

# HE TARU TAWHITI: SOME EFFECTS OF COLONISATION IN MĀORI RESEARCH

ANDREW VERCOE

*Department of Education Studies  
University of Waikato,*

**ABSTRACT** *There is a growing interest amongst Māori academics concerning the development of research methodologies for Māori contexts and the influence of an evolving ideology that is loosely referred to as kaupapa Māori. But the paradigm is subject to powerful ideological influences which, if they remain unchecked, may militate against its main objective: to liberate Māori from prescriptive Euro-centric, typically positivistic, frameworks. This dilemma stems from the process of active dehumanisation that kaupapa Māori is attempting to thwart: colonisation. Paradoxically, it has been the hegemonic saturation of Te Ao Māori that has subtly, but effectively, rendered new expressions of Māori educational emancipation in juxtaposition with empathetic paradigms that have been developed in the West. The purpose of this article is not to denigrate the valued and productive efforts of those engaged in the process of reconstructing Māori educational research, but to address some of the tensions in the research.*

## INTRODUCTION: POURING NEW WINE INTO OLD SKINS

The sub-title to this section is a biblical reference to Christ's allegory concerning the consequences of pouring new wine into old skins: they burst. Similarly, the developments in Māori research are "stretching the skins of cultural convention" so to speak, in an attempt to accommodate not only a growing sense of "global community", but also an increasing Māori comprehension of iwi empowerment. In light of this "community conscientisation", Māori researchers and educationists (Jenkins, 1994, Linda Smith, 1992; Smith, 1990; Jenkins, 1994) are engaged in a struggle to clarify high status or technical knowledge (Apple, 1990) and the emancipatory resistance (Giroux, 1983) propounded by initiatives like Te Kohanga Reo. As a response to this experience, Bishop (1994) has commented on the recent attempts to develop research methodologies that are appropriate in Māori contexts and which he and Irwin (1994) specifically referred to as *kaupapa Māori*. The model is central to the debate concerning the authenticity of knowledge Māori forms that we have amongst us today. Linda Smith (1992) succinctly framed this issue in the context of developing curricula within Kura Kaupapa Māori:

Today's curriculum needs to cater for Māori children in a post modern era. Although the emergence of an innovative kaupapa Māori curriculum clearly excites its proponents there are many difficulties ahead. One example concerns the tension between reviving a culture

and constructing or reconstructing a culture based on an already colonised view of what that culture was (p. 223 - 224).

This "tension", as Smith describes it, is pervasive in Māori initiatives in education and the call to establish appropriate Māori research methodologies is related to how Māori knowledge is viewed. The emergence of a world culture, nurtured by the rampant developments in technology, presents a challenge to certain aspects of tikanga Māori that are ontologically woven into the dynamics of the culture. Under the weight of powerful hegemonic forces, there has been a progressive "watering down" of the vitality and lucidity of Māori knowledge.

This paper will cover four areas which I consider to have important implications for developing emancipatory research in Māori contexts. Section one discusses the growing influence that feminist theory is having on "Māori friendly" research techniques. There are, however cultural ramifications at the philosophical level that have significant bearing on how power relations, in terms of feminist theory, are or can be determined. In section two, the discussion on power is extended, but specifically in relation to the co-option of relative autonomy and how this may effect the position of the researcher in Māori contexts. This discourse prompts the third section which deals with developing theory that fits the substantive area of research. The final section underpins the general tenor of the entire article, bringing into question the monopoly that tertiary institutions have over the ownership of knowledge. This discussion will hopefully contribute towards a concerted effort by Māori researchers to develop research criteria that will help to ensure that Māori remain in control over the distribution of their knowledge.

## KO TE PUAO HOU: THE NEW DAWN

Irwin, 1994 argues that to understand the "fullness" of Māori teachers' experiences, the researcher has to be aware of them, even though those experiences would be articulated through the theoretical construction propounded by the researcher:

I came to the awesome understanding, and I mean quite literally that I was in a state of awe for many months, that *I* would have to write *a theory of Māori education*, and re-write *my understanding* of the history of Māori education that has contributed to the formation of the education system that the teachers in *my* research would be socialised into (p. 28).

This discourse seems to suggest that the appropriation or recreation of knowledge is ultimately left to the devices of the researcher, given that it is the researcher who interprets the data and constructs the theory. Secondly, it demonstrates the extent to which Western theories of knowledge "crowd out" (as a consequence of colonisation) tikanga Māori by assuming that the pursuit of knowledge is individualistic rather than collectivistic. Thirdly, there is an implicit assumption being made that *academic* theory construction is the most rigorous procedure for providing "real" solutions. The pre-European tangata whenua were familiar with theory building as it provided them with the means to navigate the vastness of Te

Moana-nui-a-Kiwa (the Pacific Ocean); to develop new methods of cultivation; to create an array of bird snares and animal traps; and other technologies that equipped them with the ability to utilise the resources within the environment (see Jones et.al, 1995). The affective way in which theory was engaged and practised in pre-colonisation times, was a central critical act in the plan of survival, one that was predicated upon how well the community adapted and coped with new and challenging conditions. The successful solution to a new problem therefore required the participation of *an ensemble of people* who collectively generated propositions that would eventually crystallise after trial and error. Given these general epistemological characteristics of tikanga Māori, the question arises, How does one person get to write "a" solution to a collective problem?

Despite these philosophical and cultural anomalies, there are interpolations (which Irwin demonstrates) that have been harnessed and proven beneficial in the development of appropriate Māori research methodologies, notably feminist theory. However, the utilisation of an essentially Western construction requires cautious and critical deliberation, especially where it may impinge upon the cultural constructs of a Māori community. For example, Linda Smith (1990) negotiates the struggle between Western notions within current mainstream feminist theory and the position of mana-wahine in te ao Māori:

It is argued by some Māori women that Māori society prior to colonisation was one which relied on a balance of roles between femaleness and male-ness. This position is frequently espoused in terms of the *complementary* roles played by men and women in pre-Pakeha society. In order for society to survive the balance in roles needed to be maintained. Colonisation upset this balance by promoting the activities and perspectives held by Māori men at the expense of Māori women. Current interest therefore by Māori women in women's' knowledge is designed to reclaim knowledge and mana particularly related to women's views of the world (p. 17).

Smith continues by saying that the more radical view would propound that the struggle for Māori women's autonomy has had a whakapapa from "the time Papatuanuku was wrenched apart from Ranginui and turned over so that her sights and thoughts would look forever downwards"(ibid) (a parochial perusal of this last perspective ignores many of the recent developments in feminist theory).

In her seminal work, Pere (1982) describes the relationship between men and women in pre-European times as being mutually exclusive, inherently bound by the laws of nature, thereby divinely ordaining specific roles and functions according to gender. Neither was regarded as superior or inferior, but each was in respect of the other's discharge of responsibilities and duties to the community. Pere demonstrates this through her rendition of the law of noa as it is mediated by women:

Noa, as a concept, is applied to everyday living and ordinary situations, but it is also a most vital part of the most formal, complex rituals and social controls of the Māori people. The influence and power of noa is very significant to the physical well-being of people by freeing them

from any quality or condition that makes them subject to spiritual and/or ceremonial restriction and influences. The concept of noa is usually associated with warm, benevolent, life giving, constructive influences, including ceremonial purification. Noa as a formal ritual, is usually associated with women, particularly the most senior females of whanau or hapu. The eldest female in a family of rank usually assumes the role of removing the tapu from a new house or any other important project. The group as a whole could then use and benefit from it without any fear of spiritual or physical affliction (p. 35).

Here the dynamic and autonomous roles of women are ontologically located within the well-being of the community, not, as mainstream feminist ideology has fundamentally (and politically) located itself, within a discourse of power or powerlessness. Of course this does not mean that the discourse of power is absent in Māori contexts. That would be ridiculous both in terms of the effects of colonisation and the nature of how any society is regulated and maintained. What I am proposing is that the cultural and social practices located within *tuturu tikanga* Māori (authentic aspects of Māori culture) are holistically orchestrated so that "power" is regulated in terms of maintaining a balance. This "balance" of power between the female and male element will vary between different tribes and for this reason the preceding discourse should not be considered as a universal sign post.

Generally speaking, there can be no doubt that feminist theory has contributed a great deal to the humanising of not only women but of men as well. Weiler's (1991) critique on Freire's notion of oppression re-engages the concept by bringing to attention the numerous and different levels of oppression that contest the patriarchal construction which dominated Freire's earlier discourses. This, of course, has implications for minimising the effect of the 'researcher' in Māori contexts. Hooks (1994) discusses this phenomenon of gender emancipation, partially crediting the humanising of men to confrontation through dialogue:

Since it is difficult for many black men to give voice to the way they are hurt and wounded by racism, it is also understandable that it is difficult for them to "own up to" sexism to be accountable. More and more, individual black men - particularly young black men - are facing the challenge of daring to critique gender, be informed, and willingly resist and oppose sexism (p. 116).

Feminist theory offers positive solutions to empowering the voices of the researched by revealing what can be learned from their regular every-day experiences: by reconnecting the knower and the known this depowers the location of the researcher as the sole "knower" and empowers people to critically examine the reality of their own lives (Kincheloe, 1993). The voices of those whom the research is supposed to emancipate become marginalised if their reality is considered through the androcentric and hierarchical position of the non-interactive researcher: they are translated through the voice of one who speaks from a positivistic position (Hooks, 1989, p. 14-17). If the research project is to proceed under the aegis of mana-iwi however, then the nexus of power, in

whatever dimension and paradigm, must be located within the operational autonomy of tikanga iwi-whanui (the culture of the community).

## KO TE TUAKIRI ME TE TINO RANGATIRATANGA: IDENTITY AND AUTONOMY

Underpinning the process of developing and engaging in emancipatory research in Māori contexts, and at the heart of diffusing the negative effects of colonisation, is the question of identity, or at least developing a process of deconstruction that unravels the contradictions embedded within the notion of identity. Rangihau (1992) was critical of broad Western constructions that tended to be all-inclusive and readily adopted:

My being Māori is absolutely dependent on my history as a Tuhoe person as against being a Māori person. It seems to me there is no such thing as Māoritanga because Māoritanga is a term which embraces all Māori [and] there are so many different aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it is not a history that can be shared among others (p. 189-190).

Graham (1994) argued that the "Māori" universal was a consequence of the Eurocentric mind set of amateur anthropologists who vicariously, but mistakenly, propagated a Māori homogeneity. Hohepa (1978), in ignorance of this position it seems, suggested that affiliation to one's tribe did not in "anyway lessen [one] being 'Māori', recognising that there were many cultural signifiers common amongst iwi. But, it is this latter uncritical acceptance of the coloniser's label (which eventually depoliticised the voice of many hapu) that ultimately lessens the purity of the fundamental principle that characterised iwi-identity and power in pre-European times: *tino rangatiratanga*.

If research in Māori contexts is to take notice of the process of empowerment, then the methodologies or techniques that will be used must be negotiated and "fit" the substantive area of investigation. Any position on theory building from whatever perspective should not distort or redefine the data that are generic to the propositions that will emerge. It requires much more than the initial flurry involved in negotiating entry into the field. It demands that the community is given the right to determine how the project is to proceed, in effect, orchestrating how methodologies will be applied, modified and or transformed at every point along the way. Carkeek, Davies and Irwin (1994) encountered what they described as "tensions" subsequent to the conflict between the culture inherent within the Ministry of Education and those perceived aspects of tikanga Māori or kawa (protocol). These researchers asserted that "the whanau decide what research, if any, is necessary in the school, and how the research will be carried out" (p. 51). In association with this debate over community involvement in research, Bishop (1992, 1994) delineated the process of self determination as the vehicle by which Māori could secure their right to reject the ideological dominance that had been responsible for systemically limiting them in their capacity to create legitimate solutions to their problems.

However, I believe that *tino rangatiratanga* is subject to gross generalisation if it is rationalised under the term "Māori": the displacement of tribal autonomy, and indeed community subsidiarity (see Finnis, 1981) with a universal, depowers the political issues of tangata-iwi/ tangata-hapu, rendering them non-issues (Lukes, 1974). In retrospect, the use of tino-rangatiratanga has been co-opted to legitimate political issues in terms of Māori nationhood, effectively demonstrated through the "principles" of the Treaty of Waitangi which were created by the fourth Labour government.

What researchers, particularly Māori, must come to grips with, is that the context in which one investigates phenomena determines the process by which they shall be analysed: it is the community under the maru (umbrella) of mana-iwi/ mana-hapu (rather than mana-Māori) that legitimizes the fluid and continuous undertaking of negotiated research. It is not, as some educationists have asserted, fundamentally a question of empowering iwi to become active in the process of research, but much more importantly, recognising that it is they who should be among the architects of the framework in which the research is to be conducted.

## HE WHAKAWHANAUNGATANGA: THEORY IN CONTEXT

Empowering research must produce outcomes or "real" solutions that are related to the field of study as well as producing answers that may be developed, extended and modified to suit other contexts. Certainly "there should be more specific aims and objectives in Māori research which are directed at helping people in their daily lives" (Stokes, 1985, p. 3). These solutions are not to be regarded as a general social panacea, but should be considered propositions indicative of the data inherent within the specific area of study. Glaser and Strauss (1967), and in more recent times, Strauss and Corbin (1990), developed a technique commonly referred to as "grounded theory" or "the constant comparative method of analysis":

The theory should provide control with regard to action toward the phenomenon. This is because the hypothesis proposing relationships among concepts (which later may be used to guide action) are systematically derived from the actual data related to that *and only that phenomenon*. Furthermore, the conditions to which it applies should be clearly spelled out. Therefore the conditions should apply specifically to a given situation (p. 23).

Unlike the traditional propositions characteristic of the social sciences where data are often "forced" to fit a theory, grounded theory proposes to build propositions from the data, consequently effecting a continuity of relevance to the actual area of research:

If theory is faithful to the everyday reality of the substantive area and carefully induced from diverse data, then it should fit that substantive area. Because it represents that reality, it should also be *comprehensible*

*and make sense both to the persons who were studied and those participating in that area* (Strauss & Corbin, 1990 p. 23).

If the researcher has provided a faithful account of the phenomenon under observation, there should be minimal disparity of interpretation between the subjects and the observer. The researcher's task is to gather the data in such a manner that the "informants speak for themselves". The aim is certainly to give an honest account with little or no interpretation by the researcher of the world perceived by the actors in it, but that the accumulation of data should be systematic and rigorous. In short "the grounded theory approach discovers theory through observation and experience. It has relevance, it must work and be readily modifiable" (Ramsay, 1990, p. 88). Glaser and Strauss further suggest that the researcher must develop *theoretical sensitivity* to the subtle interplay of data; of having insight; having a hunch; the ability to give meaning to data; the capacity to understand and the capability to separate the pertinent from that which is not; constantly challenging the interplay between theory and reality so that what makes sense to the researcher, also makes sense to the researched.

Certainly a prime function of empowering research must be its accessibility and comprehensibility to those whom the research is supposed to empower. Bertaux (1981) argued that the traditional anthropological research practices ultimately rendered knowledge as a publication for an elite company of people and that its value was only in terms of its grandiose academic significance: "If sociology were a specialised science like, say, biochemistry or electronics, one could understand that none except the specialists would read about it in specialised publications" (p. 32). Traditional anthropological techniques of observation (which were eventually adopted by the social sciences) have come under strong criticism, particularly those aspects concerning the imposition of the researcher's assumptions and interpretation of the primary constructs (Berger & Luckman, 1981; Schutz, 1973) of the actors or subjects. Ethnography has been instrumental in the service of positivistic notions regarding the scientific method and has largely contributed to the mystification and inaccessibility of technical knowledge forms. With the new directions in sociology, positivism or "theory testing" (see Goodson, 1985, p. 77), was largely replaced with "situation and occasion": the interactions, practices and behaviours among groups in situations are de-contextualised. "In over-reacting to more deterministic models, this situational emphasis most commonly fails to make connection with the historical process" (ibid, p.78). These and other problems associated with ethnographic techniques, were the result of desperate attempts by sociologists to capture the approval of the natural sciences. The methods of analysis, typical of the natural sciences, and coveted by the social sciences, were seen as the only legitimate means of research methodology.

In recent times however, sociologists have employed ethnography as an element within a total research design (see Ramsay, 1993). The combination of a variety of techniques contributes towards a reflexive methodology which empowers people to develop "fresh and hopefully better social arrangements" (p. 8). Lather (1986) extends this argument by relating the task of theory to social transformation by being "open-ended, non-dogmatic, informing, and grounded in the circumstances of everyday life" (p. 262). This requires that the researcher

participates in a process of self-reflection and reciprocity that continuously precipitates emancipatory dialogue; a reflexive activity that leads to the development of greater sensitivity. Gouldner (1971) recognised this reflexive approach as a reciprocal process of discovery for the researcher:

The historical mission of reflexive sociology as I conceive it, however, would be to transform the sociologist, to penetrate deeply into his [sic] daily life and work, enriching them with new sensitivities and to raise the sociologist's self awareness to a new historical level (p. 489).

In light of Gouldner's admonition, the perpetuation of a healthy partnership, between the researcher and the community, requires a constant monitoring of the researcher's social position in the world: I as the researcher cannot effectively interpret the perspectives of others without their help. In this regard, grounded theory is similarly most effective when in combination with other research techniques.

### **MA WAI E WHAKAHAERE: WHO GETS TO CONTROL?**

There are, however, certain epistemological characteristics within the grounded theory approach that may conflict with *tikanga iwi-whanui* (iwi communities) and most certainly militate against a transformation of the relationship between the researcher and the researched. The most obvious among these is that the researcher remains in control of the process of analysis, which has an obvious bearing on how and who distributes knowledge and how it is distributed. It is at this particular juncture that Māori educationists are attempting to redefine the position of the researcher, particularly where perplexing and salient issues such as intellectual property arise. Smith, P (1978), Best (1959; 1986), Pere (1982), and Te Awekotuku (1991) alluded to certain forms of knowledge Māori as highly *tapu* and regulated to the extent that only selected individuals were given access to it:

Knowledge was of high value in this environment, and particular types of information - strategic or sorcerous, environmental or economic, geographic or geological - were highly prized and tightly regulated. Secrecy and imposed sanctions were the norm, and the observation of *tapu* formed a practical basis for the protection of such knowledge, to prevent its discovery or abuse by hostile people (Te Awekotuku, 1991, p. 7).

The monitoring of knowledge dissemination was obligatory upon the *tohunga* and those skilled performers attending schools like the *Whare Kura*, *Whare Maire* or the *Whare Wananga*. Unauthorised distribution usually resulted in physical mutilation, public humiliation, banishment and even death (the latter usually brought upon by fear of or total belief in the judgement and power of the gods). The influence of *tapu* effectively provided the parameters of accountability, ensuring that *mana-iwi* was never threatened or compromised. Hence, there was a collective responsibility which maintained the good of the community as the pivotal axis for all decision making. The well-being of the community was



paramount and surpassed even the individual mana vested in the chief. Such knowledge was extremely potent, often requiring the propitiation or appeasement of the gods to neutralise it. This of course raises "the ethical question to whom, and for whom, should this taonga of recorded knowledge be of most benefit? And should it be in the ground and out of reach forever?" (Te Awekotuku, 1991, p. 8).

Upon reviewing the exploitative efforts of the early anthropologists in this country, "pakitara" or "wall" building has become a prominent feature upon the research landscape and the ensuing emphasis on ownership of knowledge has created a parody: liberatory research is to perpetuate community conscientisation, but it will be regulated and restricted in its distribution. Te Puni Kokiri recently (Mana Tangata, 1993) issued a draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples, and of particular interest, section 29 outlined circumstances pertaining to intellectual property:

Indigenous peoples are entitled to the recognition of the full ownership, control and protection of their cultural and intellectual property. They have the right to special measures to control, develop and protect their sciences, technologies and cultural manifestations, including human and other genetic resources, seeds medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literature . . . (p. 15).

This is not a radical departure from the edicts of the past, but it does indicate that temporal or common knowledge forms inherent within the community, are not so readily or willingly disseminated as they had been in the past. Kincheloe (1991) offers a critical constructivist approach that may be contextualised in terms of how ownership of knowledge may be negotiated between the researched and the researcher:

The knower is a living human being. As a living human, a perceiving instrument, the perspective of the researcher must be granted the same seriousness of attention as is typically accorded the research design, the research methods in traditional forms of inquiry. Like knowledge, the knower also belongs to a particular, ever-changing historical world. The human being as a part of history is a reflexive subject, i.e., an entity who is conscious of the constant interaction between humans and their world. This reflexivity recognises that all knowledge is a fusion of subject and object. In other words, the knower personally participates in all acts of understanding (p. 26).

What he is essentially claiming is that it is impossible "to conceive knowledge without thinking of the knower" (ibid). This placates the position of the researcher as the sole "discoverer" and "composer" of knowledge. The researcher is dependent upon the ways in which people engage their reality, or the ways in which experiences shape their perspectives, in order to make explicit the unspoken or the hidden. Dewey (1902) in his discourse on the child and the curriculum, recognised that the acquisition and application of knowledge are contingent upon stimuli (or phenomena) that generate the capacity to create or

discover knowledge. The act of knowing requires an "experience" that may or may not involve the interaction with another human being:

The child is expected to develop this or that fact or truth out of his own mind. He is told to think things out, or work things out for himself, without being supplied any of the environing conditions which are requisite to start guide and thought (p. 225-6).

In effect, the alienation of the knower from the construction of reality, through the actions of the researcher may depoliticise the act of knowing (Freire: 1972; 1975; 1993; 1994): the researched are no longer participants but objects, dominated and rendered unauthentic by the interpretations of the researcher. Knowledge, in adherence to Freire's notion of epistemology, is always in the state of becoming and dialogue perpetuates the aggregation and amelioration of one's understanding of the object of study. Those who are participating in the construction/reconstruction of knowledge are not in opposition. "[Knowledge acquisition] must be embarked upon as a journey, as a process of change within the [researcher] and the [researched], which in turn will enable them to change their historical situation" (Boston, 1978, p. 86). Willis (1977) demonstrated that people "are not passive bearers of ideology, but active appropriators who reproduce existing structures only through struggle, contestation and political penetration of those structures" (p. 175). The "ownership" of knowledge must therefore be considered in light of a negotiated process by which the researcher and the researched together seek to understand the reality in which both parties are active, knowing and participating subjects.

It is no longer appropriate nor acceptable by Māori for universities to claim "intellectual property rights in any creation made by academic staff pursuant to the contract of service" (Ricketson, 1993, p. 6). Any research concerning Māori subjects "should be responsive to expressed Māori needs; needs expressed from within the community, and not needs perceived by those outside of it" (Te Awakotuku, 1991, p. 14). Hence, the outcomes of a negotiated project will always be implicitly bound within the parameters of the *substantive area of study*: any claims that are made to the ownership of knowledge will never discount a collective interest which ultimately demands a strong sense of accountability and responsibility. This would suggest that the principles which guide the actions of the researcher in the research field will "recognise, respect and nurture the unique cultural identity of the tangata whenua and safely meet their needs" (Fox, 1994, p. 7). These notions imply much more than Gouldner's reflexivity, and are about challenging and coming to understand the self; questioning the behaviours we demonstrate in certain social settings; "examining cultural realities, attitudes and behaviour's and how these could impact on others" (ibid, p. 11); and developing empathy with those dispossessed of power and helping them to "monitor the attitudes and service of the powerful" (Ramsden, 1993, p. 10). The cultural attitudes, beliefs and realities that one possesses must be examined in light of what the political and cultural sensitivity of the community is. Metaphorically, the researcher approaches the tangata whenua with palms out, open, bearing no intent to accord patronising lip-service.

## KO TE WHAKAKOAKOA WHAKAARO: GATHERING THOUGHTS

As Māori prepare themselves for the twenty first century, there is a growing urgency for us to reflect upon how we should become much more critically aware of the subtle action of colonisation, particularly as it concerns research design. This process has developed over the past 150 years to the point where we are quite willing to utilise various foreign elements without taking notice of the effect they will have on tikanga Māori. As we develop or modify research methodologies for Māori contexts, I believe we need to consider the following points:

1. Research must involve a collective approach. If it is to be truly emancipatory, then the combined input of all who are involved in the research can only contribute to the reification of the interests held by the community, or individual. This would imply that the ownership and distribution of knowledge is also negotiated.
2. The interpolation of so called "world knowledge" (Sharpley, 1993), cannot be left unchecked and accepted because of a similarity to matauranga Māori (knowledge Māori). This means that the implementation of foreign epistemologies must be redefined in terms of what is most appropriate for Māori communities; even aspects of feminist theory must yield to what is extant in Māori contexts.
3. Māori need to question the co-option of cultural mores like tino rangatiratanga. There has been too much discussion on what is appropriate for "Māori" rather than what is most appropriate for the various tribal nations of the Māori people. Although some would claim this to be too post-modern, we cannot ignore the dimensions of power and the balance that they maintain, which exist at this level in iwi societies.
4. If we say we are interested in emancipatory research, we need to get past the rhetoric and engage in praxis.
5. All research needs to be underpinned by a constant ongoing process of negotiation where the 'researched' become the co-architects of research design. This will mean that the methods used to obtain data are not going to impinge upon the "normal" operations and activities within the area of study and that the outcomes of the research are comprehended by all participants. This is especially true of Kura Kaupapa Māori and Total Immersion schools, where resources like time are stretched to the limit.
6. The research theory must "fit" the data that emerge from the research. As propositions begin to develop, they should reflect the world of the "knower" so that those propositions are recognised as a faithful account of the world of the knower.

The ancient saying "*he taru tawhiti*", "a 'thing' from afar", has great significance in respect of what is occurring within the field of Māori research. Simply, all foreign

interpolations, which are inevitable, should not be accepted without firstly reviewing them in the context of where they may fit in tikanga iwi, and secondly, contemplating the extent to which they may modify, and indeed challenge, the cultural mores and beliefs of Māori communities.

Māori people have been subject to gross misrepresentation at all levels of society. Much of this has come about because decisions concerning the tangata whenua have been made by power brokers who have no interest in delegating effective power to minority groups. Research which considers the points made in this paper, will give voice to those who have been marginalised, not only by the actions of the white middle class power brokers, but also by some of us who have succumbed to the powerful and pervasive influence of colonisation. This is not to say that there is a group who are pure and undefiled. Rather, it is to say that those of us who contribute unwittingly to the process of oppression must be liberated by those who are attempting to recognise the various overt and covert aspects of it. It means that "kaupapa Māori" not only represents a process of self determination, but it is a paradigm which implicitly decolonises those who are engaged in manifesting it. It means that this paradigm seeks to transform all of our society so that the members in it recognise and value the cultures and beliefs of each other. It means challenging ourselves as Māori to becoming agents of change constantly reflecting upon our actions and improving upon them. Paulo Freire expresses my most central thoughts concerning the purpose of research in Māori contexts, and it is with him that I leave the eclipsing word:

The oppressed must not, in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both. This then is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well (Freire, 1990, p. 21).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank Cathy Reischl, a visiting lecturer from Michigan State University, for her critical comments, encouragement and support. Also a special thanks to the communities of Rakaumanga and Huntly West Schools from whom much of the inspiration to write this article has come.

## REFERENCES

- Apple, M.W. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge (2nd ed.).
- Berger, P. & Luckman, P. (1981). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Norwich: Peregrine.
- Bertaux, D. (Ed.). (1981). *Biography and Society*. London: Sage.
- Best, E. (1959). *The Māori School of Learning*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- (1986), *Spiritual and Mental Concepts of the Māori*; Wellington: Government Printer.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1992). He Kanohi Kitea: Conducting and Evaluating Educational Research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 27 (2).

- Boston, B. (1978). Paulo Freire: Notes of a Loving Critic. In S. Grabowski, (Ed.), *Paulo Freire: A Dilemma for the Adult Educator*. New York: Syracuse University (3rd ed.).
- Carkeek, L., Davies, L. & Irwin, K., (1994). *What Happens to Māori Girls at School: Final Report*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Finnis, J. (1980). *Natural Law and Natural Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fox, R.A. (1994). *Speaking the Unspeakable*: Hamilton: Waikato Polytechnic.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- (1975). *Cultural Action for Freedom*. Vermont: Harvard Educational Review.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance: A Pedagogy of Opposition*. London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goodson, I. (1985). History, Context and Qualitative Methods in the Study of Curriculum. In R. Burgess, (Ed.), *Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods*. London: Falmer.
- Gouldner, A. (1971). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. London: Heinemann.
- Graham, B. (1994). *Riding Someone Else's Waka: Academic Theory and Tribal Identity*. A paper presented at the conference on Identities, Ethnicities and Nationalities, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Harker, R. (1971). Māori Education and Research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 7.
- Hohepa, P. (1978). Māori and Pakeha: The One People Myth. In M. King, (Ed.). *Tihei Muriōra*. New Zealand: Methuen.
- Hooks, B. (1989), *Talking Back, Thinking Feminist, Talking Black*. Boston: South End Press.
- (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. London: Routledge.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori Research Processes and Methods: An Exploration and Discussion. *Sites*, 28.
- Kincheloe, J. (1993). *Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment*. London: Falmer Press.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place, *Interchange*, 17 (4).
- (1986). Research as Praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56 (3).
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.
- McLaren, P. & Leonard, P. (Eds.). (1993) *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. London: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. & Lankshear, C. (Eds.). (1994), *Politics of Liberation*. London: Routledge.
- Memmi, A. (1991). *The Coloniser and the Colonised*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pere, R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts and Learning in the Māori Tradition*. Waikato University, Department of Sociology.
- Ramsay, P., Harold, B., Hawk, K., Kaai, T., Marriott, R. & Poskitt, J. (1990). *There's No Going Back: Collaborative Decision Making in Education*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

- Ramsay, P., Hawk, K., Harold, B., Marriot, R. and Poskitt, J. (1993). *Developing Partnerships*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ramsden, I. (1993). What is Cultural Safety?, *Praxis*, 8 (3).
- Rangihau, J. (1993). Being Māori . In M. King, (Ed.). *Te Ao Hurihuri*. Auckland: Reed.
- Ricketson, S. (1993). Intellectual Property Rights in the Australian University Context: An Overview. *The Australian Universities Review*, 36 (1).
- Schutz, A. (1970). *On Phenomenology and Social Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, G. (1990). The Politics of Reforming Māori Education: The Transformation Potential of Kura Kaupapa Māori. In H. Lauder, & C. Wylie, (Eds.). *Towards Successful Schooling*. London: Falmer Press.
- Smith, L. & Hohepa, M. (1990). *Mana Wahine: Mana Māori*. University of Auckland, Māori Education Research and Development Unit.
- Smith, L. (1992). Kura Kaupapa Māori and the Implications for the Curriculum. In G. McCulloch, (Ed.). *The School Curriculum in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, P. (1978). *The Lore of the Whare Wananga: Part One*. New York: AMS Press.
- Stokes, E. (1985). *Māori Research and Development*. Wellington: National Research Advisory Council.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. *Basics of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Te Puni Kokiri, (1993). *Mana Tangata*, Wellington, Ministry of Māori Development.
- Vercoe, A. (1995). *Total Immersion, Total Tikanga Māori? : A Crisis in Self Determination and Epistemology*. Unpublished proposal for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Waikato University, Department of Education Studies.
- Weiler, K. (1991). Freire and Feminist Pedagogy of Difference. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61 (4).
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to Labour*. London: Saxon House.