

# Waikato Journal of Education

Te Hautaka Mātauranga o Waikato



School of Education  
Kura Toi Tangata

The  
University  
of Waikato  
*Te Whare Wānanga  
o Waikato*

Volume 5 : 1999

Special Section: Teacher Education

# WAIKATO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

TE HAUTAKA MĀTAURANGA O WAIKATO

VOLUME 5, 1999

<b>Vouchers and the Privatisation of New Zealand Education</b> LIZ ELEY AND JOHN CLARK	3
<b>Standards-based Assessment in English: Take 3</b> TERRY LOCKE	13
<b>Poem: Untitled</b> PIRKKO MARKULA	32
<b>Qualifications, Critiques, and Reforms: The Rhetoric Surrounding the New Zealand Qualifications Authority</b> IVAN HODGETTS AND DARRIN HODGETTS	33
<b>Poem: Boarder's Leave Ending</b> RACHEL WOOD	50
<b>The Maori Language Science Curriculum in Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Contribution to Sustainable Development</b> MILES BARKER	51
<hr/>	
<b>SPECIAL SECTION: TEACHER EDUCATION AND TEACHING: TRENDS AND POSSIBILITIES</b>	61
<b>Introduction</b> BARBARA HAROLD	61
<b>Reviews of Teacher Education in New Zealand 1950-1998: Continuity, Contexts and Change</b> NOELINE ALCORN	63
<b>Research Trends and Possibilities in Teacher Education</b> CLIVE MCGEE	77
<b>Teachers Talk Back: Educational Theory and Teacher Education</b> SUE MIDDLETON AND HELEN MAY	89
<b>Stories to Live by on the Professional Knowledge Landscape</b> D. JEAN CLANDININ	107
<b>Remapping the Practicum in Teacher Education</b> ROSIE LE CORNU (DOBBINS)	121

---

<b>The Effectiveness of a Māori-Focussed Teacher Education Programme</b> FRED KANA	133
<b>Poem: Day is Done</b> TERRY LOCKE	138
<b>Coping with the Dual Crises of Legitimation and Representation in Research</b> RICHARD PRINGLE	139
<b>Poem: Tracks</b> JIM DENISON	151
<b>Bright Future, Five Steps Ahead - Making Ideas Work for New Zealand: A Commentary</b> HOWARD LEE AND GREGORY LEE	153
<b>Ka Ora Kāinga Rua: Finding a Home in the Academy. A study into the Experiences of Four Maori Women in the Academy</b> LAURA HAWKSWORTH AND PARE KANA	165
<b>Neo-Liberalism and Constructions of Democracy: The Impact on Teachers' Work</b> NESTA DEVINE	171
<b>Producing an "Iwi-Meaningful" Doctoral Proposal: A Case Study</b> BELLA TE AKU GRAHAM	181
<b>"Coming to Know" in Teaching Physical Education: Moving Across Cultural Boundaries</b> GEORGE SALTER	189
<b>To the Fullest Extent of his Powers: C.E. Beeby's Life in Education</b> NOELINE ALCORN	199
<b>Poem: Junia</b> DEBORAH FRASER	208
<b>Poem: Tania</b> DEBORAH FRASER	209
<b>Poem: Otorohanga, 1966</b> DEBORAH FRASER	210
<b>Book Reviews</b>	211
<b>Poem: Let's Hear It</b> TERRY LOCKE	217

# PRODUCING AN "IWI-MEANINGFUL" DOCTORAL PROPOSAL: A CASE STUDY

**BELLA TE AKU GRAHAM**

*Ngāti Hako, Nga Uri o Tai  
Department of Education Studies  
University of Waikato*

**ABSTRACT** *In this paper I offer a description of my doctoral research which attempts to investigate how Kaupapa Māori Research theory works in a specific context, that is the formulation of doctoral research in conjunction with and at the behest of the iwi, in this case, Ngāti Hako of the Hauraki area. I describe the settings, challenges, assumptions, concerns and processes with regard to the provision of a study that seeks to advance iwi desires in a collaborative way while striving to protect iwi members, especially the kaumātua, from having to defend the research. I argue that by following a Kaupapa Māori collaborative approach with Ngāti Hako, this research project derives its importance from not only the perceived benefits for Ngāti Hako but, its service as a discussion tool for would-be researchers of, or should we say, for iwi.*

My doctoral study entitled *Ngāti Hako and the Waitangi Tribunal Production and Construction of Iwi Identity for the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal Forum* has developed over the last three years at the behest of and in conjunction with the Ngāti Hako iwi of which I am a member. In 1995, during my discussions with Ngāti Hako elders regarding the use of our tribal taonga held in museums<sup>1</sup>, I was asked to redirect my academic expertise towards an issue of overriding priority for the iwi. This was and still is the provision of material advancing Ngāti Hako positions under the Hauraki Treaty Claims to the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal. The elders' request supported by the iwi at a general forum in 1996 could not be denied, especially given my polemic arguments within academic circles for Ngāti Hako space to tell our own stories<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, I was recruited as a researcher by the iwi to be part of a team compiling Māori Land Court information regarding Ngāti Hako. This was undertaken as a research contract. In return, the iwi agreed to be participants in my academic research so long as it was about and benefited them. For the next three years, I used observations as a member of the research team for the iwi as part of my supervised research for my incomplete M.Phil entitled "Trafficking Authenticity", which began in 1993. During this time, iwi discussions provided a study focus based on prevailing questions and issues raised in hui. As a result, the M.Phil was deregistered in 1998 in order to refocus the topic to this doctoral study on Ngāti Hako and the Waitangi Tribunal.

The Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal began hearing the Hauraki Treaty Claims in October 1998. These Claims are made up of four separate claims (WAI 100; WAI 373; WAI 374, WAI 650) managed by the Hauraki Māori Trust Board (HMTB). These claims were filed between 1986 and 1996 under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975.<sup>3</sup> Hauraki grievances as stated in the Hauraki Report are centred on the social and economic deprivation of Hauraki whānui due to Crown acquisition of mineral-rich Hauraki lands via raupatu, the Native Land Court and a series of government acts that breached the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Hauraki

whānui<sup>4</sup> claim ownership of the minerals and foreshores as well as redress for grievances suffered.

The WAI 100 claim, a comprehensive and overarching claim covering all of the traditional Hauraki rohe, filed by Huhurere Tukukino in 1987 and 35 tribal members was, at Tukukino's request, brought before the Waitangi Tribunal by the Hauraki Māori Trust Board on behalf of all of the Hauraki people. Subsequently, the Board, legally constituted of representatives from the 12 iwi of the Hauraki whānui, lodged three specific claims regarding lands and forests at Maramarua and Athenree as well as railway land in central Auckland. Other Māori (individuals, whānau, hapū, iwi) from the region lodged general and specific claims in their own right as did a small number of non-Hauraki Māori concerning the Hauraki geographic region and its resources. A search of the Waitangi Tribunal register in September 1997 revealed that there are approximately 45 claims concerning the Hauraki tribal estate.<sup>5</sup>

The Hauraki Māori Trust Board contracted external researchers of academic stature to carry out and produce the research report for the bulk of the comprehensive Hauraki Claim. Iwi representatives, in addition to representatives from some of the specific hapū and whānau claims involved in the inquiry were asked to provide the rich, specific, tangata whenua detail which would be used by the legal counsel to support the evidence provided in the Hauraki Report.

During a period of three years working to provide iwi material several issues presented themselves for vigorous inquiry. Ngāti Hako members had limited understanding of what was required in order to present statements to the Waitangi Tribunal. Although there are many documents about the Tribunal, including helpful Tribunal guides to claimants, there are few guides from a claimant perspective. Information circulated at marae, iwi and trust board hui was of some assistance to iwi, however, assumptions about the expectations of the iwi contribution to the Tribunal process presented difficulties.

There was and perhaps still is an assumption that once academic research techniques are disseminated to iwi they will be able to articulate their grievances. There is also an assumption that iwi know and can provide historical information relevant to the prosecution and that iwi are willing to provide that historical information. There is an assumption that iwi members have the financial means, time, energy etc. to carry out the research necessary to produce meaningful information.

Iwi members voiced questions familiar to academics, What do we do? What are we going to say? How can we prove what we say? However, unlike academics, iwi members voiced these questions without the self-confidence and comfort of knowing that the institution they represent (the Academy) is accepted by mainstream New Zealand society. Furthermore, iwi trepidation increased due to the knowledge that any narrative would be considered evidence and, as such, could be cross-examined by legal counsel acting on behalf of the Crown. It is not surprising then, that Ngāti Hako as well as members of the other iwi agreed to the Hauraki Māori Trust Board (HMTB)-use of academics to produce the bulk of the Hauraki claim research. Neither is it surprising that iwi searched their ranks for academics (such as myself) to provide the iwi narratives supplementary to those provided by the HMTB researchers.

The Waitangi Tribunal hearing of the Hauraki Claims began in October 1998. The major hurdle for the claimant group reiterated by the HMTB and legal counsel, was the provision of a cohesive and coherent introduction of the Hauraki



Claims to the Tribunal. Iwi of the Hauraki whānui were required to produce and deliver profiles about themselves. Ngāti Hako, as earliest inhabitants of Hauraki, were required to be first to present their profile.

This threw the questions (What do we do? What are we going to say? How can we prove what we say?) back to the iwi. While this may seem to be an easy task, it proved to be the most problematic. In the first instance, to respond would be to go against the grain for iwi members. This is because the question of "Ko wai koe?" or "Who are you?" is seldom asked in Māoridom. It is considered to be rude or audacious because it requires people to talk about themselves in reply. It goes against the principles of whakaiti or nohopuku, requiring a person to be humble and let others respond to the question which is reiterated by a well-known Māori saying which translates as, "The kumara does not talk of its sweetness". This was of utmost importance to Ngāti Hako members whose whakatauki, or guiding philosophy is "Ko Ngāti Hako, me nohopuku". For some members, this meant that we should be humble, while for others it meant that we should be silent. For others it signalled, perhaps, a need to change our philosophy because if we did not respond, others would do so for us in ways with which we may not agree.

The topic that dominated Ngāti Hako discussions about the production of a representative iwi profile was the extremely sensitive issue of how to deal with entrenched orthodox narratives that claimed Tainui tribes, specifically those descended from Paoa and Marutuahu, had conquered Ngāti Hako in the 1600s. Several Ngāti Tamatera and Ngāti Maru people had presented this information at Māori Land Court sittings in the late 1900s in order to claim their manawhenua over Hauraki lands. Their accounts dominated Māori Land Court minutes although some Ngāti Hako information contesting these claims was also recorded. Ngāti Hako perspectives denying stories of subjugation persisted as private information between die-hard iwi members who passed their knowledge onto successive, dwindling generations. However, over time, Tainui accounts became entrenched in the public sphere as publications as well as being passed from generation to generation. Tainui accounts were repeated in subsequent, authoritative writings about Māori in the Hauraki region<sup>6</sup> including the Hauraki Treaty Claims Report to the Waitangi Tribunal that was supposed to represent all 12 Hauraki iwi, including Ngāti Hako.

If Tainui accounts were to be believed, by the time the British arrived and the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti i Tamatera, Ngāti Tara Tokanui, and Ngāti Whānaunga had subsumed Ngāti Hako people who continued to live on the land as vassals. This meant that Ngāti Hako would only be party to Tainui settlements with the Crown for grievances due to breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840. For Ngāti Hako, not only was their identity at stake but also their position as a legitimate representative in any settlement process with the Crown.

The presentation of the iwi profile to the Waitangi Tribunal, in the first instance, presented an opportunity for Ngāti Hako to publicly deny reports of their subjugation and reclaim manawhenua from Tainui over legitimate places and taonga. Then Ngāti Hako, as part of the Hauraki whānui, could address Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. In a sense, Ngāti Hako had two sets of inter-related grievances: those addressing Tainui colonisation and those addressing British colonisation.

This study then is an examination of an iwi, Ngāti Hako, as it prepared to deliver statements to the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal profiling the iwi and its grievances about Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840. A major aim of this study is to investigate the ways in which the iwi has been interpreted and how it interprets itself. Attention will be given to the wider historical, social and political contexts that contributed to the shaping of iwi narratives and narratives about the iwi, in particular, how these narratives have been framed to meet the requirements of the Waitangi Tribunal. The attitudes of iwi members towards issues of iwi identity production and construction, as well as the Tribunal process will be central to the investigation.

David Battersby describes theories or theoretical models as “systematic networks of propositions that will better explain and predict phenomena within a given social domain, or for a particular situation” that are developed from “generalisations, suppositions and hunches”.<sup>7</sup> There are two general groupings of theory that, so far, have informed my interpretation of the situations faced by Ngāti Hako in the problematic construction of their iwi identity. They are loosely categorised into those theories specifically discussing Māori research and research about Māori; and critical and interpretivist theories, which I have found pertinent to Māori and iwi situations.

Publications (e.g. Belich, 1996; Phillips, 1995) discussing Ngāti Hako are dominated by accounts of their supposed subjugation and show a lack of consultation with Ngāti Hako people. It is not surprising then, that Ngāti Hako members are sceptical about research into their lives.<sup>8</sup> Their concerns are echoed by those academics that have carried out a considerable amount of work addressing Māori research issues.<sup>9</sup> The main concerns are with the marginalisation of Māori knowledge, explanations, aspirations and pedagogies which Bishop believes stem from the development of an “epistemology of knowledge generation and definition based on one world view imported into Aotearoa/New Zealand from Europe, here termed kaupapa (agenda) Pakeha Research”.<sup>10</sup> Of concern to Māori critics is the effect of Māori, schooled in a Western-centred education system and distanced from Māori knowledge bases, becoming advocates of “legitimate” Western explanations and decisions about Māori and Māori life.<sup>11</sup>

Bishop effectively summarises the concerns of Māori about research into Māori peoples’ lives by discussing their recognition that the researcher, according to his or her interests, concerns and methods, imposes power and control over research issues such as initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy and accountability.<sup>12</sup> Western research tradition affirms and legitimates keeping the researcher in control and being the primary beneficiary of the research. Not surprisingly, Māori have become disgruntled and unwilling to co-operate with researchers wanting to carry out research “on” Māori and not “for” Māori.<sup>13</sup>

In the light of the above concerns, any effective research about Māori needs to be with and ultimately for Māori. The research process, from the outset, must be examined to identify whose “concerns, interests and methods of approach determine/define the outcomes.”<sup>14</sup> Who will benefit and who will be disadvantaged by the research? Whose voice is set up as the authority? Will Māori knowledge and processes be legitimated or sidelined? Who are the researchers answerable to and who has control over the process and the knowledge generated? These questions became and remain of utmost importance to iwi

members involved in research for the iwi profile to the Waitangi Tribunal and they provide a base for inquiry in this research.

A myriad of critical and interpretivist theorists, advanced by theorists such as Said, Bhabha, Minh-ha, and hooks,<sup>15</sup> inform my research position. However, for the auspices of this article I will mention two starting points for my analysis. Social constructionism provides a good base to start discussions on the process of constructing an iwi profile by arguing that "We do not discover our reality, we invent it. . . . Rather than passively observing reality, we actively construct the meanings that frame and organise the perceptions and experience."<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, we construct our views and experiences according to the historical, social, cultural and political contexts in which we live.

Foucault's argument on power existing not as an object for possession but as a force in action that elicits, appropriates, distributes and retains knowledge (systems of thought)<sup>17</sup> which, over a period of time, becomes socially legitimated and institutionalised as the "norm" is a particularly useful theorising tool. By his critique, one is shown how the act of "construction" involves power/knowledge and how some Māori interests, concerns and knowledges such as those held by Ngāti Hako, have become socially illegitimate, even among Māori themselves.

Furthermore, Foucault's assertions about discourse (practices) and the formations of discourse into statements of and about an institution are useful in revealing the construction of institutions such as the iwi and the Waitangi Tribunal. Middleton and Jones effectively summarise discourses as "historically specific sets of meanings and practices which 'offer' various positions to us".<sup>18</sup> Discourses "supply us with the sets of concepts which we use to understand a topic; to place limits on what can/cannot be said and thought about it. More than that, discourses shape how we are, or in other words, how we understand ourselves."<sup>19</sup> Discursive analysis then, is an exciting tool for theorising Ngāti Hako positions because, while parameters limiting iwi actions are set, in the same moment, so are opportunities for iwi activism realised. For example, discursive analysis helps one understand how the Waitangi Tribunal might limit the iwi by requiring that iwi information or "evidence" focus on grievances brought by Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. Yet, discursive analysis of the iwi profile might also show how so much more than just those grievances were conveyed.

The use of discursive analysis is consistent with the principles of Kaupapa (agenda) Māori research, which seek to advance Māori interests, aspirations and practices. At the heart of Kaupapa Māori is control – conceptual, design, and methodological and interpretative control. The whānau principle of Kaupapa Māori research maintains this control as:

A way of organising a research group, a way of incorporating ethical procedures which report back to the community, a way of giving voice to the different sections of Māori communities, and a way of debating ideas and issues. It . . . is a way of distributing tasks, of incorporating people with particular expertise, and of keeping Māori values central to the project.<sup>20</sup>

On reflection, although we didn't consciously choose a model, this was the process that Ngāti Hako members used to produce iwi information for the Tribunal. Members of the iwi, including myself, formed a research unit under the auspices



of the iwi trust Te Kupenga o Ngāti Hako and were mentored by *our* authoritative Māori who are the kaumātua. While it could be viewed that I became a mentor with regards to the research, my view is that kaumātua provided the mentoring, while I, like my aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces and nephews, provided technical expertise. As workers, we positioned ourselves as mokai or servants to the iwi. Consistent with the whānau model, the iwi community shared in the decision-making and provided feedback over actions taken. Certainly, all iwi members felt the awesome responsibility of the undertaking.

This study, from the outset, has used the same process. Over the last three years, I was instructed by the iwi as to which questions would be of interest to the iwi in a further study. These were questions about the iwi research process that were of concern to the iwi but were sidelined in order to provide the information necessary for the Tribunal. So, the main question for my doctoral study is: *How does an iwi shape interpretations of its identity to meet the requirements of the Waitangi Tribunal and how do these interpretations contribute towards our understanding of iwi and wider Treaty issues?*

Research of this question had to be carried out in a manner appropriate to the kaumātua and iwi in general. The procedure that has been used the most is that of hui.<sup>21</sup> Sometimes this has meant discussion in large iwi forums, or smaller groups. By having many hui with iwi members, collaborative “voices,” which include my own, can emerge generating new theory and self-determination can be achieved. A taped interview, structured or semi-structured was not used. I was expected to remember what a person said in discussion and perhaps record it in writing later. Before I write up any comments I must again consult with the person concerned. Viewpoints on the data will be thoroughly discussed with iwi members in various hui convenient to them.

There is a need for this process because the research is fraught with risks that could be potentially harmful to the participants. For example, the disclosure of information may have a detrimental effect upon professional relationships, or cause embarrassment to people involved in the Hauraki Claims process and the iwi in general. What if information was disclosed that called into question the validity of material that had been presented to the Waitangi Tribunal? Potential embarrassment and stress may also be caused to people involved in the Hauraki Claims process if the findings of this research are critical of that process. What if opinions were repeated that call into question the legitimacy of those managing the iwi throughout the process?

While it is important to avoid the generation of a sanitised, politically correct rhetoric, we must also remember the vulnerable position of an iwi that for so long has been silenced by dominant discourses. Opinions could descend into personal slanging matches giving ammunition for would-be iwi-bashers. Through successive collaborative discussions with the participants, it is hoped that these implications will be discussed and avoided. Ultimately, I am in the position of wanting to express Ngāti Hako concerns but seek to protect iwi members, especially the kaumātua, from having to defend this research.

Despite the risks, this research will be historically significant because little has been written about iwi experiences in providing evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal. This research will go some of the way towards providing an account of the ways in which iwi deal with Waitangi Tribunal requirements. At a broader level, it is hoped that the outcomes of this research will contribute towards an understanding of Treaty issues. More importantly to me, is that this doctoral research will be iwi-meaningful in that it will serve Ngāti Hako as an academic

document that accepts our collectively negotiated and hard fought iwi narratives and will contribute to further iwi collection and production of narratives that describe us.

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1 As part of my research for an incomplete MPhil (1993-1998) study on non-Māori use of taonga Māori entitled "Trafficking Authenticity", as well as contract research for the Waikato Museum of Art and History to write historical information for exhibitions on Tainui taonga including those from the Hauraki area. For further discussion on this see Graham, B., (1995) *Trafficking Authenticity: Aspects of Non-Māori use of Maori Cultural and Intellectual Property*, *New Zealand Museums Journal*, 25, (1), 31-34.
2. Graham, B., (1995) Riding someone else's waka: Tribal Identity and Academic theory. In Suvendrini Perera (Ed.) *Asian Pacific Inscriptions: Identities, Ethnicities, Nationalities*, a special book issue of *Meridian The La Trobe University English Review*, 14, (2), pp 45-64.
3. *The Hauraki Treaty Claims, Volume One - The Claims*, Hauraki Māori Trust Board, 1997.
- 4 Collectively made up of the 12 iwi of Hauraki which are: Ngāti Hako, Ngāti Hei, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Patukirikiri, Ngāti Porou ki Harataunga ki Mataora, Ngāti Pukenga ki Waiau, Ngati Rahiri-Tumutumu, Ngai Tai, Ngāti Tara Tokanui, and Ngāti Whānaunga.
- 5 *The Hauraki Treaty Claims, Volume One - The Claims*, Hauraki Māori Trust Board, 1997.
- 6 See Phillips, F., (1995) *Landmarks of Tainui = Nga tohu a Tainui : a geographical record of Tainui traditional history, Volume Two*, Otorohanga: Tohu Publishers, and Belich, J., (1996) *Making peoples: a history of the New Zealanders : from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*, Auckland: Penguin.
- 7 Battersby, D., (1981) *The first year of teaching: A grounded theory study*. Unpublished D.Phil thesis, University of Waikato, p.22.
- 8 Graham, *op.cit.*
- 9 See Smith L. T. (1999), *Decolonizing Methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*, London; New York; Zed Books, R. Bishop (1994) *Collaborative Stories: addressing kaupapa Māori research issues*. Christchurch: New Zealand Association for Research in Education; Smith, G.H., (1992) Tane-nui-a-rangi's legacy . . . propping up the sky: Kaupapa Māori as resistance and intervention. A paper presented at the NZAARE/ARE joint conference, Deakin University, Australia; Irwin, K., (1992) Māori research methods and processes: An exploration and discussion. NZARE/ARE Conference, Geelong, Australia.; and Stokes, E., (1985) *Māori research and development*. Discussion paper, Social Sciences Research Committee of National Research and Advisory Council. (1987) Māori geography or geography of Māoris. *New Zealand Geographer*, 43 (3), 118-123.
- 10 Bishop, p.3
- 11 Graham, *op.cit.*
- 12 Bishop, pp. 4-5
- 13 Stokes, (1987) *op.cit.*
- 14 Bishop, p. 4.

- 15 For a start, see Bhabha, H. K., (1990) *Nation and narration*, London: New York: Routledge; Bhabha, H. K., (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London: New York: Routledge; Said, E., (1978) *Orientalism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin; (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf; Hooks, B. (1994), *Teaching to Transgress*, New York: Routledge; and Trinh, T. Minh-Ha, (1989) *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana Press.
- 16 Hare-Mustin, R., and Marecek, J., (1988) (Eds.) *Making a Difference: Psychology and the construction of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press, p. 455
- 17 Foucault, M., Gordon C., (transl.), (1980) *Power - Knowledge: 1926-1984*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- 18 Middleton, S., & Jones, A., (1992) Introduction. In Sue Middleton & Alison Jones (eds) *Women and Education in Aotearoa 2*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd., pp. ix-x
- 19 *ibid.*
- 20 Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies*, p. 187.
- 21 For further discussion of this method see Bishop, *op.cit.*