QUALITATIVE STUDIES IN EDUCATION, 1998, VOL. 11, NO. 2, 199–219

Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: a Maori approach to creating knowledge[1]

RUSSELL BISHOP
School of Education, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

This analysis is undertaken by a researcher who is a member of an indigenous minority, the Maori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This paper examines, by reference to a recent meta-study of five research projects conducted within Maori contexts, an indigenous initiative in research within Aotearoa/New Zealand, an initiative that is termed Kaupapa (agenda/philosophy) Maori research. This agenda for research is concerned with how research practice might realize Maori desires for self-determination, while addressing contemporary research issues of authority and legitimacy. This paper suggests that it is the cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices of Maori people that implement and organize the research process and that position researchers in such a way as to operationalize self-determination (agentic positioning and behavior) for research participants. The cultural context positions the participants by constructing the story lines and with them the cultural metaphors and images, as well as the "thinking as usual," the talk/language through which research participants are constituted and researcher/researched relationships are organized. Kaupapa Maori research, thus, rejects outside control over what constitutes the text's call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Maori position promotes, then, what Lincoln and Denzin (1994) term an epistemological version of validity. Such an approach to validity locates the power within Maori cultural practices where what is acceptable and what is not acceptable research, text, and/or processes is determined and defined by the research community itself.

Introduction

> It is difficult to change one's concept of the self from the pervasive alienated mode of consciousness, involving as it does a self that needs to establish clear boundaries both of the self and other, to a more participatory mode that requires one to release such need. (Heshusius, in press)

Maori people are concerned that educational researchers have been slow to acknowledge the importance of culture and cultural differences as key components in successful research practice and understandings. As a result, key research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization, and accountability continue to be addressed in terms of researchers' own cultural agendas, concerns, and interests. This paper seeks to identify how such domination can be addressed by both Maori and non-Maori educational researchers by their conscious participation within the cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices of the research participants.

This analysis is based on a recent study conducted by the author (Bishop, 1995, 1996). The study was a collaborative meta-study of five projects that addressed Maori agendas in research in order to ascertain in what ways the researchers were addressing Maori people's concerns about research and what the researchers' experiences of

0951–8398/98 $12·00 © 1998 Taylor & Francis Ltd

these projects meant to them. These experiences of the various researchers and their understandings of their experiences were investigated by co-constructing collaborative research stories. The objective was to engage in a process of critical reflection and build a discourse based on the formal and informal meetings that were part of each of the projects in order to connect epistemological questions to indigenous ways of knowing by way of descriptions of actual research projects.

Maori people's concerns about research

Despite the guarantees of the Treaty of Waitangi[2] the colonization of Aotearoa/New Zealand and the subsequent neocolonial dominance of majority interests in social and educational research has continued. The result has been the development of a tradition of research into Maori people's lives that addresses concerns and interests of the researcher's (who are predominantly non-Maori) own making, defined and accountable in terms of the researcher's own cultural world-view.

Researchers in Aotearoa/New Zealand have developed a tradition[3] of research that has perpetuated colonial values, thereby undervaluing and belittling Maori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonizers and adherents of neo-colonial paradigms. There has developed a social pathology research approach in Aotearoa/New Zealand that has implied, in all phases of the research process, the "inability" of Maori culture to cope with human problems and proposed that Maori culture was and is inferior to that of the colonizers in human terms. Such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes and the legitimization of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.

Further, traditional research has misrepresented Maori understandings and ways of knowing by simplifying, conglomerating, and commodifying Maori knowledge for "consumption" by the colonizers. These processes have consequently misrepresented Maori experiences, thereby denying Maori authenticity and voice. Such research has displaced Maori lived experiences and the meanings that these experiences have with the "authoritative" voice of the methodological "expert," appropriating Maori lived experience in terms defined and determined by the "expert." Moreover, many misconstrued Maori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Maori and non-Maori alike, and traditional social and educational research has contributed to this situation.

As a result, Maori people are deeply concerned about who researchers are answerable to. Who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, construction, and distribution of newly defined knowledge? An analysis would identify this, just as it would identify that the control of legitimization and representation is maintained within the domain of the colonial and neo-colonial paradigms. Such an analysis would also show that locales of accountability are situated within Western cultural frameworks, thus precluding Maori cultural forms and processes of accountability.

Traditional research epistemologies have developed methods of initiating research and accessing research participants that are located within the cultural preferences and practices of the Western world as opposed to the cultural preferences and practices of Maori people themselves. For example, the preoccupation with neutrality, objectivity, and distance by educational researchers has emphasized these concepts as criteria for authority, representation, and accountability and, thus, has distanced Maori people

from participation in the construction, validation, and legitimization of knowledge. As a result, Maori people are increasingly becoming concerned about who will directly gain from the research. Traditionally research has established an approach where the research has served to advance the interests, concerns, and methods of the researcher and to locate the benefits of the research at least in part with the researcher, other benefits being of lesser concern.

Kaupapa Maori Research

Out of this discontent with traditional research and its disruption of Maori life, an indigenous approach to research has emerged in New Zealand. This approach, termed Kaupapa (agenda/philosophy) Maori research, is challenging the dominance of the Pakeha world-view in research. Kaupapa Maori research emerged from within the wider ethnic revitalization movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid Maori urbanization of the post-Second World War period. This revitalization movement blossomed in the 1970s and 1980s with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Maori communities. More recently, in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, this consciousness has featured the revitalization of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and a resistance to the hegemony[4] of the dominant discourse.[5]

There are a number of significant dimensions to Kaupapa Maori research that set it apart from traditional research. One main focus of a Kaupapa Maori approach to research is the operationalization of self-determination (tino Rangatiratanga) by Maori people (Bishop, 1991b; G. Smith, 1990; L. Smith, 1991). Such an approach challenges the locus of power and control over the research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization, and accountability as outlined above, with the latter being located in another cultural frame of reference/world-view. Kaupapa Maori is, therefore, challenging the dominance of traditional, individualistic research which primarily, at least in its present form, benefits the researchers and their agenda. In contrast, Kaupapa Maori research is collectivistic and is oriented toward benefiting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas, defining and acknowledging Maori aspirations for research, while developing and implementing Maori theoretical and methodological preferences and practices for research.

Kaupapa Maori is a discourse that has emerged and is legitimized from within the Maori Community. Maori educationalist, Graham Smith (1992b) describes Kaupapa Maori as "the philosophy and practice of being and acting Maori" (p. 1). It assumes the taken-for-granted social, political, historical, intellectual, and cultural legitimacy of Maori people, in that it is an orientation in which "Maori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right" (p. 13). Further, Kaupapa Maori presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within our society. These include rejection of hegemonic belittling, "Maori can't cope" stances, together with a commitment to the power of conscientization and politicization through struggle for wider community and social freedoms (Smith, 1992a).

A Kaupapa Maori position is predicated on the understanding that Maori means of accessing, defining, and protecting knowledge existed before European arrival in New Zealand. Such Maori cultural processes were protected by the Treaty of Waitangi, subsequently marginalized, but are today legitimized within Maori cultural discourse. As with other Kaupapa Maori initiatives in education, health, and welfare, Kaupapa

Maori research practice is as Maori educationist, Kathie Irwin (1992b), explains, epistemologically based within Maori cultural specificities, preferences, and practices. In Olssen's (1993) terms, Maori initiatives are "epistemologically productive where ... in constructing a vision of the world and positioning people in relation to its classifications, it takes its shape from its interrelations with an infinitely proliferating series of other elements within a particular social field" (p. 4).

This paper, then, seeks to identify how issues of self-determination and legitimization of research texts are addressed in practices within an indigenous Kaupapa Maori approach and how such considerations may impact on the Western-trained and -positioned researcher. One fundamental understanding to a Kaupapa Maori approach to research is that it is the discursive practice that is Kaupapa Maori that positions researchers in such a way as to operationalize self-determination (agentic positioning and behavior) for research participants. This is because the cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices of Maori people implement and organize the research process. Further, the associated research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization, and accountability are addressed and understood in practice by practitioners of Kaupapa Maori research within the cultural context of the research participants.

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

Addressing issues of self-determination

Western approaches to operationalizing agentic positioning and behavior in others are, according to Noddings (1986) and Davies (1990), best addressed by those who position themselves within empowering relationships. Authors such as Oakley (1981), Tripp (1983), Burgess (1984), Lather (1986, 1991), Patton (1990), Delamont (1992), Reinharz (1992), and Eisner (1991) suggest that an "empowering" relationship could be attained by developing what could be termed an "enhanced research relationship," where there occurs a long-term development of mutual purpose and intent between the researcher and the researched. In order to facilitate this development of mutuality, there is also the recognition of the need for personal investment in the form of self-disclosure and openness on the part of the researcher.

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

Traditional conceptualizations of knowing do not adequately explain this understanding. Elbow (1986, in Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) identifies a different form of reciprocity, one he terms "connected knowing" where the "knower is attached to the

known'' (p. 4). In other words, where there is common understanding and a common basis for such an understanding, where the concerns, interests, and agendas of the researcher become the concerns, interests, and agendas of the researched and vice versa. Hogan (cited in Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) refers to this as a ''feeling of connectedness'' (p. 4). Heshusius (1994) transforms this notion by suggesting the need to move from an alienated mode of consciousness which sees the knower as separate from the known to a participatory mode of consciousness. Such a mode of consciousness addresses a fundamental reordering of our understanding of the relationship ''between self and other (and therefore of reality), and indeed between self and the world, in a manner where such a reordering not only includes connectedness but necessitates letting go of the focus on self'' (p. 15).

Heshusius (1994) identifies this form of knowing as involving, that which Polyani calls ''tacit learning,'' which Harman calls ''compassionate consciousness,'' and which Berman calls ''somatic'' or ''bodily'' knowing (cited in Heshusius, 1994). Each of these authors is referring to an embodied way of being and of a knowing which is a nonaccountable, nondescribable way of knowing. Heshusius (1994) suggests that ''the act of coming to know is not a subjectivity that one can explicitly account for'' but rather it is of a ''direct participatory nature one cannot account for'' (p. 17). Also in Heshusius (in press) she suggests that :

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

Heshusius (1994) identifies the ground from which a participatory mode of knowing emerges as ''the recognition of the deeper kinship between ourselves and other'' (p. 17). This form of knowing speaks in a very real sense to Maori ways of knowing, for the Maori term for connectedness and engagement by kinship is *whanaungatanga*,. This concept is one of the most fundamental ideas within Maori culture, both as a value and as a social process.[6] Whanaungatanga consists literally of kin relationships between ourselves and others and is constituted in ways determined by the Maori cultural context.

Whakawhanaungatanga is the process of establishing family (*whanau*)[7] relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness, and, therefore, an unspoken but implicit commitment to other people. For example, a *mihimihi* (formal ritualized introduction) at a *hui* (Maori ceremonial gathering) involves stating your own *whakapapa* (genealogy) in order to establish relationships with the hosts/others/visitors. A mihimihi does not identify you in terms of your work, in terms of your academic rank or title, for example. Rather, a mihimihi is a statement of where you are from and of how you can be related to these other people and the land, in both the past and the present.

For Maori people, the process of whakawhanaungatanga identifies how our identity comes from our whakapapa and how our whakapapa and its associated *raranga korero* (stories) link us to all other living and inanimate creatures and to the very earth we inhabit. Our mountain, our river, our island are us. We are part of them and they are part of us. We know this in a bodily way, more than in a recitation of names. More than in the actual linking of names, we know it because we are blood and bodily related. We are of the same bones (*iwi*), of the same people (iwi). We are from the same pregnancies (*hapu*), and are of the same subtribe (hapu). We are of the same family (*whanau*), the

family into which we were born (whanau). We were nurtured by the same land (*whenua*), by the same placenta (whenua). In this way the language reminds us that we are part of each other.

So when we introduce ourselves as *whanaunga* (relatives), whether it be to engage in research or not, we are introducing part of one to another part of the same oneness. Knowing who we are is a somatic acknowledgment of our connectedness with and commitment to our surroundings, human and nonhuman. For example, from this positioning it would be very difficult to study Maori kinship in a ''nonsomatic'' distanced manner. To invoke ''distance'' in a Maori kinship research project would be to deny that it is a Maori kinship project. It would have different goals, not Maori goals.

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

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

The whanau is a location for communication, for sharing outcomes, and for constructing shared common understandings and meanings. Individuals have responsibilities to care for and to nurture other members of the group, while still adhering to the kaupapa of the group. The group will operate to avoid singling out particular individuals for comment and attention and to avoid embarrassing individuals who are not yet succeeding within the group. Group products and achievement frequently take the form of group performances, not individual performances.[8] The group will typically begin and end each session with prayer and will also typically share food together. The group will always make major decisions as a group and then refer those decisions to kaumatua (respected elders of either gender) for approval, and the group will seek to operate with the support and encouragement of kaumatua. This feature acknowledges the multigenerational compositioning of a whanau with associated hierarchically determined rights, responsibilities, and obligations.

What non-Maori people would refer to as management or control mechanisms are traditionally constituted in a whanau as *taonga tuku iho*, literally those treasures passed down to us from the ancestors, those customs that tell us how to behave. In this manner, the structure and function of a whanau describes and constitutes the relationship among research participants; (in traditional research terminology, between the researcher and the researched) within Kaupapa Maori research practice. Research, thus, cannot proceed unless whanau support is obtained, unless kaumatua provide guidance, and unless there is aroha (mutuality) between the participants, evidenced by an overriding feeling of tolerance, hospitality, and respect for others, their ideas, and their opinions. The research process is participatory as well as *participant-driven* in the sense that it is the concerns, interests, and preferences of the whanau that guide and drive the research

processes. The research itself is driven by the participants in terms of setting the research questions, the design of the work, the undertaking of the work that had to be done, the distribution of rewards, the access to research findings, accountability, and the control over the distribution of the knowledge.

What is crucial to an understanding of what it means to be a researcher is that it is through the development of a participatory mode of consciousness that a researcher becomes part of this process. He or she does not start from a position outside of the group and then choose to invest him/herself. The researcher cannot "position" him/herself or "empower" the other. Instead, through entering a participatory mode of consciousness the individual agent of the "I" of the researcher is released in order to enter a consciousness larger than the self.

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

This emphasis on positionings within a group constituted as a whanau also addresses concerns about accountability and control. In a Maori collective whanau, there are a variety of hierarchically determined positions, some of which are open to the researcher, some of which are not. The extent to which researchers can be positioned within a whanau of interest is therefore tied very closely to who they are, often more so than what they are. Therefore, positioning is not simply a matter of researchers' choice, because this would further researcher imposition. That is, the researchers are not free to assume any position that they think the whanau of interest needs in order for the whanau to function. The researchers' choice of positions is generated by the structure of the whanau and the customary ways of behaving constituted within the whanau.

The clear implication is that researchers are required to locate themselves within new "story-lines" that address the contradictory nature of the traditional researcher/researched relationship. The language used by researchers working in Kaupapa Maori contexts contains the key to the new story-lines; the metaphor and imagery are those located within the research participants' domains, and the researchers either are or need to move to become part of this domain. Researchers position themselves by the use of the contextually constituted metaphor within the domain where others can constitute themselves as agentic. Further, within this domain exist discursive practices which provide the researchers with positions that enable them to carry through their negotiated lines of action.

Through developing a research group by using Maori customary sociopolitical processes, the research participants become members of a research whanau of interest, which, as a metaphoric whanau, is a group constituted in terms understandable and

controllable by Maori cultural practices. These whanau of interest determine the research questions and the methods of research, and they use Maori cultural processes for addressing and acknowledging the construction and validation/legitimization of knowledge. Further, the whanau of interest develops a collaborative approach to processing and constructing meaning/theorizing about the information, again by culturally constituted means. It is also important to recognize that the whanau of interest are not isolated groups, but rather are constituted and conduct their endeavors in terms of the wider cultural aspirations, preferences, and practices of Maori cultural revitalization within which the projects are composed.

Whanau of interest are developed by a Maori social process, here termed the process of *spiral discourse*, a culturally constituted discursive practice which is found in many Maori cultural practices associated for example with *hui* (Maori formal meetings). A hui generally commences with a formal welcome (a *powhiri*), a welcome rich in cultural meaning, imagery, and practices which fulfill the enormously important task of recognizing the relative *tapu* (specialness; being with potentiality for power) and *mana* (power) of the two sides; the hosts and the visitors (Salmond, 1975; Shirres, 1982). Once the formal welcome is complete and once the participants have been ritually joined together by the process of the welcoming ceremony, hui participants move on to the discussion of the matter under consideration (the kaupapa of the hui). This usually takes place within the meeting house, a place designated for this very purpose, free of distractions and interruptions. This house is symbolically the embodiment of an ancestor, which further emphasizes the normality of a somatic approach to knowing in such a setting and within these processes.

The participants address the matters under consideration, under the guidance of respected and authoritative elders (kaumatua), whose primary function is to provide and monitor the correct spiritual and procedural framework within which the participants can discuss the issues before them. People get a chance to address the issue without fear of being interrupted. Generally the procedure is for people to speak one after another, in sequence of left to right. People get a chance to state and restate their meanings, to revisit their meanings, and to modify, delete, and adapt their meanings according to local customs (*tikanga*).

The discourse spirals, in that the flow of talk may seem circuitous, opinions may vary and waver, but the seeking of a collaboratively constructed story is central. The controls over proceedings are temporal and spiritual, as in all Maori cultural practices. The procedures are steeped in metaphoric meanings, richly abstract allusions being made constantly to cultural messages, stories, events of the past, and aspirations for the future. Such procedures are time proven and to the participants are highly effective in dealing with contemporary issues and concerns of all kinds.[9] The aim of a hui is to reach consensus, to arrive at a jointly constructed meaning. This takes time, days if need be, or sometimes a series of hui will be held in order that the elders monitoring proceedings can tell when a constructed "voice" has been arrived at.

Initiating research: rejecting empowerment

An illustration of how fundamental is the process of power-sharing to hui proceedings is seen in the case when the visitors make a contribution toward the cost of the meeting. This gift is termed a *koha*. In the past, this koha was often a gift of food to contribute to the running of the hui; nowadays it is usually money that is laid down on the ground, by the last speaker of the visitors' side, between the two groups of people who are coming

together at the welcoming ceremony. The koha remains an important ritualized part of a ceremony that generally proceeds without too much trouble. However, what must not be forgotten is that the reception of the koha is up to the hosts. The koha, as a gift or an offering of assistance towards the cost of running the hui, goes with the full mana of the group so offering. It is placed in such a position as to be able to be considered by the host. It is not often given into the hands of the hosts (except in some parts of the *Taranaki* region). Whatever the specific details of the protocol, the process of "laying down" is a very powerful recognition of the right of others to self-determination.

The koha generally precedes the final coming together of the two sides. The placing of the koha comes at a crucial stage in the ceremony, where the hosts can refuse to accept the mana of the visitors, where the hosts can display their ultimate control over events, where the hosts can choose whether they want to become one with the visitors (*manuhiri*) by the process of the *hongi* and *haruru* (pressing noses and shaking hands). Symbolically, with the koha, the hosts are taking on the kaupapa of the guests by accepting that which the manuhiri are bringing for debate and mediation. But overall it is important that the kaupapa the guests laid down at the hui is now the "property" of the whole whanau. It is now the task of the whole whanau to deliberate the issues and to own the problems, concerns, and ideas in a way that is real and meaningful, the way of *whakakotahitanga* (developing unity), where all will work for the betterment of the idea.

By invoking these processes in their metaphoric sense, Kaupapa Maori research is conducted within parameters and understandings of Maori people. Figuratively, laying down a koha as a means of initiating research, for example, or of offering solutions to a problem, challenges notions of empowerment, a major concern within contemporary Western-defined research. It challenges what constitutes "self" and "other" in Western thought. Rather than figuratively saying "I am giving you power," or "I intend to empower you," the laying down of a koha and stepping away for the others to consider your gift, which is your potential contribution as a researcher, means that your mana is intact, as is theirs. You as a researcher are indicating that you do not want anything from it. It is up to the others to exert agency, to decide if they wish to pick it up. Whatever they do, both sides have power throughout the process. Both sides have tapu that is being acknowledged.

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

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

metaphors of the relationship. What makes it Maori is that it is done using Maori metaphor within a Maori cultural context.

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

Further, differential power relations among participants, while construed and understood as collaborative by the researcher, may still enable researcher concerns and interests to dominate how understandings are constructed. This can happen even within relations constructed as reciprocal, if the research outcome remains one determined by the researcher as a data-gathering exercise. Where attempts at developing symmetrical dialogue move beyond efforts to gather "data" and move towards mutual, symmetrical, dialogic construction of meaning, within appropriate culturally constituted contexts, then the voice of the research participants is heard, and their agency is facilitated.

Such understandings seeks to address the self/other relationship by examining how researchers shift themselves from a "speaking for" position to a situation Michelle Fine (1994) describes as obtaining "when we construct texts collaboratively, self-consciously examining our relations with/for/despite those who have been contained as Others, we move against, we enable resistance to, Othering" (p. 74). Fine (1994) attempts to:

> ... unravel, critically, the blurred boundaries in our relation, and in our texts; to understand the political work of our narratives; to decipher how the traditions of social science serve to inscribe; and to imagine how our practice can be transformed to resist, self-consciously, acts of othering. (p. 57)

However, what is of crucial importance is that reciprocity in indigenous research is not just a political understanding, never an individual act, nor a matter of refining and/or challenging the paradigms within which researchers work. It is the very world-view within which the researcher becomes immersed that holds the key to knowing. For example, establishing relationships and developing research whanau by invoking the processes of whakawhanaungatanga establishes interconnectedness, commitment, and engagement, within culturally constituted research practices, by means of constitutive metaphor from within the discursive practice of Kaupapa Maori. It is the use of such metaphor that reorders the relationship of the researcher/researched from within, from one which focused on researcher as "self" and on the researched as "other" to one of a common consciousness of all research participants.

This re-ordering is not on terms or within understandings constructed by the researcher, however well intentioned contemporary impulses to "empower" the "other" might be. From an indigenous perspective such impulses are misguided and perpetuate neo-colonial sentiments. In other words, rather than researcher-determined criteria for participation as a research process, whakawhanaungatanga uses Maori cultural practices, such as those found in hui, to set the pattern for research. Whakawhanaungatanga as a research process uses methods and principles similar to those used to establish relationships among Maori people. These principles are invoked

to address the means of research initiation, to establish the research questions, to facilitate participation in the work of the project, to address issues of representation and accountability, and to legitimize the ownership of knowledge defined and created.

Addressing issues of legitimacy and authority

In the international literature, methodological approaches that address issues of self-determination for the research participants are described as participatory or collaborative by Reinharz (1992), interaction methodology by Kleiber and Light (in Reinharz, 1992), feminist interviewing in Oakley (1981) and polyphonic research by Bakhtin (as used in Haig-Brown, 1992, and as used by Te Hennepe, 1993). However, there are dangers in developing an understanding of indigenous approaches to research by comparing Kaupapa Maori research aspirations and practices with the international literature. These dangers arise because of the strong tendency among researchers toward constructing quasi-positivistic, "grand narratives" that address the need of the researcher to make sense of the research experience in reference to criteria outside of the experiences and context of the research participants.

> Banks (1988) is critical of grand theories because:
> ... researchers usually feel obligated to interpret their findings in ways that will support their theories. The theory must remain intact... [and] findings are described in ways that will fit the theory. This often results in description of events and institutions that are extreme, and that are characterised by an inattention to details that the grand theory does not explain and by explanations that are incomplete or misleading. (pp. 149–150)

In other words, a cycle is created where the idea determines the collection of data that in turn will promote and validate the original idea. It is ironic that this hegemony of ideas is one of the very problems that emancipatory research is determined to displace. An example may illustrate this.

Giroux (1984), Freire (1985), Giroux and McLaren (1986), and Anderson (1989) are among the "resistance theorists" who voice concern about the "revisionists" such as Bowles and Gintis (in Banks, 1988, p. 149) and cultural and social reproduction theorists such as Bourdieu (1977), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), and Bernstein (1977). Resistance theorists are critical of the denial of human agency and the over-burdensome reliance on structural limitations to change advocated by the social and cultural reproduction theorists. Giroux and McLaren (1986) and Giroux (1991) have proposed a new "critical pedagogy" based on the dialectical notion of resistance to persuasive hegemonies as a means of allowing for human agency.

However, from an indigenous and participatory perspective, this explanation can be seen as another "grand theory" in that while Lather (1991), drawing on Ellsworth's (1989) classroom experiences, critiques the impositional tendencies, Utopianism, and consequent diminished emancipatory value of Giroux's (1991) critical pedagogy, both Lather and Giroux subscribe to a methodology that is based on reducing explanations to fundamental principles bounded by the Western tradition. Their argument is framed in terms of binaries, that is, in terms of dialectical, linear progressions. However, within a Polynesian world-view, ideas are not related in oppositional pairs but sometimes in triplets (McCudden, 1990) or sometimes as interrelated matrices (Holmes, Bishop, & Glynn, 1993; Pere, 1982, 1988; Rangihau, 1975), whose interrelationships are examined.

It is important to note, though, that this is not an attempt to recreate the modernist mission, to construct a further grand narrative with which to understand all events, or to progressively incorporate all cultures in the world into one understanding, in this case a Polynesian one. It is also important not to ignore the impact of European colonialism by claiming that Maori culture has all the answers. Nor is this to say that all knowledge is completely relative. It is to suggest, as Heshusius (in press) does, that:

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

This emphasizes the importance of attempting to locate researchers who wish to research in Maori contexts within Maori cultural preferences and practices rather than within international approaches to research. Attempts to locate Kaupapa Maori research within the broad framework of international perspectives on participatory research, indeed even to search for a methodology of participation, may defeat the very purpose of Kaupapa Maori research, which is to reduce researcher imposition in order that research meets and works within and for the interests and concerns of the research participants within their own definitions of self-determination.

Ballard (1994), referring to Donmoyer's work, suggests that formulaic research procedures are rarely in fact used as "prescriptions for practice" because people use their own knowledge, experience, feelings and intuitions "when putting new ideas into practice or when working in new settings" (pp. 301–302). Further, personal knowledge and personal experience can be seen as crucial in the application of new knowledge and/or working in new settings. This means that the application of research findings is filtered through the prior knowledge, feelings, and intuitions we already have. Donmoyer (in Ballard, 1994) suggests that experience compounds, and this compounded knowledge/experience, when brought to a new task, provides for the occurrence of an even more complex process of understandings. Experience builds on and compounds experience, and, as Ballard suggests, this is why there is such value placed on "colleagues with experience" in the Pakeha world and on kaumatua (elders) in the Maori world.

The second, and related, but somewhat more complex danger of referring to an international methodology of participation is that there may be a tendency to construct a set of rules and procedures that lie outside of any one research project, and, in so doing, take control over what constitutes legitimacy and validity, that is, what authority is claimed for the text will be removed from the participants – thus, with such recipes comes the danger of outsiders controlling what constitutes reality for other people.

For example it is essential to challenge modernist discourses, with their concomitant concerns regarding validity, including strategies such as objectivity/subjectivity, replicability, and external measures for validity. These discourses are so pervasive that Maori researchers may automatically revert to using such means of establishing validity for their texts, but problematically so because these measures of validity are all positioned/defined within another world-view. For example, as bell hooks (1993) suggests, the Black Power movement in the United States in the 1960s was influenced by the modernist discourses on race, gender, and class that were current at the time. As a result of not addressing these discourses and the ways they affected the condition of Black people, issues such as patriarchy were left unaddressed within the Black Liberation

movement. bell hooks insists that unless Black people address these issues themselves, others will do so for them, and in ways determined by the concerns and interests of others, rather than those that "women of color" would prefer.[10]

In other words, research conducted within what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) term as positivist and post-positivist frames of reference perpetuates problems of outsiders determining what is valid for Maori. This occurs by the very process of employing non-Maori methodological frameworks and conventions for writing about such research processes and outcomes. For example, Lincoln and Denzin (1994) argue that terms such as "logical, construct, internal, ethnographic, and external validity, text-based data, triangulation, trustworthiness, credibility, grounding, naturalistic indicators, fit, coherence, comprehensiveness, plausibility, truth and relevance ... [are] all attempts to reauthorise a text's authority in the post-positivist moment" (p. 579).

These concepts, and the methodological frameworks within which they exist, represent attempts to contextualize the grounding of a text in the external, empirical world. "They represent efforts to develop a set of transcendent rules and procedures that lie outside any specific research project" (p. 579). These externalized rules are the criteria by which the validity of a text is then judged. The author of the text is thus able to present the text to the reader as valid, thus replacing the sense making, meaning construction, and voice of the researched person with that of the researcher by representing the text as an authoritative re-presentation of the experiences of others by using a system of researcher-determined and -dominated coding and analytical tools.

Kaupapa Maori rejects outside control over what constitutes the text's call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Maori position promotes what Lincoln & Denzin (1994) term an epistemological version of validity, one where the authority of the text is "established through recourse to a set of rules concerning knowledge, its production and representation" (p. 578). Such an approach to validity locates the power within Maori cultural practices where what is acceptable and what is not acceptable research, text, and/or processes is determined and defined by the research community itself in reference to the cultural context within which it operates.

Maori people have always had criteria for evaluating whether a process or a product is valid for them. *Taonga tuku iho* are literally the treasures from the ancestors. These treasures are the collected wisdom of ages, the means that have been established over a long period of time which guide and monitor our very lives today and in the future. Within these treasures are the messages of kawa,[11] those principles that, for example, guide the process of establishing relationships. Whakawhanaungatanga is not a haphazard process, decided on an ad hoc basis, but rather is based on time-honored and proven principles. How each of these principles is addressed in particular circumstances varies from tribe to tribe and hapu to hapu. Nevertheless, it is important that these principles are addressed.

For example, as described earlier, the meeting of two groups of people at a hui on a marae involves acknowledgment of the tapu of each individual and of each group, by means of addressing and acknowledging the sacredness, specialness, genealogy, and connectedness of the guests with the hosts. Much time will be spent to establish this linkage, a connectedness between the people involved. How this is actually done is the subject of local customs, which are the correct ways to address these principles of kawa. *Tikanga* (customs) are an ongoing fertile ground for debate, but all participants know that if the kawa is not observed, then the event is "invalid." It does not have authority.

Just as Maori practices are epistemologically validated within Maori cultural contexts, so are Kaupapa Maori research practices and texts. Research conducted

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

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

Attacks on legitimacy: neo-conservative, liberal, and radical/emancipatory

The Kaupapa Maori position regarding legitimization is based on the notion that the world constitutes multiple differences and that there are different cultural systems that legitimately make sense of and interact meaningfully with the world. Kaupapa Maori research, based in a different world-view from that of the dominant discourse, makes this political statement while also acknowledging the need to recognize and address the ongoing effects of racism and colonialism in the wider society.

Such a position is constantly under attack within Aotearoa/New Zealand from a wide front; from neo-conservative voices who deny Maori culture any legitimacy and liberal notions of integrating what is the best of both worlds in order to create a rosy future for all New Zealanders to radical/emancipatory voices who claim that they have the formula for emancipation of Maori as oppressed and marginalized people. These positions have in common the notion that "insiders" are incapable of an appropriate critical distance from which to understand their experiences, because they are incapable of sufficient "detachment" or that they do not understand the "reality" of their own lives.

The neo-conservatives desire to establish and maintain control of the criteria for evaluating Maori experience, hence we get a deluge of statistics telling us of the appalling socioeconomic condition of Maori people. The liberals, once dominant in education circles, capture Maori cultural elements, often out of context, and add these to the existing academic curriculum, such as they did with the Taha Maori programs in schools. The radical emancipationists argue that Maori cultural practices do not conform to their perspectives of how emancipatory projects should develop.

The neo-conservative attack on the validity of Maori culture and knowledge is

continually made by "New Right" advocates (for example, the Sexton report, 1991) in the process of promoting, in contrast with Maori cooperative collectivism, their own cultural view of the "primacy of the individual, the emphasis on meritocracy and the fundamental need for competition" (Smith, 1992b, p. 4). At the same time, "New Right" advocates maintain that their stance is nonideological, and is not based in terms of cultural, but rather "normal, modern" practices. That this stance is indeed ideological and hegemonic simply further denies the impact of the self of the knower on the larger life of the community and begs the question of who has the authority and legitimacy to engage in constructions of and definitions of what is "normal" and what is "reality."

However, in many ways the radical/emancipatory approach is perhaps the more insidious for it purports to side with Maori struggles, yet insists that Maori people are an "oppressed minority" who "suffer" from the malady of "false consciousness" where "people's self-understanding of what they are doing is illusory or deceptive" (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 96). Critical theorists Carr and Kemmis (1986) provide a striking example of this attack on the ability of a culture's participants to make sense of the world and on a culture's means of solving problems in ways legitimized within and understood by participants of that culture. Carr and Kemmis (1986) claim that the manner in which "others," that is those who are subjugated, understand their own actions and experiences often hides the true nature of their situation. Certain social mechanisms operate to create distorted views of the social reality, and it is only the emancipation theorists who actually understand what is happening to other people because they understand these hidden mechanisms. Carr and Kemmis (1986) explain that:

> ... clearly the ways in which people characterize their actions may be at variance with what they are really doing so that their understandings and explanations may be no more than rationalisations that obscure the true nature of their situation and mask reality in some important way ... certain social mechanisms operate to bind people to irrational and distorted ideas about their social reality. They [that is, theoretical accounts constructed by outsiders] may also try to reveal, at the social-structural level, the ideological character of group life by showing how social processes such as language and the processes of cultural production and reproduction shape our experiences of the social world in specific ways and for specific purposes.
>
> These kinds of explanations not only deny the validity of the individual's own explanation of what he [sic] is doing. They also offer alternative explanations which, were they made intelligible and acceptable to the individuals concerned would prevent them from acting in the ways that they do. (p. 96)

In other words, an emancipationist stance provides answers for problems faced by the "oppressed" people. If only the oppressed could know what the detached, distanced emancipationist knows, the lives of the oppressed would be improved. However, such explanations arise outside of the people's own understandings and deny the validity of these understandings in terms dictated by the researcher, in an attempt to emancipate the subjugated. But, far from "suffering from false consciousness," colonialists' attempts to remove from Maori the opportunity to engage in Maori sense-making processes in education (Bishop, 1991a; Simon, 1990; G. Smith, 1990; Walker, 1990), justice (Jackson, 1989), health (Durie, 1994; Rolleston, 1989), welfare (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988), and research (Bishop, 1994; L. Smith, 1991) have been constantly and successfully resisted.

However, a further development in the pursuit of emancipation has been the promotion of empowerment of the oppressed, of the "subjugated voices." One operational approach focuses on the distance between researcher and researched as a measure of empowerment. The operational question for Troyna (personal communication, 1992), for example, becomes that of finding ways to reduce the power and control differentials between researcher and researched. However, within this debate, Acker, Barry, and Esseveld (1991) claim that this is impossible. Stacey (1991) also warns that it is not just a matter of choosing correct or preferred methods, for example ethnography; indeed, Stacey further suggests that, on reflection, she has realized that the "greater the intimacy, the greater the apparent mutuality of the researcher/researched relationship, the greater is the danger" (p. 114).

An indigenous Kaupapa Maori stance suggests, as do Connelly and Clandinin (1990) and Heshusius (1994), that "distance," "detachment," and "separation" do not characterize these research relationships in any way. Rather, Kaupapa Maori research experiences insist that the focus on "self" is blurred and that the focus turns to what Heshusius describes as a situation where "reality is no longer understood as truth to be interpreted but as mutually evolving" (p. 18). In an operational sense, and crucial to researcher positionings, is the setting aside of epistemological and methodological concerns that researchers spend so much time on. Instead, it is suggested that researchers address the concerns and issues of the participants in ways that are understandable and able to be controlled by the research participants and in ways such that these concerns and issues also are, or become, those of the researchers.

Such practices stand in contrast with those of researchers who escape into the rhetoric of empowerment, of managing subjectivity or objectivism. Such positionings ignore the need to attain an awareness of connectedness. They persist in addressing detachment and distance (objective, subjective, or critical) and remain concerned to address "meaningful" epistemological and methodological questions of their own choosing, rather than those questions that Heshusius (1994) suggests would address moral issues, such as "what kind of society do we have or are we constructing?" (p. 20) or questioning who will benefit from the research project.

Objectivity, "that pathology of cognition that entails silence about the speaker, about [their] interests and [their] desires, and how these are socially situated and structurally maintained" (Gouldner cited in Tripp, 1983, p. 32) is a denial of identity. Just as identity to Maori people is tied up with being part of a whanau, a hapu, an iwi, in the research relationship, membership in a metaphoric whanau of interest also provides its members with identity and hence the ability to participate. For Maori researchers to stand aside from involvement in such sociopolitical organization is to stand aside from one's identity. This would signal the ultimate victory of colonization. For non-Maori researchers, denial of membership of the research whanau of interest is, similarly, to deny them a means of identification and hence full participation within the projects. Further, for non-Maori researchers to stand aside from participation in these terms is to promote colonization. Shifting one's position within the Western-dominated research domain need not address questions of interest to Maori people, because paradigm shifting is really a concern from another world-view. Non-Maori researchers need to seek inclusion on Maori terms, in terms of kin/metaphoric kin relationships and obligations, that is, within Maori constituted practices and understandings in order to establish their identity within research projects.

However, this does not mean that, instead, researchers need to try to control their subjectivities. Heshusius (1994) suggests that managing subjectivity is just as prob-

lematic for qualitative researchers as managing objectivity is for the positivists. The problem is epistemic in that the development of objectivity, through borrowing methodology from the natural sciences, introduced the concept of distance into the research relationship. Heshusius argues that the displacement of "objective positivism" by qualitative concerns about managing and controlling subjectivities perpetuates the fundamental notion that knowing is possible through constructing and regulating distance, a belief that presumes that the knower is separable from the known. Heshusius suggests that the preoccupation with "managing subjectivity" is a "subtle form of empiricist thought" (p. 16) in that it assumes that if one can know subjectivity then one can control it. Intellectualizing "the other's impact on self" perpetuates the notion of distance, validates the notion of "false consciousness" in others, and reduces the self–other relationship to one that is mechanistic and methodological.

Preoccupations with managing and controlling one's subjectivities also stand in contrast with Berman's (cited in Heshusius, 1994) historical analysis which suggests that "before the scientific revolution (and presumably the enlightenment) the act of knowing had always been understood as a form of participation and enchantment." Berman's states that "for most of human history, man [sic] saw himself as an integral part of it" (p. 16). The very act of participation was knowing. Participation was direct, somatic (bodily), psychic, spiritual, and emotional involvement. "The belief that one can actually distance oneself, and then regulate that distance in order to come to know ... has ... left us alienated from each other, from nature and from ourselves" (Heshusius, 1994, p. 16).

The process of colonization further developed this alienated and alienating mode of consciousness and, thus, has tried to take away a fundamental principle of life from Maori people – that we do not objectify nature, nor do we subjectify nature. For as we learn our whakapapa, we learn of our total integration, connectedness, and commitment to the world and the need to let go of the focus on self. We know that there is a way of knowing that is different from that which was taught to those colonized into the Western way of thought. We know about a way that is born of time, connectedness, kinship, commitment, and participation.

Appendix: Glossary of Maori terms

aroha: love in its broadest sense; mutuality
hapu: subtribe, usually linked to a common ancestor; pregnant
haruru: greeting others by shaking hands and performing a hongi
hongi: greeting another person by pressing noses together, to share the breath of life
hui: ceremonial, ritualized meeting
iwi: tribe; bones
kaumatua: respected elder
kaupapa: agenda/philosophy
kawa: protocol
koha: gift
mana: power
manaaki: hospitality, caring
manuhiri: guest(s)
Maori: indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand
marae: ceremonial meeting place

mihimihi: ritualized self-introduction
raranga korero/: those stories that explain the people and events of a whakapapa
tangata whenua: indigenous people
taonga tuku iho: treasures passed down to the present generation from the ancestors
taonga: treasures, including physical, social, cultural and intellectual
tapu: sacred, to be treated with respect, a restriction, being with potentiality for power, integrity
te reo: Maori language
tiaki: to look after
tikanga: customs, values, beliefs, and attitudes
tino Rangatiratanga: self-determination
whakakotahitanga: developing unity
whakawhanaungatanga: establishing relationships
whanaungatanga: kin relationships
whanaunga: relatives
whanau: extended family; to be born
whakapapa: genealogy

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Professor Lous Heshusius for her careful consideration of a draft of this paper.

Notes

1. This paper is a revision of a Keynote Address given at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education conference, Massey University, Palmerston North, December, 1995.
2. Two peoples created this nation when in 1840 lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the chiefs of New Zealand signed the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of the British Crown and the Maori descendants of New Zealand. The Treaty is seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision-making processes of this country and for Maori determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand (Walker, 1990). The history of Maori and Pakeha relations since the signing of the Treaty has not been one of partnership, of two peoples developing a nation, but one of domination by Pakeha and marginalization of the Maori people (Bishop, 1991b; Simon, 1990; Walker, 1990). This has created the myth of our being "one people" with equal opportunities (Hohepa, 1975; Simon, 1990; Walker, 1990). Results of this domination are evident today in the lack of equitable participation by Maori in all positive and beneficial aspects of life in New Zealand and by their over-representation in the negative aspects (Pomare, 1988; Simon, 1990). In education for example, the central government's sequential policies of Assimilation, Integration, and Multiculturalism (Irwin, 1989; Jones et al., 1990) and Taha Maori (Holmes, Bishop, & Glynn, 1993; G. Smith, 1990), while concerned for the welfare of Maori people, effectively stress the need for Maori people to subjugate their destiny to the needs of the nation-state, whose goals are determined by the Pakeha majority.
3. Traditional is used here to denote that "tradition" of research that has grown in New Zealand as a result of the dominance of the Western world-view in research institutions. However, Maori means of accessing, defining, and protecting knowledge existed before European arrival. Such Maori cultural processes were protected by the Treaty of Waitangi, subsequently marginalized, but are today legitimized within Maori cultural discursive practice.
4. The concept of hegemony is used here in the sense defined by Foucault (in Smart, 1986), who suggests that hegemony is an insidious process which is gained most effectively through "practices, techniques, and methods which infiltrate minds and bodies, cultural practices which cultivate behaviors and beliefs, tastes, desires and needs as seemingly naturally occurring qualities and properties embodied in the psychic and physical reality of the human subject" (p. 159).
5. Irwin (1992b) argues that prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the colonization of New Zealand there existed a "complex, vibrant Maori education system" which had "Maori development [as] its vision, its educational processes and its measurable outcomes" (p. 9). Protection of this education system was guaranteed under Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi, just as Article Three guaranteed Maori people, as

citizens of New Zealand, the right to equitable educational outcomes. Yet this promise had been negated by subsequent practice. The outcome is the present educational crisis (Davies & Nicholl, 1993; Jones et al., 1990). The post-Treaty education system which developed in New Zealand, the mission schools (Bishop, 1991a), the Native schools (Simon 1990), and the present mainstream schools (Irwin, 1992b) have been unable to "successfully validate matauranga Maori, leaving it marginalised and in a precarious state" (Irwin, 1992b, p. 10). Further, while mainstream schooling does not serve Maori people well (Davies & Nicholl, 1993), the Maori schooling initiatives of Te Kohanga reo (Maori medium pre-schools), Kura Kaupapa Maori (Maori medium primary schools), Whare Kura (Maori medium secondary schools), and Whare Waananga (Maori tertiary institutions) "which have developed from within Maori communities to intervene in Maori language, cultural, educational, social and economic crises ... are successful in the eyes of the Maori people" (Smith, 1992b, p. 1; emphasis added).

6. It is important to emphasize at this point that the use of Maori cultural practices (literally and/or metaphorically) in research might lead those not familiar with New Zealand to question how relevant such an analysis is to the lived realities of Maori people today. As Maori people today are a fourth world nation or nations, that is, within a larger entity, it is more a matter of degree as to who participates and when they participate. So rather than being able to quantify which portion of the Maori population still acts in this way, it is perhaps more realistic to say that most do at some time. For some, it might be only at funerals or weddings; others, of course, (albeit a small proportion) live this way all the time, but increasingly more and more Maori people are participating in (for example) educational initiatives, and these are all run in a Maori manner. So most people do sometimes, some all the time, others not so often. What is perhaps more critical is that most Maori people are able to understand the processes and are able to participate. Much is said of the impact of urbanization on Maori people and the removal of young people from their tribal roots and the consequent decline in language abilities and cultural understandings. However, it is a measure of the strength of the whanau (the extended family) and the strength of genealogical linkages that when Maori people gather, the hui (formal meetings) process is usually the one that is used, almost as a "default setting," despite more than a century of colonization. Indeed, it is a measure of the strength of these cultural practices and principles that they have survived the onslaught of the last 150 years. It is to these underlying strengths that I turn also as inspiration for developing an approach to Maori research. So my argument is not an attempt to identify "past practices" but rather present Maori cultural practices that are guided by the messages from the past. Maori, along with many other indigenous people, are guided by the principles of guidance from the ancestors. It is not a matter of studying how people did it in the past but more an ongoing dynamic interactive relationship between those of us alive today as the embodiment of all those who have gone before. It seems to me that, in practice, Maori cultural practices are alive and well and that, when used either literally or metaphorically, they enable Maori people to understand and control what is happening.

7. Whanau is a primary concept (a cultural preference) that underlies narratives of Kaupapa Maori research practice. This concept contains both values (cultural aspirations) and social processes (cultural practices). The root word of whanau literally means family in its broad "extended" sense. However, the word "whanau" is increasingly being used in a metaphoric sense (Metge, 1990). This generic concept of whanau subsumes other related concepts: whanaunga (relatives), whanaungatanga (relationships), whakawhanaungatanga (the process of establishing relationships), and whakapapa (literally, the means of establishing relationships). (The prefix "whaka" means "to make;" the suffix "tanga" has a naming function).

8. This poses major challenges for assessment in education settings.

9. Eminent Maori scholar, Rose Pere (1991) describes the key qualities of a hui as "respect, consideration, patience, and cooperation. People need to feel that they have the right and the time to express their point of view. You may not always agree with the speakers, but it is considered bad form to interrupt their flow of speech while they are standing on their feet; one has to wait to make a comment. People may be as frank as they like about others at the hui, but usually state their case in such a way that the person being criticized can stand up with some dignity in his/her right of reply. Once everything has been fully discussed and the members come to some form of consensus, the hui concludes with a prayer and the partaking of food" (p. 44).

10. Donna Awatere (1981) and Kathie Irwin (1992a) are two Maori feminist scholars who have taken up this challenge in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in a way that has clearly delineated their stance as different from white feminisms. In operationalizing Maori feminisms they have critiqued modernist issues from a Maori world-view in Maori ways. Awatere critiqued white modernist feminisms for hegemonically voicing Maori feminist concerns as identical to their own. Kathie Irwin's critique addressed the question that is vexatious to non-Maori modernist feminisms of "why don't women speak on a marae?". She responded with other questions such as "What do you mean by speaking?," "Is a karanga not speaking?," and "Who is defining what speaking is?". She asserts that rather than taking an essentialist position, the validity of a text written about Maori women "speaking" on a marae is understandable only in terms of the rules established within Maori cultural practices associated with marae protocols. In this she is not only addressing a Maori issue but is also addressing modernist feminists in poststructural terms of epistemological validity.

11. People often use the term kawa to refer to marae protocols. For example, at the time of whaikorero (ritualized speech making), some tribes conduct this part of the powhiri by a tikanga known as paeke, where all the male speakers of the hosts' side will speak at one time, then turn the marae over to the visitors' speaker who then follows. Other tribes prefer to follow a tikanga termed utuutu, where hosts and visitors alternate. Some tribes welcome visitors into their meeting house following a hongi; others keep the hongi until the end

of the welcoming time. It is clear that these various tikanga are practices that are correct in certain tribal or hapu contexts, but underneath is the practice of the kawa being handed down from those who have gone before about the need to recognize the tapu of people, their mana, their wairua, and the mauri of the place and events. See Salmond, Hui: A Study of Maori Ceremonial Greetings (1975) for a detailed ethnographic study.

References

Acker, F., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1991). Objectivity and truth problems in doing feminist research. In M. Fonow & J. Cook, (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research.* (pp. 133–154). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status, and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, *59* (3), 249–271.

Awatere, D. (1981). *Maori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet.

Ballard, K. (Ed.). (1994). *Disability, family, whanau and society*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Banks, J. (1988). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bernstein, B. (1977). *Class, codes and control: Towards a theory of educational transmission.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bishop, R. (1991a). *He whakawhanaungatanga tikanga rua: Establishing links: A bicultural experience.* Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Education, University of Otago.

Bishop, R. (1991b December). *Te ropu rangahau tikanga rua: The need for emancipatory research under the control of the Maori people for the betterment of Maori people.* Paper presented to the 13th New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Knox College, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *29* (1), 1–14.

Bishop, R. (1995). *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Education Department, University of Otago.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of theory and practice.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education: Society and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Burgess, R. G. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research.* New York: Falmer Press.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. London: Falmer Press.

Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2–14.

Davies, B. (1990). Agency as a form of discursive practice: A classroom observed. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 341–361.

Davies, L., & Nicholl, K. (1993). *Te maori i roto i nga mahi whakaakoranga: Maori in education.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Delamont, S. (1992). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives.* London: Falmer Press.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research.* London: Sage Publications.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Maori health development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59* (3), 297–324.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 70–82). London: Sage Publications.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation.* Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1984). Marxism and schooling: The limits of radical discourse. *Educational Theory*, *34* (2), 113–135.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Schooling for democracy: Critical pedagogy in the modern age*. London: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56* (3), 213–238.

Haig–Brown, C. (1992). Choosing border work. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 19* (1), 96–115.

Heshusius, L. (1994). Freeing ourselves from objectivity: Managing subjectivity or turning toward a participatory mode of consciousness? *Educational Researcher, 23* (3), 15–22.

Heshusius, L. (in press). Modes of consciousness and the self in learning disabilities research: Considering past and future. In D. K. Reid, W. P. Hresko, and H. L. Swanson (Eds.), *A cognitive approach to learning disabilities.* Houston, TX: Pro–Ed.

Hohepa, P. (1975). The one people myth. In M. King (Ed.), *Te Ao Hurihuri: The world moves on* (pp. 98–111). Auckland: Hicks Smiths.

Holmes, H., Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1993). *Tu mai kia tu ake: Impact of taha maori in otago and southland schools* (Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua Monograph No. 4). Dunedin, New Zealand: Department of Education, University of Otago.

hooks, b. (1993). Postmodern blackness. *Postmodern Culture, 1* (1) (Electronic media).

Irwin, K. (1989). Multicultural education: The New Zealand response, 1974––84. *New Zealand Educational Journal of Education, 24* (1), 3–18.

Irwin, K. (1992a). Towards theories of maori feminisms. In Du Plessis et al. (Eds.), *Feminist voices: women's studies texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Irwin, K. (1992b). *Maori research methods and processes: An exploration and discussion*. Paper presented to the joint New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Geelong, Australia.

Jackson, M. (1989). *Maori and the criminal justice system: He whaipaanga hou: a new perspective*. Wellington: Project Waitangi.

Jones, A., McCulloch, G., Marshall, J., Smith, G. H., & Tuhiwai–Smith, L. (1990). *Myths and realities: Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (3), 257–274.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. London: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (1994). The fifth moment. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 575–586). London: Sage.

McCudden, M. (1990). *Te Maroharoha*. Wellington: Special Education Service.

Metge, J. (1990). Te rito o te harakeke: Conceptions of the whanau. *Journal of the Polynesian Society, 99* (1), 55–91.

Ministerial Advisory Committee for the Department of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao–te–Ata–Tu: Daybreak. The report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee of a Maori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Wellington: Department of Social Welfare.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (4), 496–510.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research* (pp. 30–61). London: Routledge.

Olssen, M. (1993 April). *Habermas, post–modernism and the science question for education*. Paper presented to staff seminar, Department of Education, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury: Sage Publications.

Pere, R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the maori tradition*. Hamilton: Department of Sociology, University of Waikato.

Pere, R. (1988). Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *Women and girls in education* (pp. 6–19). Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Pere, R. (1991). *Te Wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Gisborne: Ao Ako.

Pomare, E. (1988). *Hauora: Maori standards of health*. Wellington, Department of Health.

Rangihau, J. (1975). Being Maori. In M. King (Ed.), Te ao hurihuri, the world moves on: Aspects of Maoritanga. Auckland: Hicks Smith.

Rolleston, S. (1989). *He kohikohinga: A maori health knowledge base*. Wellington: Department of Health.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salmond, A. (1975). *Hui: A study of Maori ceremonial greetings*. Auckland: Reed & Methuen.

Sexton, S. (1991). *New Zealand schools: An evaluation of recent reforms and future directions*. Wellington: New Zealand Business Roundtable.

Shirres, M. (1982). *Tapu. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 91* (1), 29–52.

Simon, J. A. (1990). *The role of schooling in Maori–Pakeha relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auckland University.

Smart, B. (1986). The politics of truth and the problems of hegemony. In D. C. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 157–173). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Smith, G. H. (1990). Taha maori: Pakeha capture. In J. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash (Eds.), *Political issues in New Zealand education* (pp. 183–197). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Smith, G. H. (1992a). *Research issues related to Maori education* (The Issue of Research and Maori Monograph No. 9). Department of Education, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Smith, G. H. (1992b November). *Tane–nui–a–rangi's legacy … propping up the sky: Kaupapa Maori as resistance and intervention*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australia Association for Research in Education joint conference, Deakin University, Australia.

Smith, L. T. (1991). Te rapuna i te ao marama: Maori perspectives on research in education. In J. R. Morss & T. J. Linzey (Eds.), *The politics of human learning: Human development and educational research* (pp. 46–55). Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Stacey, J. (1991). Can there be a feminist ethnography? In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 111–119). New York: Routledge.

Te Hennepe, S. (1993). Issues of respect: Reflections of first nation students' experiences in postsecondary anthropology classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 20* (2), 193–260.

Tripp, D. H. (1983). Co–authorship and negotiation: The interview as act of creation. *Interchange: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 14* (3), 32–45.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin.