 1980). In particular, I question the positioning by some Maori, who purport to locate kaupapa Maori and Maori research from within a selective paradigm that appears based on notions of power and what ‘counts’ as knowledge – notions that place me outside the context of kaupapa Maori research. As a result of this examination on power/knowledge and what counts as knowledge, a tribal

position or construct of success emerges. This positioning locates the research from within a tribal, and specifically Tainui paradigm – a paradigm that has been based on notions of resistance and liberation, and from which strategies for success can be developed.

Re/presenting research

I have been told by kaumatua (tribal elders), that in order to understand where one wants to go, one must first understand where one has come from. In the context of academic research, the literature on ‘how to do’ research assumes certain knowledge forms thus influencing how we choose to conduct our research. Generally, the ‘how to do’ research approach falls into two distinct camps: quantitative and qualitative.

Duverger (1964) states that adopting a quantitative analytical approach gives the advantage of being objective, through the elimination of subjective elements, and thus arriving at an independent interpretation. Accordingly, positivistic inquiry contrasts with value based inquiry, because it is primarily concerned with the “study of what *is*, not of what ought to be” (Duverger 1964:33). Glesne & Peshkin (1992:5-6) define quantitative analysis as being supported by the positivist/scientific paradigm where the world is made up of measurable and observable facts. Primarily, the positivist paradigm assumes there is no bias, maintains an adherence to only one truth (through a systematic process of elimination), and that findings can be regarded as universally applicable (McPhillips 1992). From this traditional perspective, authority for the research ultimately lies with the researcher. In turn, this locates power over issues of representation and legitimation with the researcher (Bishop & Glynn 1999a).

Qualitative research, on the other hand, “seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings” (Berg 1995:7), emphasises subjectivity, and places the researcher in the position of “main research instrument” (Glesne & Peshkin 1992:7). Speaking from an

interpretivist paradigm, the worldview is assumed to be complex, lacks any form of standardisation, and is “evolutionary in nature” (Glesne & Peshkin 1992:6). However, despite attempts to address the power imbalances inherent in quantitative methods, many qualitative approaches similarly maintain power in the hands of the researcher (Bishop 1996). This is because many qualitative approaches prescribe to dominant ways of knowing, whereby such ‘knowing’ has ensured the continued subordination of indigenous and minority cultures and knowledge codes. Bishop & Glynn (1999a:106) describe this approach as “paradigm-shifting,” where, despite replacing one type of research practice (such as quantitative) with another (such as qualitative), researcher domination is perpetuated “through maintaining control of agenda-setting within the domain of the researcher.”

The patriarchal characteristics of dominance over acceptance of prescribed knowledge codes still exist and the debate between legitimacy of qualitative versus quantitative research methods occurs within this dominant world, because ‘other’ ways of knowing have yet to find a way into mainstream thoughts and practices. More specifically, the western research community still perceives the ‘other’ as an object of study, where the ‘other’ is located on the periphery of what ‘counts’ as research, as described by Lomawaima (2000:6):

For many years researchers have had the distinct advantage of representing the more powerful society, of having the authority...behind them...[R]esearchers could set their own research agendas, devise their own questions, develop whatever methodology suited their agenda, and do as they pleased without having to consult with or defer to tribal politics. Research has always been deeply implicated in the colonial political context, and educational research is no exception.

L. Smith (1999:2) agrees with this positioning:

it is surely difficult to discuss *research methodology* and *indigenous peoples* together, in the same breath,...without understanding the complex ways in which the pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices.

Bishop & Glynn (1999b:169) question the dominance of such practices, based on the experiences of Maori knowledge being misrepresented and located within terms “acceptable to the epistemological framework of Western located paradigms.” Scheurich & Young (1997) label this type of domination as ‘epistemological racism.’ They believe that “we..live...think, and act within a particular social history, within a particular social construction,” where this particular way of knowing becomes ‘normal’ (Scheurich & Young 1997:8). The problem, especially for indigenous and minority researchers is that “all of the epistemologies currently legitimated in education arise exclusively out of the social history of the dominant White race,” and this form of epistemological racism means that indigenous peoples continue to be ‘othered’ by those of the dominant discourse (Scheurich & Young 1997:8). One form of ‘othering’ is the construction of power imbalances within research relationships by the researcher maintaining control over what constitutes legitimate knowledge. McLaren (1994:120) also speaks of the dominance of western ‘norms,’ where discourses of power and privilege have “epistemically mutated into a new and terrifying form of xenophobic nationalism in which the white male Euro-American becomes the universal subject of history.” From this epistemical mutation, power is maintained and the indigenous and minority ‘others’ continue to be subordinated.

Indigenous researchers are becoming increasingly resistant to the hegemonic practices of western research. Resistance has come in the form of developing counter-strategies that are more reflective, appropriate and applicable to the indigenous research agenda. These counter-strategies, or counter-hegemonies, have enabled indigenous researchers to reposition, “to tell an alternative story: the history of Western research through the eyes of the colonised” (L. Smith 1999:2).¹ Graham Smith (1992:2) sees this counter-hegemonic approach as being “a shift

¹ A good example of this concerns the history of the Waikato tribe, particularly during the Land Wars of the 1860s. The confiscation of Waikato tribal lands was justified because Waikato resistance was branded as the actions of rebels (Smith 1988:141). The 1927 Sim Commission report indicated that the confiscations were illegal and immoral, however, history had already assumed and labelled Waikato’s defiance as rebellious. In 1995, Queen Elizabeth II signed the legislation for the Deed of Settlement, which was negotiated between Waikato and the New Zealand government. Contained within the legislation is an apology, acknowledging the wrongful actions of the colonial troops and recording that Waikato were not rebels. Kaumatua have stated that this apology was the most significant part of the settlement process.

from the marginal position of the constructed 'other' to the more central position of 'inclusion'." In this way, the 'alternative' stories begin to emerge and slowly find their way into dominant discourses.

Peters & Lankshear's (1996:2) postmodernist examination of "counternarratives" seeks to "counter not merely (or even necessarily) the *grand* narratives, but also (or instead) the "*official*" and "*hegemonic*" narratives of everyday life." From this position, Peters & Lankshear (1996:3) argue that western culture has become more differentiated, particularly since World War Two, and as a result is no longer able to sustain the "liberal myth of a common culture...which functioned to assimilate difference and otherness." As a result, "the game rules for the discourse of legitimation have been altered" (Peters & Lankshear 1996:9).

The battle for legitimation and of 'finding a space' from which to resist the dominant constructs of what 'counts' as knowledge has been ongoing for indigenous and minority researchers. L. Smith (1997b:3) notes that the indigenous research agenda is:

strategic in its purpose and activities. It is relentless in its pursuit for social justice. It is critical in its approach to all that has been said and claimed by the non-indigenous world of indigenous peoples...It draws on multidisciplinary approaches selectively. It is informed by analyses of imperialism and colonialism and about what it has meant to be colonised. It is concerned with change and with emancipatory outcomes for indigenous people.

Changing the rules for legitimation, as described by Peters & Lankshear, therefore requires an understanding of what it has meant to indigenous and minority peoples to exist on the margins. Understanding this positioning on the margins - as a result of the historical and cultural context "shapes researcher preconceptions" and means that an examination of the relationship between researcher and the researched is also required (Glesne & Peshkin 1992:11). This type of examination acknowledges the "participatory connectedness with the other research participants" (Bishop & Glynn 1999a:103). Indigenous research has sought to move beyond the power relationships inherent in researcher/researched

relationships, and has tried to relocate the focus on the connected relationship between all those involved with the research. From this positioning, legitimation comes not from the academic institutions and bodies that validate research activities, but, more importantly to indigenous and minority peoples, from the communities that are involved with the research. Further, this approach takes the emphasis of a power relationship away from the researcher's imposed agenda, concerns and interests, which has traditionally not empowered those communities being researched (Bishop 1998a; Johnston 1998). This approach is, essentially for indigenous communities, about taking back control (L. Smith 1999).

Insider Research

The dominance of the western positivistic notion, with its emphasis on “notions of objectivity and neutrality,” and based on the assumption that “the researcher is an outsider able to observe without being implicated in the scene” is problematic for insider researchers, particularly indigenous researchers who seek empowerment of the communities involved in the research projects (L. Smith 1999:137). This is because the insider research approach ensures that the meanings and interpretations of social situations cannot be objective in the positivistic sense that traditional western research prescribes.

Wagner (1993) describes insider research as participant research. Ambiguities are created as a result of this description, which simultaneously create problems and opportunities. These ambiguities relate to opportunities for establishing rapport and trust, and problems in establishing credibility, both as a researcher and as part of a research project. Smyth & Holian (1999:2) suggest that the position of the insider researcher:

forces us to ground our work in everyday issues as those involved experience them, it confronts us and others with our assumptions, perceptions and their impact, it enables us to learn, reflect and act and it insists that we engage with what and who we are curious about.

Wolcott (1999:137) uses the terms “emic” and “etic” to differentiate between “insider” and “outsider” points of view, although he stresses that there are multiple views where “every view as *a* way of seeing, not *the* way.” The advantage of the emic/insider approach is its attempts to define what Wolcott (1999:137) describes as the “heart of the matter.” In contrast, in the traditional ethnographic approach, someone else’s story is always told, as described by Bishop (1996:26):

the general trend of research into indigenous people’s lives in Aotearoa/New Zealand has been for the ‘research story’ teller to be an outsider who gathered the stories of ‘others,’ collated them and generalised as to the patterns and commonalities.

However, empowerment for those involved in research is becoming an increasing priority for indigenous researchers. This empowerment is based on an implicit understanding that traditional research methods have not acknowledged the contribution of research communities to the research project, nor has it acknowledged the impact such research can have on the communities concerned. As mentioned above, indigenous researchers are becoming increasingly resistant to the prescriptions of traditional western research methods, which place control and power in the hands of the researcher. From an indigenous research position, power is repositioned away from the researcher and located back amongst those who are involved in the research process. A dilemma arises, however, when the researcher is also located amongst those being researched. How then, is the issue of power/knowledge and researcher/researched resolved?

L. Smith (1999:137) acknowledges the problematic location of indigenous researchers as insider researchers “because there are multiple ways of both being insider and outsider in indigenous contexts.” As described earlier in the chapter, an indigenous researcher can be an insider researcher by virtue of their tribal affiliation and a member of the community being researched. However, indigenous researchers’ western educational background may also place them in an outsider position, which could be compounded by issues of gender, age, cultural knowledge and linguistic ability. The problem of being an indigenous

researcher working within their own community is further complicated by “a deeply held view that indigenous people will never be good enough, or that indigenous researchers may divulge confidences within their own community, or that the researcher may have some hidden agenda” (L. Smith 1999:10). Further, L. Smith (1999:107) acknowledges that because of the “burden of history,” the positioning of an indigenous person as a researcher can be “highly problematic.” However, the development of indigenous research and indigenous research agendas “privileges indigenous concerns,” whereby indigenous practices and participation as researchers and researched become ‘normal’ practices (L. Smith 1999:107).

Smyth & Holian’s (1999:1) view of insider research suggests that the “researcher who researches their own organisation can offer a unique perspective because of their knowledge of the culture, history and actors involved.” For indigenous researchers, however, the dilemma lies in being able to offer such a unique perspective, whilst negotiating the suspicions of their own communities. Part of this negotiation must require an acknowledgment on the part of the indigenous insider researcher that perhaps their western education has the potential to influence the types of research methodologies they use, methodologies founded within the discourses of neo-colonialism and methodologies which perpetuate the hegemony of the ‘master narratives.’ Indeed, while indigenous researchers attempt to ensure against “exploitative research” (L. Smith 1999:9), they can still be influenced by researcher imposition and reinforce notions of power during the research process (Bishop 1996). From my own position, the dynamics of working for a tribal institution, being a tribal member represented by this tribal institution, and attempting to conduct research that examines some key concepts within tribal objectives are part of the complexities that make up indigenous research and my position as an insider within this research project.

The complexities of being a researcher located within the research is described by Bishop (1996) in his discussion on a kaupapa Maori research strategy, where he was located within a complex matrix of relationships. In this setting Bishop (1996:213) sought to:

examine a way of knowing that reflects what meanings I can construct from my position. This matrix consists of my being a participant in a research group with an agreed-to agenda, [and] of my being a participant within the projects considered in the narratives...This...is an attempt to reflect on what I learned from my position within this matrix in order to identify a way of constructing meanings about such experiences and to investigate a methodological and theoretical framework for a Kaupapa Maori approach to research.

Using Bishop's example as a basis for my own examination, my matrix was shaped and guided by a number of experiences, which centred on establishing credibility as a researcher working within a tribal context, and how I understood, interpreted and represented tribal knowledge and beliefs. For me, this aspect of establishing credibility posed particular problems. As L. Smith (1999:10) suggests, one of the dilemmas of insider research is being judged on "insider criteria; family, status, politics, age, gender, religion as well as...perceived technical ability." I received a scholarship from the Tainui Maori Trust Board, which allowed me to pursue my own doctoral studies. Recipients of these scholarships were chosen for their "emphasis on research which is relevant to tribal development," with the intention being to "develop an increasing pool of highly educated and well qualified tribal members with expertise in a wide range of fields, who will contribute to the future development of the tribe" (Tainui Maori Trust Board 1998:21).

My position as a scholarship recipient aided in increasing the educational base of the tribe, however, as the first recipient of a doctoral scholarship (post-1995) it also placed very high expectations upon me. Would my research project measure up to tribal expectations? What were the expectations? As a young woman, I also felt that my age was certainly another factor that impacted upon my credibility as a researcher. Maori culture reveres the knowledge that elders possess, knowledge that is gained over time and through experience. Therefore, the acquisition, possession and dissemination of knowledge is deemed precious and valuable. My age deems me to be considered a rangatahi (youth), and in the presence of elders, high levels of 'western' education have little relevance at times, particularly in tribal contexts. Furthermore, my 'western' education, compounded by my age,

can potentially place me in relationships of power/knowledge. These relationships, in my opinion, have the potential, if not correctly addressed, to upset cultural 'norms,' whereby I place myself in a position that acquires, possesses and disseminates knowledge that I have no right to possess.

Tribal experiences of participating in research projects has resulted in the development of a number of processes that seeks to protect these cultural norms, as well as test the research candidate's ability to 'do the job.' While the tribe does not have explicit research protocols (such as those described by Tsianina Lomawaima, 2000), it has its own implicit set of rules or guidelines that enables it to determine the value of the research being undertaken and the impact it might have on the tribe. These rules or guidelines were used by tribal elders, and were similar to L. Smith's (1999) criteria for insider researchers working in indigenous contexts. As a result, I was required to give presentations about core tribal concepts (such as the Kingitanga and the history of the tribe) at which tribal elders have often been present. I have also been expected to find my own way through the labyrinth of decision-making processes, and to ensure that the appropriate people have been considered, approached, informed, consulted with and listened to. These processes, I believe, test the worthiness of my western education in Maori contexts, and more importantly, determines from their perspective, to what extent I have become ensnared within the western construct of knowledge/power, and whether this has been at the expense of my knowing the complexities of tribal ways of knowing. Throughout these processes, I have been gently, and at times not so gently, reminded of my mistakes, my oversights and my shortcomings, with the express intention that I learn from them and not repeat them again. In essence then, tribal elders guided me through another educative process, with its own series of tests and examinations. This whole process examined my robustness as a candidate for tribal research; a process that I believe was endorsed when I received a tribal scholarship, but a process that is ongoing through practices of constant reflection and examination.

Because insider researchers have a personal stake in their research, by their location within the research and their relationship to the research participants, they

have to “live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis for ever more,” as do their “families and communities” (L. Smith 1999:139). The role of tribal elders, as guides, critics and mentors - as I have described above - thus becomes critical to the researcher in the research process. For the insider researcher, this consequence also ensures that they examine how the research is represented, and the impact research findings may have on the communities involved. For example, Lomawaima (2000:11) recognises that:

outsiders' evaluations of risk and anonymity may not correspond to a community's internal definitions. Tribal definitions or understandings of the boundaries between “private” and “public” activities may also differ significantly from the understandings of non-community researchers.

Te Hennepe (1993:222) acknowledges these concerns, experiencing what she described a “crisis in representation” when she was attempting to analyse data from her research with indigenous peoples in Canada. Specifically, her concern arose when she tried to provide an accurate representation of the material shared by First Nations students, where “all phases of the research encounter...are governed by economies of truth” (Te Hennepe 1993:197). In this respect, Te Hennepe acknowledges that her interpretation necessarily influenced what she had been told and how she chose to present the data. From Scheurich & Young's (1997:8) perspective this is because “no epistemology is context-free.” In essence, all researchers are influenced by their own experiences, their own knowledge-background, and their own ‘slant’ on the research topic, regardless of how ‘objective’ research is purported to be. This poses a challenge for the researcher. How does one represent correctly and respectfully the diversities that characterise research participants’ experiences, without being unduly influenced by the epistemological constraints (or contexts) that they describe? Te Hennepe (1993:234) resolved this dilemma by submitting that:

we are all constructing tales based on our truth as we know it in order to relate what we have to say to others. In many cases we want to teach others something about the way we see the world.

Carol Barnhardt (1994:68-69) consciously attempted to “do no harm” to the participants in her study, based on an acute awareness of the “very real potential for misunderstanding, miscommunication, and abuse of power.” In my own study, as I was intimately connected with the research participants and the two institutions examined in this study – as tribal member and employee – it was important that I not interpret what was happening in terms of some ‘outsider’ process. As my connectedness positioned me within the research so too did my connectedness mean that my research should be understandable and use the sense-making processes of the participants themselves. Of more importance, however, was the need to ensure that my connectedness, or my responsibility as an insider researcher ensured that the research I was involved in made a difference (Smyth & Holian 1999).

As a researcher, I have become increasingly aware of the lack of research concerning Maori participation in higher education, and Maori success. My own experiences as a Maori student at university have helped shape an ‘insider’ perspective that has informed the development of this research project. Similarly, my insider status as a tribal member and employee of the two organisations being examined for this thesis ensures that the ‘little stories’ get told, influenced by tribal concepts of resistance and tino rangatiratanga, and by the inclusiveness of Kingitanga and, to a lesser extent, kaupapa Maori. In this respect, by adopting an insider research approach, I am able to represent the stories of the marginalised (successful Maori graduates, the Tainui Maori Trust Board) as well as putting forward a tribal position that seeks distinction from both western and kaupapa Maori research approaches.

Developing a research methodology

Bishop & Glynn (1999a:106) have found that “paradigm-shifting” (for example replacing quantitative with qualitative research practices) “may still perpetuate researcher domination through maintaining control of agenda-setting within the domain of the researcher.” They propose a qualitative research approach that

seeks to address the issue of researcher imposition or dominance, an approach they have termed collaborative storytelling. McPhillips (1992:18) defines collaboration as a process that shares in the “creation of knowledge among the participants of a research group which includes a researcher and those being researched...so that all members have the opportunity to be active in the research.” In this way, all members of the research process become involved and take ownership of what is being researched and how issues pertaining to the research can be defined, prioritised and actioned.

Bishop & Glynn (1999a:107) state that the interview “can be a strategy, controlled by the researcher, and repressive of the position of the informant/participant.” In essence, this approach identifies the issues of power, which according to Limerick et al (1996:450), “lies in the recognition that the relationship between researcher and researched is a political and social relationship.” Essentially, then, researchers adopting an interview approach must bear in mind the power/knowledge relationship. As Limerick et al (1996:459) state “understanding the politics of the interview relationship is fundamental to the quality of analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the text that lies at the heart of interview-based research.”

I chose to include interviews as a research approach, because I wanted to ensure that the voices of the graduates – in terms of how they have experienced the attempts of the two institutions to improve their own education advancement - would be heard within the research. In trying to ascertain what made these Maori students succeed at university, I wanted the graduates’ thoughts and understandings about the two institutions examined at the forefront of the analysis. In essence, I wanted them to be positioned as the “politically powerful” in the debate about Maori academic achievement (Morrow & Hensel 1992). In my opinion, they were in positions of power, because having been subject to institutional practices and policies the graduates were in the best position to comment on how they, and their efforts to succeed, were affected. This is contrary to the positioning of research subjects in traditional western research, where what they say is processed by the researcher to make sense of or add to an agenda established by the researcher. However, this positioning conveys the counter-

hegemonic shift that is kaupapa Maori research, which seeks to locate the narrative from within Maori codes, assumptions and conventions.

The process by which I arrived at positioning the graduates as the politically powerful was aided by a number of conversations I had with different people when I first began to think about doing the research project. At the beginning of this chapter, I described my own experiences at university and some of the concerns I had about Maori participation at university. Applying for a tribal scholarship forced me to focus my thoughts into how the research project might make a difference, based on the experiences of Tainui graduates, to the way in which the Tainui Maori Trust Board and the University of Waikato approached Maori educational advancement and success. I talked with a number of people – graduates, fellow scholarship holders, colleagues and tribal elders and members – to try and formulate what I thought might be a positive approach to Maori educational advancement. In essence, these conversations generated an initiation process into the research project, guiding, shaping and at one point seemingly influencing how I was going to approach the research.

Another aspect, which influenced my decision to focus on the experiences of Tainui graduates, was the lack of information available on the experiences of Maori graduates. The historical context, described in Chapter One and reinforced in this chapter, has sought to exclude the voices of those on the periphery. Maori university students are rare in the tertiary education sector, Maori university graduates even more so. Thus, I pictured the research project as being a very small step in relocating their voices away from the periphery, and towards a more central position of inclusion (G. Smith 1992).

As a result of the conversations I had, I began to develop more concrete ideas about how the research project might proceed, and in what direction it might take. From this positioning, I developed a series of questions, grouped in themes that were suggested in some of the earlier conversations I had had and which covered the main areas I intended to examine in the thesis. These themes included family background, early education experiences, opinions of the University of Waikato

and knowledge about initiatives offered for Maori, opinions on the Tainui Maori Trust Board scholarship process and knowledge about other education initiatives developed, and views on success. I tested the questions and interview approach and style on several colleagues, making minor changes before finalising the interview questions used with the graduates. Rather than forming rigid questions as the basis for the interviews, I instead adopted what Bishop (1996) and Bishop & Glynn (1999a) have described as in-depth, semi-structured interviews. This approach was identified as being most suitable for the purposes of the thesis because it allowed the interviews to flow. Berg (1995:33) describes this type of interview as one that combines predetermined question formats with the ability to “digress,” to “probe far beyond” what the predetermined questions might have revealed. Bishop & Glynn (1999a:109) believe that these types of interviews “promote free interaction and opportunities for clarification and discussion between research participants through the use of open-ended questions rather than closed questions.”

Problematic issues related to the use of interviews as a research method focus on two areas: interpretation of results (or bias), and issues of privacy. According to Limerick et al (1996:457), “the point at which the researcher’s power is unrivalled by those being researched is on the analysis phase.” Bishop & Glynn (1999a) agree. Data has the potential to be interpreted according to the focus of the research topic, as well as being reinterpreted according to researcher agendas. Therefore, “how those data are interpreted and used is usually implicitly, if not explicitly, out of the hands of the research participants” (Bishop & Glynn 1999a:111). In attempting to ensure that the interpretation of data highlighted the voices of the graduates, I decided to group their responses according to the main themes that arose as a result of the interviews. Bishop & Glynn (1999a:112) caution against this approach, in that “data can be selected to fit the preconceptions of the author and data can also be selected to construct theories.” I was very aware of this possibility, given the subjective nature of the research topic. How was I to protect the voices of the graduates? I reverted to the commitment notion attached to the whakawhanaungatanga concept illustrated by Bishop & Glynn to ensure that I would “do no harm” (Barnhardt 1994). I also

involved the graduates throughout the research process, although this proved difficult in that I lost touch with some of graduates over the course of the research project (some five years). However, I did feel that I had the confidence of the graduates that I would respect what they had shared with me, and that I would not abuse or misconstrue what they had told me, which gave me a greater sense of belief in the research project itself.

In order to get to this point of confidence, and to develop a comfortable level of interaction, it is acknowledged that there must be some rapport between the researcher and the researched. Freeman & Sherwood (1970:91) likened this rapport to the development of an interpersonal relationship. Ensuring a comfortable environment between researcher and researched affects both the outcomes and quality of the material. Because I had known some of the graduates prior to the start of the interviews, a rapport (in varying degrees) was already in place. I had also spoken with some of the graduates about the topic of my thesis, and the subjects that would be covered in the interviews. In many ways, these conversations helped me to form the basis of the thesis itself, and to add some validity as a topic worthy of study. I came to know the other graduates through the course of the thesis, and through interactions at tribal occasions and events. Indeed, these pre-interview sessions were vital to the process of interviewing that was to follow, as well as being part of the very process of joint collaborative agenda setting that is fundamental to kaupapa Maori approaches to research.

Prior to each interview, I discussed with the graduates the aims and intentions of the research project, outlined expectations of the interview (which was to determine the effectiveness of the University of Waikato and the Tainui Maori Trust Board in assisting their academic success), and discussed issues of privacy and use of the information. The responses contained within the thesis have been given back to the graduates concerned for validation, to ensure that my interpretation of their responses has been correct, and to ensure their views have been correctly and appropriately represented. The graduates appeared comfortable with my approach, and I have maintained contact with several of them through the whole research process, discussing the outcomes and findings with them on an

ongoing basis. In a sense, I have developed a process of seeking endorsement and validation for the work to ensure that it is still essentially their ‘voice.’ It is through this process that I feel I have addressed issues concerning the “crisis of representation,” described earlier by Te Hennepe (1993:222), by co-constructing – with the research participants – a collaborative narrative of their experiences as Tainui scholarship recipients and graduates from the University of Waikato.

My rapport with the graduates was also reinforced through the Maori cultural concept of *whakawhanaungatanga* (Bishop & Glynn 1999a). This concept, as explained by Bishop & Glynn (1999a:121) asserts the fundamental requirement to establish and maintain relationships in such a way that those commitments and obligations that are fundamental to the *whanau* relationship are also fundamental to the research relationship. At another level, the concept *whanau* (family) indicates a much deeper, more intimate relationship than the more formal construct of researcher/researched. In this case, I shared with the graduates a *whanau* link – tribal membership. Therefore, I became connected with, or committed to the research process itself.

The *whanau* link becomes a critical component of the methodological process in the thesis, especially in relation to my interconnectedness, or ‘insiderness.’ Whereas an etic positioned researcher is more likely to ask questions of their interests and of their concerns, my position as an emic researcher required the interview questions be inclusive of the community’s interests and concerns, insisting engagement (Smyth & Holian 1999). As mentioned above, I had discussed the ideas and concepts of the thesis with some of the graduates prior to the start of the research project, so I had some idea of their concerns. Similarly, I discussed some of the research concepts that form the basis of the thesis with other colleagues and academic mentors, who were able to guide me in shaping the research as a whole project. Most importantly, I have been guided by tribal mentors, who have questioned my work, who have tested my understanding of tribal issues, and who have examined my commitment to the research project, beyond the life expectancy of the research project itself. All of the advice and guidance I have received prior to beginning the research project has ensured that

my approach to the research has been examined and evaluated by members of the tribal community, by academic peers and mentors, and by participants within the research itself. In a sense, all of this advice envelops me as a researcher, similar to that of a korowai (cloak). The korowai incorporates the advice, wisdom and experience of the different groups who have assisted, advised, cajoled and queried the research project, from its infancy to its completion. The korowai image also ensures the validity of the research project, and the expectations that the research project's outcomes will have on the community. The korowai, therefore, is my connectedness as researcher, to the community being researched.

Criticism of insider researchers is that the emic positioning (within which I have been positioned) removes critical reasoning. On the contrary, I would argue that the emic position that I have just described ensures that critical reasoning becomes a core component of the thesis itself, because it requires constant reflection and revision of all aspects of the research process. Receiving a tribal scholarship in order to conduct this research in effect validates the commitment of the researcher (me) to the researched (the tribal community), and adds to the weight of the korowai. However, there is also an expectation, because of the awarding of the tribal scholarship, that the research process is as robust as any other western academic endeavour, and that any findings (positive or otherwise) are duly reported. The difference being that the expectation is that the research must not just be research for the sake of research. The tribal philosophy, encapsulated in the mission statement for the University of Waikato's Centre for Maori Studies and Research, is "there is to be no research without development, and no development without research." It is from this premise that emic research can be an effective methodological tool, because I am working within a context where there is a very clear expectation that such research will aid the development of the tribe. In many ways, this expectation also helped to define the thesis just as much as did the initial conversations with the scholarship recipients.

One aspect related to the concept of whakawhanaungatanga that I did not incorporate in the thesis method, were interviews of key people involved in the various committees and reports discussed in the thesis. I was asked to consider

interviewing these key people, but I declined this approach, which may appear contrary to the notion of inclusiveness and empowering for those involved in the research – to be able to put their story across. This was a deliberate approach from my perspective, and from which I hoped would ensure the continued prime positioning of the graduates within the research. Specifically, I decided against interviewing these people for two reasons. Firstly, the documents examined in the thesis speak to issues of policy. While there are discrepancies between policy documents, statements and their intentions, I decided that interviewing the people involved in developing these documents was not going to assist in identifying the impact of the actual policies. In my opinion, the two institutions were already in positions of power because they had developed these policies, and often, policy is developed without careful planning and consideration (M. Durie 1998). Furthermore, policy often does not reflect the experiences of those it impacts upon. Secondly, it was important to me that those affected by the policies (the graduates) be given ‘voice’. It is rare that the recipients of policy are able to have their voices heard. Policies and initiatives have often been created with little or no thought as to the effect on the intended parties. Therefore, I decided that the institutions would have an opportunity to ‘hear’ what the graduates have had to say through the research. I envisaged that this was an opportunity in which the graduates would become empowered by being able to share their experiences - as tribal members, and as university students - and how the processes and policies of these two institutions affected them during their time at university. In my opinion, that allows the process of education to become more liberating and empowering, as well as providing an aid to policy makers to reflect on their own contributions to the policy process.

Further to the use of interviews, I also relied on a number of other methods for gathering together the information required for the diverse research settings. One of these settings included Maori university education participation and academic achievement, which I examined through documentary evidence drawn from western and non-western sources (Chapter Two, Seven, Eight). Another included the Tainui Maori Trust Board, which I examined primarily from information taken from the Tainui Maori Trust Board Minute Book, and publicly available annual

reports and documents (Chapter Five). A third setting was the University of Waikato, which I examined from information taken from public reports and documents (Chapter Four).

The information obtained from these research settings served two main purposes: provision of historical information, and analysis of specific documents. Primarily, the historical component was limited to providing an account of the establishment and development of the two institutions, and their aspirations, policies and procedures in relation to Maori. These accounts also tracked the progress of university education in New Zealand, as well as providing a chronological timeframe in which key events in the history of the Waikato tribe occurred. Specific documents have been used in the thesis to analyse the effectiveness of the two institutions in ensuring effective Maori participation at university (Chapter Four and Five). I also used government, university and tribal data to describe the status of Maori participation within higher education (Chapter One). These data provide the context for the research topic.

Throughout my journey as an insider researcher, defined by kaupapa Maori and tribal research practices, I have tried to gain a better understanding of how the dominant western paradigm has excluded indigenous knowledge through the maintenance of power codes and determinants of what 'counts' as knowledge. Indigenous and minority researchers, in their resistance to these dominant prescriptions, have developed research methods that are more reflective of indigenous and minority aspirations. For Maori, this journey requires the researcher to become more reflective of their practices, and to engage in methods of collaboration, informed by concepts of whanaungatanga, responsibility (to the research participants) and respect. Above all, this approach seeks to validate the research from the participants' position, giving 'voice' and thus using the research process as a means of empowerment.

Theoretical considerations – Understanding the thought processes

Theoretical moments...are also shaped inside your head, through reflection and reflexivity...It may begin as an ever so slight hesitation, a pause for thought, a moment of critical self-reflection, a question that is asked, a statement that pulls you up short or an idea which forms somewhere inside you, but leads you on an intellectual journey. The journey takes you deeper into the ideas and ways of thinking which intrigue you and which lead you into new theoretical spaces (L. Smith 1996:17-18).

Contrary to L. Smith's statement, theory has traditionally been seen as a part of a system of controls, which determines what counts as knowledge, and thus determines the shape and direction of the intellectual journey. As a result, Thomas (1997:85) claims that theory is harmful because "theory structures – and thus constrains thought." Popkewitz (1995:xiii) asserts that theory "posits a historical amnesia to the power relations inscribed in disciplinary knowledge." Such amnesia highlights "theory's acquired potency for bestowing academic legitimacy," which "means that particular kinds of endeavour in educational inquiry are reinforced and promulgated, while the legitimacy of atheoretical kinds is questioned or belittled" (Thomas 1997:76). Bishop & Glynn (1999b:168) agree, asserting that "such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes, and the legitimization of diversity of cultural epistemologies and cosmologies."

The introductory chapter of this thesis described the problematic notions attached to academic legitimacy in the New Zealand setting, where Maori underachievement has been a direct result of Maori knowledge and ways of living being questioned and belittled. Theory and its application in a New Zealand education context, therefore, has been based primarily on western dominant constructs of what counts as knowledge (Bishop 1998b; Bishop & Glynn 1999a, 1999b; Irwin 1992b; McCarthy 1997; G. Smith 1995; L. Smith 1999; Stewart 1997).

My academic background in Maori Studies ensured that I had some understanding of the “form of historical and critical analysis of the role of research in the indigenous world” (L. Smith 1999:5). However, I struggled to understand the extent to which Maori Studies prepared me for the rigours of doctoral research. More problematic was the perception that because my topic concerned issues related to education, I had an automatic understanding of the concept of kaupapa Maori, and of education as a process of liberation and transformation (G. Smith 1992). Indeed, at an early seminar I gave on my research for the thesis, I was challenged about my approach to the research, and whether I was intending to follow the kaupapa Maori ‘way.’ Initially I had struggled against aligning my research to the kaupapa Maori way of knowing, doing, and thinking. Graham Smith (1992:1) defined kaupapa Maori as “the philosophy and practice of ‘being Maori’,” which was a “common sense, taken for granted assumption.” I assumed therefore, that kaupapa Maori theory and practice required a total commitment to Maori ways of knowing and analysing, to the exclusion of all others.

However, Linda Smith’s (1999:191) definition of kaupapa Maori allowed me to see that, in fact, kaupapa Maori was much more: “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.” In effect, I found that kaupapa Maori was more about having the confidence to move between traditions without losing one’s identity and grounding than being aligned to any specific academic tradition. For me, the ability to weave in and amongst different traditions, western and indigenous frameworks, allowed me to move beyond what I initially thought were quite restrictive boundaries associated with kaupapa Maori. This more collective notion of kaupapa Maori, with its weaving together of different academic traditions was more aligned to the tribal notions of unity and working with and amongst races (as espoused by the Kingitanga through the words of Potatau and Tawhiao), and I found a more comfortable space (hooks 1994) from which to position myself within the research project.

Problems associated with kaupapa Maori research

Part of my initial struggle with aligning the research with kaupapa Maori was that, as I mentioned, I was uncomfortable with the notion that kaupapa Maori was based on ‘being Maori,’ the philosophy and practice of which was a ‘taken for granted assumption.’ This definition of ‘being Maori’ was a vague, almost arrogant assumption, particularly given my position as an insider researcher ‘doing’ research on and about the tribal community to which I was affiliated. Indeed, who was I to ‘assume’ what ‘being Maori’ was?

This definition of kaupapa Maori is further complicated by the differences between being Maori, as Graham Smith describes, and operating from a position that acknowledges that Maori are not homogenous, which Graham Smith (1995) also describes. In my mind, the research I was conducting was not located from a kaupapa Maori perspective that practiced and philosophised in a ‘Maori way.’ Rather, it was shaped by my association with the tribe – as a member and as a researcher, in effect, as an insider/outsider. Further, as a result of my association with the tribe, and as a tribal member myself, I was also influenced by the practices and philosophies of the tribe, which were, in turn, based around and drew cultural and spiritual sustenance from the Kingitanga movement. Indeed, the guidance I received from tribal elders, who tested my suitability for the research project and for taking a greater part in tribal activities (as described earlier), were very specific in their construction of what it meant to be a member of the tribe and what it meant to be aligned to the Kingitanga. In order to ‘be’ Maori, I first had to ‘be’ Tainui.

According to Johnston (1998:356), my difficulty in aligning the research with kaupapa Maori is perhaps because the “notion of Kaupapa is not that easily defined.” Specifically, Johnston argues that, as such, kaupapa are specific to the circumstances in which the kaupapa exist or are located, and are thus influenced by such circumstances and situations. As a result, the “implementation of Kaupapa Maori in any given context will result in practices relevant (and often unique) to that particular context” (Johnston 1998:356). Indeed, as I have

discussed, the circumstances of this research project insist on a kaupapa that is aligned to tribal notions of advancement and success. Because of this alignment, the research project is thus located within a specific context, guided and shaped by these tribal notions and the philosophies of the Kingitanga. Therefore, the Kingitanga, which was founded as a structure of resistance and which seeks liberation and empowerment for tribal members through the process of education, forms the theoretical basis for the research project.

Another aspect that has also caused difficulties in my perceptions of kaupapa Maori arises from my academic background, from which most of my theory and research practice has been drawn to date. While I have already acknowledged in this chapter the difficulties I have had in determining whether the Maori Studies discipline has readied me for doctoral research, I cannot deny its existence within my own particular learning context. However, its existence within my learning context, and as an influence on this research project raises issues about its validity as a knowledge construct – given its location within the university setting, a setting that has failed to acknowledge Maori knowledge as a valid way of knowing because of its insistence on maintaining western traditions of superiority, power and control.

According to Royal (1998:1), the “theory of matauranga Maori presents a view concerning the paradigm of traditional Maori culture, and therefore the paradigm of traditional matauranga Maori.” Positioning knowledge within a set, specific paradigm, Royal (1998:6) discounts Maori Studies as a knowledge discipline because of its location within a western institution, and because it “grew out of political agitation appropriate for the time” rather than being reflective of the “needs, aspirations and perceptions of a knowledge discipline itself.” However, political agitation, of the type described by Royal, spawned in America the Black, ethnic and women’s studies disciplines. This political agitation, through the civil rights movement, “fuelled the demand for a knowledge and history of ‘our own’” (Mohanty 1994:149). In essence, then, the development of Maori Studies has mirrored this demand, reflecting the “wider transitional struggles of Maori” and thus while originating within western paradigms, seeks, through its evolution

towards a more “philosophical articulation of kaupapa Maori itself,” transformation from its racist origins (Macpherson 1997:12). Walker (1999:187) agrees, describing the emergence and existence of Maori Studies in universities as being “testimony to the resilience of indigenous people who were subjected to the dehumanising project of European expansionism into the New World.” Further, Walker (1991:195) argues, “it is not the business of Maori Studies to teach students how to be Maori.” In his opinion, that falls within the paradigm of traditional maturaanga Maori, and the role of Whare Wananga.

The problem with Royal’s definition of maturaanga Maori is descriptive of those who construct theories and methodologies in ways “that make it a critical terrain which only a few can enter” (hooks 1994:68). McLaren (1994:135) adds further to this discussion, where, from his postmodernist position, he suggests, “critical educators must assume a transformative role.” Specifically, McLaren believes that:

the site of translation is always an arena of struggle. The translation of other cultures must resist the authoritative representation of the other through a decentering process that challenges dialogues which have become institutionalised through the semantic authority of state power.

In essence, Royal’s positioning of maturaanga Maori against Maori Studies assumes such an authoritative representation, where Maori Studies is viewed from his perspective as the ‘other.’ Mohanty (1994:147) sees this type of positioning as the academy locating itself as a political and cultural site representing “accommodations and contestations over knowledge by differently empowered social constituencies.” For someone like me, placed within what has been described as essentially a western paradigm, it serves to locate me - as a Maori Studies researcher - on the periphery, marginalising my experiences not only as a Maori researcher, but also as a Tainui researcher. Furthermore, Royal’s stance denies Maori Studies, from the political and cultural site of the university, an analytical space from which transformation and change can occur. From my position, as an inexperienced researcher, but having addressed what I thought were critical theoretical and methodological concerns of the thesis – such as tribal

endorsement, responsibility to the tribe and being reflective of tribal needs and aspirations – Royal’s stance initially proved alienating and intimidating.

The debate of knowledge/power, in the context of Royal’s positioning of *matauranga Maori* and Maori Studies, raises concerns about validation of knowledge and the role of knowledge/education as a process of empowerment. Specifically, Maori and indigenous research has fought to ‘take back’ knowledge from the colonisers/oppressors, in order to empower communities who are often at the other end of research projects, as objects/subjects to study, analyse and comment on. Indeed, Walker (1991:197) believes that because of its need to be “dynamic and flexible enough to respond to the contemporary and the evolving needs of Maori people,” Maori Studies as an “emancipatory project” becomes an “uncomfortable science because it creates tensions with the institution in which it is embedded by seeking to transform power relations of domination and subordination.” In essence, therefore, Walker acknowledges the uncomfortable positioning of Maori Studies within universities, but suggests that because of such positioning Maori Studies is a tool from which transformative learning and empowerment can be achieved – similar to the goals expressed in Royal’s positioning of *matauranga Maori*. The main difference is that Walker has chosen to locate the battle of knowledge/power between western and Maori sources, rather than Royal’s notion of what counts as Maori knowledge.

Kaupapa Maori and the decolonisation process, according to L. Smith (1999:39), has not meant “a total rejection of all theory or research or Western knowledge,” but it has meant a ‘taking back’ or a ‘reclaiming’ of indigenous knowledge and indigenous ways of representing knowledge. Early colonial observations of Maori life and culture effectively appropriated Maori knowledge in what Smith (1999:157) describes as the naming and claiming phenomenon. Citing Paulo Freire’s famous aphorism: “name the word, name the world,” L. Smith (1999:157) asserts that this phenomenon is also about retaining control over meanings. In the context of Maori research, this control has redefined intrinsic Maori cultural concepts, effectively ‘re-naming’ and ‘re-reclaiming’ in attempts to validate Maori knowledge in the context of academic writing and research.

Freire's philosophy argues for the "deconstruction of the category of 'the oppressed' and the acknowledgement of diversity" (McLaren & Leonard 1993:3). Essentially, by asserting certain ways of knowing and categorising, despite expressing sentiments of the paradigm of decolonisation, it becomes "impossible to speak an identity from a different location" (hooks 1992:45), where the essentialist construct does "not allow for difference" or acknowledge diversity. It also refocuses the attention away from the inclusive notions of what Linda Smith (1999) believes kaupapa Maori espouses, into notions where Maori research is being framed from positions where "the word is changed into idle chatter, into *verbalism*, into an alienated and alienating 'blah'" (Freire 1996:68). Therefore, it is suggested that the notions of Maori knowledge, or maturaanga Maori as described by Royal, have not embraced the diverse process of deconstruction/decolonisation because of their inability to acknowledge the diversity that Freire and hooks believe is an essential component of education as liberation and transformation.

L. Smith (1999) acknowledges the multi-faceted nature of Maori research. Maori knowledge is even more so, where interpretations depend on tribal, hapu and whanau experiences, highlighting the divergent nature of Maori as a people/s (which I discuss further below). The main point in this thesis seeks to discount the notion that Maori knowledge can only be viewed in particular ways, and from particular constructs, determined and shaped in ways that, in my opinion, are essentially non-Maori.

In essence, then, my struggles against a kaupapa Maori definition as described by Graham Smith (1992) and Royal (1998), forced me to really think about the context in which the research project was based. This process of critical reflection then highlighted for me what was important about 'being Maori,' which in turn highlighted the philosophical underpinnings of the research project, that being, what it meant to 'be Tainui,' which in turn meant aligning the research alongside the Kingitanga and ensuring the research was reflective of Kingitanga beliefs and practices. From this position, I was able to 'reclaim' kaupapa Maori, find a space within this paradigm which was comfortable for me, and which reflected what I

considered the important and defining aspects of the research project, that being, the tribe and the Kingitanga. It is from this background that I have found a ‘space’ that recognises who I am, that legitimates my experiences as a tribal member, and more importantly, that is respectful to the community that the research is attempting to represent.

Recognising/Legitimising Diversity: Tribal Constructs of Success

Lomawaima (2000:1) states that moves by First Nations/Native American tribal groups to develop their own research protocols and guidelines have come about as “reasoned and reasonable responses to changes in the balance of power in Indian country.” Discussing the power relationship between government agencies (such as government departments and universities) and tribal, minority peoples, Tsianina Lomawaima asserts that tribal peoples are becoming more proactive and taking a more active stance about why, for who, and how research on Native communities is able to be conducted. Based on issues of legal, ethical and procedural concern, minority peoples worldwide are now engaged in “taking back” control of their culture, language and knowledge forms (L. Smith 1999). The development of kaupapa Maori theory is an example of how Maori are ‘taking back’ this control, by seeking to challenge conformity through the introduction of new epistemologies that are more reflective of Maori aspirations (L. Smith 1996).

L. Smith’s (1999:128-129) discussion on the role of tribal research notes that theoretical considerations within this context are influenced not only by notions of what counts as knowledge, but also by reaffirming notions of traditional, tribal culture and how they might be reconceptualised in the fight for liberation, as stated by Tsianina Lomawaima at the beginning of this section. The Tainui Maori Trust Board has long recognised the role research plays within indigenous and minority communities, and have ‘taken back’ control of their tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) through processes of education and research. Specifically for the tribe, research that it has developed, structured and defined has led to the

production of reports that retell the story of colonisation and its impact – from a tribal perspective (Centre for Maori Studies and Research 1986; Egan & Mahuta 1983; Florin & Tainui Health Task Force 1990). This body of research acknowledges the power imbalances and resulting subordination of Maori as a result of the colonisation process. Further, this body tells of the specific impact suffered by the tribe as a result of Pakeha insistence on maintaining power and control, through the illegal confiscations of over 1.2 million acres of tribal lands during the Land Wars of the 1860s.

In its efforts to reconstruct itself as a tribe and to reclaim its culture, language and history, the Tainui Maori Trust Board has used the power of research, of knowledge, but reconstructed it in a way that challenges the dominant construct of power and that challenges the dominant, ‘master’ narratives. It has done this based on the notion of tino rangatiratanga. Lomawaima’s discussion on sovereignty and the First Nations experiences on the struggle for sovereignty mirror that of Maori, and also that of the Tainui tribe’s desire for tino rangatiratanga. In particular, Lomawaima (2000:3) notes, “sovereignty is the bedrock upon which any and every discussion of Indian reality today must be built.” From the tribe’s position, particularly in relation to education, tino rangatiratanga encapsulates “the development of equity and self-reliance by all Tainui descendants in educational, social, cultural, economic, and political aspects of life” (Tainui Maori Trust Board 1991:4). In this way, the tribe has redefined its future development in terms of what is relevant for its own people, based on tribal histories, tribal experiences and tribal philosophies.

Weaving through these tribal concepts, particularly for the Tainui tribe, has been its association as kaitiaki (guardians) of the Kingitanga. As a result, the link between the tribe and the Kingitanga is seen as fundamental to the identity of the tribe, which shapes and influences how the tribe seeks and strives for tino rangatiratanga, and which is reflected in a saying from Potatau Te Wherowhero, the first Maori King:

Kotahi te kohao o te ngira e kuhuna ai te miro ma, te miro pango, te miro whero.

There is only one eye to the needle through which the white, black and red threads must pass (Turongo House 2000:42).

Chapter One introduced the historical position of Tainui who, being the guardians of the Kingitanga, were subjected to being branded rebels and had their lands confiscated for European settlement. The devastation was immense, effectively making Tainui landless, and thus homeless. However, the Kingitanga philosophy called for unity between tribes, as a resistance mechanism against the powerful forces of the colonial armies; and it called for unity amongst the tribes to resist in the continued subordination and marginalisation of Maori through the selling of Maori land to Pakeha. The resistance of the Kingitanga can be viewed as a philosophical victory, because the people maintained their cultural identity and integrity and resisted against the might of the colonial armies. Since that time, successive Maori kings have sought restitution, and despite being landless and homeless, maintained their strength as a tribal people, clinging to their cultural identity and integrity, as espoused by their tribal leaders. It was from this grounding, initiated by the establishment of the Kingitanga in 1858 that tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination, emerged.

From this a picture of resistance by a particular group of Maori to western domination is formed. This resistance has been characterised by the long search for restitution, which has shaped and guided tribal philosophies and approaches for more than 100 years. As a result, tribal elders reflect this philosophy in their approach to life, and in the advice they give to younger tribal members like myself. Tribal meetings are conducted under the auspices of the Kingitanga and tribal organisations, like the Tainui Maori Trust Board, seek to incorporate these philosophies as emancipatory mechanisms for tribal development, and for tino rangatiratanga. If one looks at the words of Potatau, together with the experiences of the Waikato tribe, through the establishment of the Kingitanga and subsequent land confiscations, one could say that this is an example of liberatory practice and transformation. The words of Potatau Te Wherowhero and his son, the second

Maori King, Tawhiao, have sustained Kingitanga supporters and tribal members through oppression and then, symbolically with the signing of the Raupatu settlement in 1995 (which acknowledged the subordination of the tribe through processes of annihilation, suppression and exclusion from their own lands), through liberation. I draw on another saying to highlight my point:

Maku ano e hanga i toku nei whare. Ko nga pou o roto he mahoe, he patate. Ko te tahuu he hinau.

I will build again my own house. The supporting posts shall be of mahoe and patate. The ridgepole of the procreative hinau (Tainui Maori Trust Board 1997).

Tawhiao, the second Maori King, talked about the confiscation of Waikato lands, and the retreat into Maniapoto territory. Not deterred by their poverty, Tawhiao talks of rebuilding, using lesser-known trees as sustenance and for support. In a modern context, I have heard this saying used in an educational setting to infer that the rebuilding was to be in the minds of tribal members, who would access education as a means of liberation and transformation. I suggest that in this context, research theories can be constructed through tribal experiences (historical and contemporary). In particular, the tribe has reconstructed the words of Potatau and Tawhiao as indicators from which tino rangatiratanga can be defined and achieved.

What this tribal experience has highlighted is the need for tribal knowledge and constructs to be legitimated, not only in relation to the battle for power with dominant constructs, but also in relation to the battle for power with what other Maori researchers believe is kaupapa Maori. The tribe's experience of being subordinated and alienated by the dominant power, and its subsequent resistance to this subordination has resulted in the creation and development of tribal theories based on notions of liberation and, through the process of education, transformation. I argue that from this context, the tribe has rewritten what kaupapa Maori means, reclaiming its tribal knowledge and redefining this knowledge to ensure that researchers working within this tribal context are aware of the expectations of the tribe as it seeks tino rangatiratanga and of researchers'

responsibility, through the work they do, of helping the tribe to achieve tino rangatiratanga. In this sense, then, kaupapa Maori becomes a derivative of tribal knowledge, which in this setting, is defined by the tribe's commitment to the Kingitanga.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the methodological and theoretical frameworks on which the study is based. I have suggested that quantitative and qualitative research methods are primarily patriarchal constructions of dominant prescriptions as to what counts as a research process. In order to move beyond these limitations, the need to develop counter-strategies/hegemonies has been identified by L. Smith (1999), while Peters & Lankshear (1996) identify the use of counter-narratives as a way of resisting against dominant constructions. The use of these methods enables the voices of the indigenous 'other' to be heard in contexts determined by them. In this way, I was able to examine the notion of re/representing the research, in particular, the location of power in research, and the struggles indigenous and minority researchers face in acknowledging and managing power in their relationships with their research communities.

The chapter then examined the role of the insider researcher. I described my position as an insider researcher within the context of this study, highlighted some of the problems associated with such a position and how I have addressed these problems throughout the course of the study.

The selection and use of semi-structured interviews was described in the chapter in order to locate the graduates in powerful positions within the research context. This deliberate positioning ensured that the graduates' voices could be heard. The use of interviews also identified the concept of whakawhanaungatanga, in terms of establishing rapport with the graduates interviewed. This concept was also in keeping with the interconnectedness theme of the research process and served to

highlight further the responsibility of the researcher, and the relationship of the researcher to the research project and research community.

The chapter also examined the positioning of the study within the kaupapa Maori paradigm, and specifically examined the relationship between kaupapa Maori and tribal research. From this examination, the notion of power and how it relates not only to the researcher/researched position, but also how it relates to knowledge and constructs of knowledge was discussed. The chapter then examined the development of an alternative paradigm - a tribal position or construct – based on notions of tino rangatiratanga or self-determination. Drawing from notions of education for freedom, education as liberatory and transformative practice, and based on reclaiming traditional knowledge as a way of seeking liberation and transformation, the theoretical framework was reconstructed from a tribal position, guided, defined and developed by tribal histories, knowledge and philosophies.

From this examination, the theoretical base for the thesis has been set. Located from a tribal position, of which kaupapa Maori becomes a connected derivative, the thesis is able to analyse the extent to which the two institutions examined reflect tribal and Maori aspirations for success in higher education. The following chapters describe the two institutions, outlining their attempts to cater for the needs of Maori participating in university education. The examination of the graduates in Chapter Six, and subsequent analysis in Chapter Seven, will determine the extent to which kaupapa Maori and tribal constructs of success, through resistance, transformation and liberation, have been formulated and proved, or whether the process of assimilation has permeated through the graduates' perceptions and approaches to university education.