

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

DEVELOPING A MORE BICULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY:  
ACADEMIC DISCOURSES OF RESISTANCE

Tony Waldegrave

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Massey University

1996

## ABSTRACT

Psychologists through-out the world, have found themselves under increasing pressure to reflect upon the suitability of the psychological theory they present, for the contexts in which they operate (Sue, 1993). In New Zealand this concern is manifested in a call for the development of a more bicultural psychology. This recognises the poor performance of Maori in academic and professional psychology, and draws attention to issues of bicultural partnership prescribed by a document of constitutional significance in New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi.

Despite disciplinary intention to develop more biculturally, successive surveys have found that the movement toward this goal has been slow. Such findings prompted the present study, which considers whether conditions are conducive to the provision of the recommended changes.

Issues of bicultural development were discussed with ten non-Maori psychology lecturers, from two New Zealand universities. A discourse based analysis of the transcripts was undertaken. This drew attention to procedures by which lecturers made sense of Maori concerns and the discipline's responses.

The participants discourses were found to resist Maori concerns for bicultural development. This was achieved by undermining the validity of concerns, by claiming Maori were unfairly treated, by presenting current performance in a positive light, or by drawing attention to difficulties of being able to respond productively. These discourses used Pakeha values of legitimacy as commonsense rationale to resist changes.

This process of legitimisation was determined to provide a barrier to the bicultural development of the discipline because it asserted monocultural control of a bicultural process. Attempts to account for Maori psychological needs and to capture the 'spirit and intent' of the Treaty of Waitangi would therefore work to accommodate Maori perspectives which could be legitimised by Pakeha values.

On this basis it is argued that bicultural development is dependant upon the establishment of a dynamic of mutual accountability, on space being made for Maori values and the ability of Pakeha to assume an active role to facilitate ideological and systemic reflexivity, among students who may not otherwise have had this opportunity.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Contents	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Method	38
Chapter Three: Analysis	48
Chapter Four: Conclusions	94
References	109
Appendix A: Information sheet	117
Appendix B: Consent form	119

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to several people for their contributions to the development and production of this project. Firstly to Hine TimuTimu-Thorpe and Keith Tuffin for the inspiration to undertake this project. To my supervisors, Kerry Chamberlain and Mandy Morgan, thank you both for your encouragement and guidance. Thanks also to members of staff from Massey and Victoria universities who generously gave this their time and thoughts as interviewees. Finally, special thanks go to my family, including Kiwi Tamasese, for offering energy to drafts, and for providing me with lifeline support.

## *Chapter One*

### INTRODUCTION

#### **The concern**

The practice and teaching of psychology in New Zealand has been experienced as alienating by Maori clients and students (Gibbs, 1983, Abbott and Durie, 1987, Lawson -Te Aho, 1993). As a grouping over-represented as recipients of mental health services and under-represented as students of psychology, it is considered particularly important that the discipline consider the existence and maintenance of this situation (Sawrey, 1990, Brady, 1992). It is expected that Pakeha gaining an appreciation of why Maori feel alienated by psychology is a necessary precursor to the development of a more bicultural psychology (New Zealand Psychological Society (NZPS), 1995).

The sense of alienation Maori experienced in academic environments is explained to result from a lack of representation of Maori values in psychological curricula and in the presentation of this curricula (NZPS, 1995). This is a scenario which has been noted in many societies where Western psychological theories are presented as universally applicable (Sue, 1993, Gergen, Gulerce, Lock and Misra, 1996). In this situation the values of specific groups are used to inform psychological theory, however these are not

accounted for in the delivery of the theory. Professional or academic delivery of these theories may, as a result, alienate those who do not share the same values.

Feminist critique has also explained how traditional psychological teaching and practice predominantly nurtures the values of white middle class males. This analysis has suggested that characteristically operational conceptualisations of mental health do not account for cultural variations of gender, socio-economic class or ethnicity (Trinh, 1989, Riger, 1992). Instead, culturally specific interpretations are used to establish norms which are then used as yardsticks to classify behaviour deviating from them, as abnormal. As a result of this process, psychological theories which were presented as widely inclusive, have a counterproductive effect to explicitly exclude.

Maori note this effect in referring to the systematic marginalisation of their values, through the presentation of Pakeha information as normal (Kaai-Oldman, 1988, Lawson -Te Aho, 1993). Maori and Pakeha alike have argued that teaching and theorising, as culturally located practices, should be presented with greater emphasis upon the contexts with which they are concerned (New Zealand Psychological Society Bulletin, 1993).

Nairn (1993) recommends that this requires consideration of some of the everyday assumptions made about the content and presentation of psychological knowledge. He suggests that typically usage of the term 'knowledge', presupposes an existence, validity and applicability of its own right. In other words, the historical, cultural and theoretical frameworks that have been used, to determine factuality from

opinion are not made explicit. When knowledge is identified as a certain understanding, it may be a logical progression to realise that:

...as teachers of psychology in this country, we have been enculturating our students (Nairn, 1993, 40).

This restates that teaching psychology in New Zealand presents curricula as representing 'reality' rather than as points of view, or value based interpretations.

Lawson -Te Aho criticises this situation:

Psychology, and clinical psychology in particular, has created the mass abnormalisation of Maori people by virtue of the fact that Maori have been on the receiving end of psychological practice as the helpless recipients of (English) defined labels and treatments .... Clinical psychology is a form of social control derived from human intent and human action and offers no more "truth" about the realities of Maori peoples lives than a regular reading of the horoscope page in the local newspaper. (Lawson -Te Aho, 1993, p. 26)

This warns that if students are presented versions of reality which are inconsistent with their own values systems and their realities remain marginalised, then they are likely to continue to perform poorly.

Abbott and Durie (1986) have explained for psychologists how Pakeha psychological conceptions of dysfunctional behaviour could be antithetical in nature to a Maori point of view. They noted that mainstream psychological theories revolve around



fundamentally foreign concepts for Maori. They may depend for example, upon the distinction and separation of thoughts, emotions and behaviours.

Their concerns about the difference between Maori and Pakeha psychological values were compounded by the findings of a survey taken of bicultural aspects of health related professional training programs (Abbott and Durie, 1986). The survey indicated that psychological theories presented and studied in universities, were derived predominantly from texts of North American or Western European origin. Few texts in use were of New Zealand origin and none were Maori in origin. They recommended that courses and contexts are provided which facilitate bicultural development (Abbot and Durie, 1986, NZPS, 1995). Participation of Maori at all levels of psychology education is seen as fundamental to bicultural development (NZPS, 1995).

The development of a more bicultural discipline is said to also require consideration of the role of Pakeha students in a process of change (Gibbs, 1983, Sawrey, 1990, NZPS, 1995). Non-Maori psychology students are expected to need to develop a keen sensitivity for the bicultural context into which they will graduate and work. Yensen and McCreanor (1993) argue that biculturalism training for non-Maori is two-fold. Firstly, 'cultural sensitivity training' is needed to facilitate students becoming aware of Maori cultural practices and values. This can best be managed by Maori teachers. The second aspect involves Pakeha developing an understanding of institutional practices that have marginalised Maori people, and that continue to deny them access to psychological services, on their own terms.

This approach involves a reinterpretation of the value of culture. The traditional goal of psychology (to present the 'science of human behaviour') has involved the generalisation of context specific experiments in which culture was not considered significant (Lawson -Te Aho, 1993). Bicultural development requires a change in this perspective to uphold culture as a defining variable of individual experience. This may be realised by considering the role that culture plays in what are considered alternative perspectives to mainstream psychology.

Maori psychology, for example, emphasises the influence of specific cultural values on the way that someone with a Maori cultural upbringing will make sense of the world. It makes its cultural base explicit. No claims of applicability to universal contexts are made and attention is drawn to culture as the unique variable affecting quality of experience.

Psychology departments could acknowledge this difference by implementing recommended measures, such as offering papers in Maori psychology and facilitating the participation of Maori at all levels of psychology training. Papers in Maori psychology would highlight the role of cultural values in psychological well-being, and help identify Western psychological assumptions which are presented in New Zealand. Importantly it would make students, Pakeha especially, conscious of the subjectivity and applicability of 'knowledge'. From this perspective, they could be expected to approach psychological theory, in a manner that is more likely to make them sensitive to contextual qualities of their professional encounters.

## **The role of the Treaty of Waitangi**

The Treaty of Waitangi is a document of constitutional significance in New Zealand society. It established a partnership between Maori and Pakeha and as such is recognised as a focal point for addressing cultural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. It therefore forms the basis of the Maori case to have their values better represented in psychological activities (NZPS, 1995).

Recent recommendations have been particularly direct about Pakeha responsibilities to honour the Treaty of Waitangi. Nairn (1993), for example, locates an argument for improved cultural performance by the discipline, as a matter of Treaty based social justice. In this analysis Pakeha are seen to have their values and systems dominate in New Zealand society, and are therefore identified as the power holders who have the opportunities and responsibilities to facilitate change. Stanley (1993) also points out, that it is Pakeha who have the responsibility to facilitate a 'de-monopolisation of New Zealand psychology'.

Pakeha acknowledgement of responsibility is seen as a prerequisite to provision of genuine change consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi. Awatere-Huata (1993), for example, explains that Pakeha responsibility means realising that New Zealand psychologists are either involved in propping up a political system, with economic advantage to one group at the expense of another, or contribute to deconstructing the system. She suggests that it is time for Pakeha to become more like Maori, rather than

the other way round, as has been the experience of Maori since the signing of the Treaty.

### **The changes in response to these concerns**

A need to consider the discipline's responsibilities to Maori, has been voiced with increasing intensity over the previous two decades (NZPS, 1995). At the 1975 annual conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society Jules Older called for concerted efforts to recruit and retain Maori students. In "The Pakeha Papers" he outlined his proposal for Equal Education Opportunities, amounting to an increase in the number of Maori psychologists, to numbers at least proportional to the percentage of Maori in the general population (Older, 1978). The remit for change was not accepted, and a manuscript containing his proposal was also rejected by the editorial board of the New Zealand Journal of Psychology. This may have been indicative of general lack of concern amongst psychological practitioners with respect to Maori experience of psychology, at that time.

During the same period, public attention had increasingly focused on the dynamics of Pakeha - Maori partnership, due to the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi Act, in 1975. Despite this, institutional consciousness, such as that exhibited at the 1975 annual conference, did not lead towards significantly dealing with Maori concerns in the short term.

Momentum at a structural level was again called for, a decade later, by Abbott and Durie (1986). They reported a complete lack of Maori graduates from professional psychology programmes in the previous two years, and a general lack of enthusiasm by programme directors to attract Maori students. They described applied psychology as

... probably the most monocultural, in terms of Maori representation, of all New Zealand professions. (67)

They also pointed out that psychology programmes had been slower to develop a bicultural orientation than other health professions.

These observations prompted some swift and significant steps to attend to Maori concerns for the discipline. Linda Nikora was appointed the first Maori staff member of a New Zealand psychology department. This was followed by the submission of a remit of Older's recommendations for change. On its acceptance, the professional society became positioned to make concerted efforts to train more Maori psychologists.

The society established a Kaupapa Maori Working Party to advise the society and to guide operations. This group created a National Standing Committee of Bicultural Issues (NSCBI). The committee was given responsibilities to monitor the development of bicultural issues, organise symposia at annual conferences, and disseminate information on issues of indigenous development. A significant endorsement to facilitate a bicultural repositioning came in the society's adoption of rule three into the constitution:

In giving effect to the objects for which the Society is established the Society shall encourage policies and practices that reflect New Zealand's cultural diversity and shall in particular, have due regard for the spirit and intent of the Treaty of Waitangi (NSCBI, 1993, 3).

The movement toward a more bicultural psychology has been carefully monitored in recent years. Three surveys will be briefly discussed here, as they consider the reaction to calls to reform psychological teaching and practice since 1989. Sawrey (1990), Brady (1992) and the New Zealand Psychological Society (1995) explain that there has been a lack of progress towards a more bicultural psychology for New Zealand.

Sawrey (1990) drew attention to the monocultural nature of institutional psychological services and opinion regarding Maori concerns. Of 163 psychologists approached, 97% identified themselves as Pakeha and only one identified him/herself as Maori. Over 80% of the respondents estimated that more than 30% of their clients were Maori. Over 75% of respondents felt their knowledge of taha Maori was inadequate to work effectively with Maori clients. Despite this less than half agreed that there should be compulsory courses in taha Maori comprising 20% of the training for clinical psychologists.

Brady reported in 1992, that there were no Maori staff in any of the clinical psychology programmes of the six New Zealand universities. Only three Maori students had graduated from clinical psychology programmes in the six years before the survey.

She also identified several hurdles that Maori students faced to successfully completing a clinical programme.

The first obstacle was that Maori and Pakeha were competing for places based on their undergraduate grades which Maori had to work harder to attain in the first instance. A second obstacle was identified in the program selection phase. Five out of six recruitment situations did not operate culturally relevant protocol for interviewing applicants unless specifically requested. Typically the selection panels were composed of Pakeha academics and clinicians, who would attribute different value to aspects of the interview performance than a Maori interviewer would. For example, whereas family involvement may not be of great significance to a Pakeha candidate, self-presentation is lesser significance to the familial presentation of a Maori candidate (Nikora, 1991, in Brady 1992).

The clinical interviews have been seen to have a double negative effect for Maori, firstly, by minimising the opportunity for best presentation of a Maori candidate, and secondly, by reinforcing the sense of alienation experienced by Maori students. A sense of alienation is compounded by the interview context if Maori values are not represented. This makes the discipline less attractive for future Maori candidates.

The successful Maori recruit is likely to experience further marginalisation through the structure of the programme. Here, European assumptions about the comprehension, status and binding power of the written word over the oral transmission of knowledge are enforced. Content has also been considered problematic:

Maori students are forced to consider human dysfunction in terms which do not reflect Maori beliefs or values systems, and which omit the very essence of Maori cultural existence; spirituality (Sachdev 1990, in Brady 1992, 59).

If a student used spirituality as a theoretical perspective in a clinical submission, without presenting supporting empirical materials, s/he would invariably be penalised. Students are required to adhere to Western literature and practices.

Brady concludes that these features offer little opportunity or encouragement for Maori to develop a culturally alternate position to that of the institution. In the final year, the Maori trainee is likely to have put a Maori mental health perspective to one side, and have adopted Pakeha models of abnormality and therapy, which fall short of Maori needs and put the trainee at risk of rejection by his/her family, as a Pakeha psychologist.

In March of 1995, the NSBCI reported the findings of a survey of the bicultural aspects of psychology teaching, based on departmental public documents. Prospectuses, handbooks and course outlines, were taken to represent the departmental self-definition and the face of psychology presented to potential students. These were also expected to demonstrate efforts being made by staff and departments with respect to becoming more bicultural.

It could not be determined from the materials surveyed whether staff were required, or made specific efforts, to ground their teaching in a New Zealand context, by using local examples and perspectives. This suggested little improvement had been made



in this area since Abbott and Durie made a similar observation in 1986. Only one of the psychology departments included Maori psychology lectures at the first year level. Typically emphasis was seen to be on the generalities of human behaviour removed from any cultural context. Only one psychology department offered Kaupapa Maori tutorials.

In seeking to account for this lack of momentum towards a bicultural psychology, Thomas (1993) suggests that many Pakeha psychological practitioners and teachers are unaware of cultural specificity of the services that they provide, because they have little conception, or experience, of how other services would differ from what is already offered. Nikora and Robertson (1995) observe that although several attempts have been made recently to attempt to improve the delivery of government-funded social services to Maori<sup>1</sup>, these have been limited by remaining under the control of Pakeha-dominated structures.

The experience of 'doing psychology' in a New Zealand university is generally agreed to be becoming less alienating for Maori students (NZPS, 1995). However, reports continue to indicate that there exists a dependency within psychology departments on the efforts of particular individuals. This may be risky, in the sense that improvements become vulnerable to circumstantial changes of individuals (Abbott and Durie, 1987).

Events such as Cultural Justice and Ethics symposium (NSBCI, 1993) confirm that improved and concerted efforts are required to bring about significant bicultural changes. However, it has been suggested that the prescribed task is of too great a

magnitude both in terms of acceptance of responsibility and practicalities of power sharing (Brady, 1992).

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Maori Affairs established, biculturalism training encouraged for Pakeha staff in social service agencies, Maori workers recruited and Maori units established within mainstream social services

## Summary

To this point, a case regarding the marginalisation of Maori concerns, by the discipline of psychology in New Zealand, has been outlined. The disproportionate over-representation of Maori as recipients of mental health services and the under-representation of Maori as students is seen to have warranted an urgent response. These issues of representation and the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand society are considered adequate justification to warn that no training programme can afford not to account for Maori values (Brady, 1992).

However, the findings of surveys undertaken in recent years, have indicated that movement towards a more bicultural psychology has been slow. This is concerning, given the discipline has recognised a need and indicated an ambition, to develop more biculturally (NSBCI, 1993). If practitioners and teachers continue to present only Pakeha perspectives, Maori recipients will continue to experience a sense of alienation and perform poorly or not participate. This will ensure that the discipline's ability to deal with issues of Maori mental health remains unimproved.

The development of a more bicultural psychology is considered dependant upon the willingness of individuals, institutions and organisations, to consult Maori and offer room to implement changes. The present study considers whether the conditions for change are as conducive to implementing change, as they outwardly appear. If support and enthusiasm have been expressed, then why has there been little practical change toward addressing the concerns?

### **What can discourse analysis offer?**

Discourse theorists maintain that the dynamics of a situation such as this may be illuminated by attending to discourses about the topic (Wetherell and Potter, 1992).

Discourse is seen as central to processes of understanding or sense making because it is used to convey, interpret and attribute meaning. It therefore has a fundamental role in determining the construction of our mental and even physical realities (Parker, 1992).

Discourse analysis breaks with the traditional psychological view of language, which holds it to be a neutral and transparent medium (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Alternatively, a post-structuralist perspective of language is promoted which considers language to be an action oriented social tool by which realities are constructed, not simply described (Parker, 1993).

An approach to discourse from this theoretical standpoint maintains a suspicious regard for claims to reveal a world outside of language, and claims that we may experience aspects of ourselves outside of language (Parker, 1993). It is more concerned with what is said to be achieved by its use, rather than the veracity of claims. In this way discourse analysis embraces the Foucauldian notion that a powerful way to undermine a 'truth' is not to counterpoise it with another 'truth' but to examine the processes by which truths and falsities are distinguished (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). This means that analytical focus is on how objects (attitudes, prejudices, personalities) and subjects (self or others) are constructed, or made 'real'.

When constructing an account of a social phenomenon speakers draw on shared meanings and conventional accounting resources to convey sense. These resources are contained in texts and when analysed can show how the political and socio-political realm is produced and reproduced (Parker, 1992). Focus upon the expression of attitudes has demonstrated this process and indicated the utility of discourse analytical tools over more traditional approaches to understanding human expression.

### **Discourse analysis and the expression of attitudes.**

Typically, human behaviour has been considered representative of underlying attitudes (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Discourse theorists however, maintain that attitudes are socially constructed for specific purposes in different contexts. Potter and Wetherell (1987) have offered a detailed critique of the usefulness of the traditional attitude concept. They take issue with the attitude theory assumption that people hold relatively enduring attitudinal positioning in different social contexts. They explain that this assumption is inconsistent with the variability of accounting within discourses.

People are expected to construct accounts to perform different functions in different discursive contexts. These constructions can be drawn from texts and their design and delivery considered in terms of their social locations. This can offer insight as to the effects of perceived norms, social desirability factors and cultural or ideological beliefs in social settings. The application of traditional attitudinal concepts would be less rewarding with respect to these factors.

Billig (1987) similarly rejects the notion that the expression of attitudes is primarily a matter of presenting an inner mental orientation. This author argues that expressing an attitude involves taking an argumentative stance in the context of opposed views. By this analysis, attitudes are seen to be constructed as argumentative positions. Because of the rhetorical context in which they are fashioned, people are expected to justify their stance and criticise competing views. This suggests that a focus on the

multiple and contradictory aspects of attitude construction may offer a discursive researcher insight as to the role of ideology in discourse.

Attitudes have also been seen to be expressed with differing intensity, depending on the attitude holders direct experience with the stimulus, and the frequency of previous expression (Verkuyten, de Jong and Masson, 1994, Van Dijk, 1992). Stronger attitudes may be expressed in a more complex fashion (Verkuyten, de Jong, and Masson, 1994). This is considered indicative of sensitivity to perceived norms (Zammuner, 1987). Those who hold normatively desirable attitudes (e.g. antiracist) may not require much explanation, whereas the expression of more contentious views may draw great elaboration, to ward off social stigmatism (Wetherell and Potter, 1992).

These effects have been studied in a range of different contexts. Van Dijk (1992), for example, has described and analysed the detailed strategies and manoeuvres used in the expression and reproduction of racist language in the Netherlands. He distinguished between a direct and honest expression of peoples views on the one hand, and manoeuvres which are primarily utilised for impression formation, such as denial of prejudice. The contradiction between the presentation of attitudes, and efforts to appear unprejudiced, indicated that speakers felt pressure to account for social desirability factors.

Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gane, Middleton and Radley (1988) similarly noted that when people used phrases such as "I'm not racist, but..", they were attempting to account for contradictory ideological points of view. From this observation they determined that social norms did not only illicit compliance by existing outside of

people, but that they are also internalised, to form the beliefs that people hold.

Discursive accounting, therefore, requires that people organise and construct their accounts around practical ideologies to convey or make sense (Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gane, Middleton and Radley, 1988). These dilemmas arise in almost every aspect of social life where there are oppositional principles available to be supported.

Having drawn attention to some of the complexities of everyday accounting, it is appropriate to further consider some of the ways that people construct accounts to manage audience understanding. To do so speakers draw on existing resources which are expected to be valued by the audience. If a speaker uses resources which the audience does not value s/he is less likely to be convincing. To communicate sensibly then, a speaker must also appeal to shared understandings. These appeals are made with what are sometimes called discursive resources or accounting devices. These can be considered to be the tools of the trade which enable a speaker to manage speaker attention and understanding.



## **Tools of appeal**

Much about the nature of a phenomenon can be learnt by considering the usage of discursive manoeuvres that are used to convey meaning. Justifications, excuses, disclaimers, metaphors and narratives are examples of the sorts of resources that may be available to a speaker, to communicate sensibly and effectively. They are used in accordance with the value that the audience has for them, to gain familiarity and credibility. For example, if a speaker seeks to re-negotiate the terms of an offence, by explaining that a victim 'deserved it', s/he seeks to justify the incident. This indicates the circumstances under which the audience is expected to value the otherwise offensive behaviour.

*Contrastive Rhetoric*

When a speaker presents an opinion, they may have pre-determined that aspects of the account may be unsavoury to the audience or they may wish to ward off perceived criticism. Accordingly the construction and delivery of the account can have accompaniment or be emphasised in ways which reconcile the opinion with shared understandings about object in question.

Counter-arguments may be undermined in several ways. Speakers may offer comparisons with other times or locations, they may draw attention to ambiguity or they may recognise accept an argument alongside other interpretations (on the one hand, on the other hand). This form of accounting has been termed 'contrastive rhetoric' (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). It provides an audience with the opportunity to recognise which state of affairs is preferred.

A broad analysis of contrastive rhetoric has been undertaken by Potter and Wetherell (1987). They offer a typology of justifications and excuses, noting them to be highly conventional acts which are couched in socially approved vocabularies. These can be explored for their regularity and peculiarity to understand more about the social conventions of specific groups. For example, a speaker who seeks to justify poor performance by suggesting that s/he was treated unfairly, makes an appeal to shared understandings about the causes and effects influencing performance in a specific context.

Other authors have focused on how speakers deflect perceived criticism (Van Dijk, 1992, Verkuyten, de Jong and Masson, 1994). Van Dijk (1992) observed that a speaker may do this by reinterpreting the nature of an offence, or by turning the offence around. He noted that speakers listed ways in which they were disadvantaged to undermine the significance of minority discontent. A study by Verkuyten, de Jong and Masson (1994) found that participants sought to justify institutional discrimination, by pointing out that that minority group members discriminated against each other.

These rationalisations are made more effective by appealing to the values of the audience. For example, Western societies are likely to find appeals to principles of modern liberal-democratic thinking particularly persuasive. Van Dijk (1992) observed that accounts which claimed to uphold equality, freedom, and human rights were generally left unquestioned by a Dutch audience. Similarly, Potter and Wetherell (1992) noted that Pakeha New Zealanders appealed to cultural ideals to justify racist and antiracist points of view.

The analysis of disclaimer use can also illuminate social understandings of a phenomenon and its reproduction in specific contexts. Disclaimers are used when a speaker predicts a possible reaction to his/her opinion and wishes to deny its applicability, for example, "I'm not prejudiced... but,..." (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). Lengthening an explanation to take into account a range of counter-arguments has also been seen to make a contentious argument more palatable (Verkuyten, de Jong and Masson, 1994).

### *Narrative*

The storied quality of qualitative textual data enables the analyst to gain a perspective of how people order and express experiences. This perspective recognises that the transmission of information through stories or narratives may be an integral part of cultural experience. Legends, tales of morality, and stories can convey cultural values in narrative form. Tales of atrocity and success may be used to maintain a sense of the collective culture of an organisation. If a cultural group values narrative presentation, they could be expected to remember, organise and transmit their experiences authoritatively within that group (Gergen and Kaye, 1992). That cultural groups place different value upon narrative expression is exemplified between Maori and Pakeha in New Zealand. Maori have relied upon the transmission of information through oral story telling and speeches however Pakeha have relied more heavily upon books and other written documentation. This means that an oral argument based on narrative may require less elaboration in Maori culture because this form of expression is held in high regard.

Edwards and Potter (1992) add that the use of narrative example can be powerful because it makes a claim literal and solid. Even if details are of unique, the combination of personal experience and presentation according to socially shared conventions of reporting can be compelling. It works to establish credibility and positions the speaker as having a degree of expertise with regard to the topic being described. This is effect may be accomplished by claims that someone 'saw it with their own eyes'.

Narrative form and function can be considered in terms of their locations within particular interactions and within social, cultural and institutional discourses. When a narrative is located within power structures and social milieu, they may carry messages which dominate or oppress (Goldberg, 1993). For example, a narrative which depicts a walk-out by a group of protesters asserts a socially negotiated boundary, beyond which behaviour can be condemned as erratic and valueless and the group who performed it are justifiably marginalised. This practice works to strengthen the identity of a group because it reinforces their interpretations as 'desirable'.

## *Metaphor*

Another aspect of language which can be analysed to understand how people make sense of their experiences is metaphor. The essence of metaphor has been simply described as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 5). The term can be used to include analogies, similes and other kinds of imagery that encourage figurative comparison. These can be considered for what the speaker is trying to express, the information they are trying to impart and how his/her interests are being served.

When applied skilfully metaphors have a strong impact because they appeal to a cultures appreciation of literary quality and visual concreteness. This allows them to emphasise particular elements and linkages and de-emphasise others. They are often used to organise the understanding of cause and effect, symptom and essence, and praise and blame.

Metaphor can be used to appeal to cultural ideologies without having to directly assert them. They are therefore used to naturalise subjective accounts as commonsense. As such they have become a key subject in studies of prejudicial discourse. Van Teeffelen (1994) for example, focused on metaphor as a mechanism of stereotyping in fictional best-sellers about Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This study argued that the conflict was used to amplify a general contrast between the western and non-western world. Metaphor was seen to be a key component of this function, used to activate common-sense notions of self versus other, which idealised some and are prejudiced against

others. They were observed to feed upon Western self-other dualities for example, mind-body, culture-nature, and masculinity-femininity. During the Reagan administration a particularly bold triangle of themes was seen to dominate western ideological concerns, Islamic = fanaticism, Palestinian = terrorism and atomic = blackmail. Metaphor invoking these themes was thereby seen to reinforce stereotypical judgements as common-sense.

Van Teeffelen's observations draw attention to the need for the analyst to have particular regard for the context in which a metaphor is used. For example, the dualistic nature of metaphors is culturally specific. In Samoan cultural experience metaphor is used to draw continuum rather than to delineate. In other words they are used to connect such things as humans and water together rather than separate them. Similarly, Maori do not draw a distinction between their own identity and the identity rivers or mountains. Introducing oneself in this context is not simply a matter of stating name and birth information but of establishing links between sections of one's family and the geography of the area from which they came.

### *Subject Positioning*

The construction of 'believable' subjects positions is identified as an important component of discursive accounting;

The constitutive force of each discursive practice lies in its provision of subject positions. A subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structures of rights for those that use that repertoire. Among the products of discursive practices are the very persons who engage them. (Harré and Davies, 1990, 40).

This is therefore seen as an essential component of attitudinal presentation.

When people present subjects in their accounts they appeal to the existing resources that the audience has to understand them. If the speaker is familiar with the workings of these understandings then s/he is likely to be more persuasive. This process is called subject positioning.

The 'positioning' of subjects can be seen as an act to 'represent' in a certain way. As was previously described with regard to metaphor and narrative, representation involves choice about emphasis. A subject is constructed to suit the purposes of the argument. For example, Van Teeffelen (1994) noted how American writers portrayed the desert as a lonely and miserable place to encourage negative judgements about its inhabitants.

Speakers also create their own subject positions. These notions of self are constructed as they are needed to substantiate an argument, for example, one may



present themselves as a victim to avoid being blamed for an offence. How one conceives of self in relation to a phenomenon can therefore be seen to offer valuable information about its existence, perpetuation and possible extinction.

The determinate function of these mechanisms is that they appeal to cultural ideologies (Billig , 1988) or notions of common-sense (McCreanor, 1993a) They can be studied to gain a perspective on how a specific group makes sense of a phenomenon and therefore how it exists and how it may cease to exist. The usage and effects of these mechanisms has been considered in the discourses used to make sense of issues of race related issues in New Zealand.

### **Sense making in New Zealanders discourses about race related issues**

Discursive manoeuvring has been a persuasive feature of historical accounts of Maori - Pakeha interaction. The decline in the Maori population of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, for example, was often explained to European audiences as being a matter of 'fatal impact'. This theory proposed that Maori society would naturally disintegrate as European civilisation in New Zealand expanded (Owens, 1981). Maori in this analysis were positioned as naturally inferior to Europeans. This standpoint justified conscious acts of marginalisation as inconsequential due to the assumed inevitable demise of Maori society.

Belich (1996) also comments about the selective presentation used to justify in the reports of early European visitors to New Zealand.

The stereotyping distorted 'Us' as well as 'Them' through racial 'archotyping' and 'antityping'. An archetype positively idealised 'Us', teaching you what to be; an antitype negatively idealised 'Them' teaching you what not to be. The worst of non-European societies was compared to the best of European. Observers compared temporary Maori shelters to the houses of London merchants rather than to the tenements of Hogarth's Gin Lane. Such stereotyping varied quite predictably, more according to the needs of the observer than the actual characters of the observed (Belich, 1996, 20).

The constructions of Maori in these manoeuvres provided authorisation for the imposition and domination of European institutions in New Zealand.,

Similar effects have been seen in the history of Pakeha accounts of Maori educational performance in New Zealand (Irwin 1988). During the 1960's the *deficit theory* was the predominant way to account for minority underachievement. The theory argued that intrinsic deficiencies in ability of the minority groups lead to educational failure. These deficiencies were Maori ability for language development, Maori child rearing practices and the quality of their home environments.

The evaluation by Pakeha values justified the provision of educational programmes based only on the values of the dominant culture and rationalised that curricula be taught in English only. Pakeha values of child raising, education and organisation were used as yardsticks to measure Maori behaviour in these areas. These forms of assessment have been noted by commentators of New Zealand's social environment as irresponsibly presenting ethnocentric assessment as 'mere description' (Wetherell and Potter, 1992, Belich, 1996).

In the following decade cultural difference became a focus of attention. Culture and language were upheld, by Pakeha, as valid expressions that schools should embrace within the structures of their educational programmes. However attempts to convert this into practice were firmly rejected. They were criticised as representing a 'spaghetti eating and basket weaving' approach to teaching about culture. This criticism implied a superficiality of emphasis and tokenistic recognition of cultural difference.

This experience can be seen to represent how efforts to incorporate Maori cultural and language values have worked to reinforce Pakeha ideological and institutional dominance whilst appearing to recognise Maori needs. Despite the increased cultural content in curriculum the attempts to account for cultural diversity had failed to identify the cultural bias of the whole education system. Essentially the increased concern had resulted in little more than “simplistic additions of some cultural knowledge to a monocultural system” (Irwin, 1988).

This pattern of superficial recognition was maintained during the 1980's, when the debate over educational inequity became more politicised. Racism was increasingly identified as central to issues of inequality, particularly at institutional, collective and personal levels. However, there was still little analysis of the impact of racism on education, and the perpetuation of educational inequality, based on ethnic group membership. Attempts to address inequality during this period were tagged as *band aid* approaches, because they dealt more with symptoms than causes. This meant that changes, which came about from this consciousness, were expected to do little to ensure that educational equality was sustainable.

These observations have prompted calls for a reassessment of the education system, which includes analysis of the cultural bias of education as well as the impact of exclusionary practices.

Discourse based analyses have recently been undertaken in New Zealand to investigate how sense is made of race issues in everyday talk (McCreanor 1993a, 1993b, Wetherell and Potter 1992).

McCreanor (1993a), studied media reports of a Maori protest. He observed that reports encouraged negative evaluations of the protest by appealing to Pakeha stereotypical beliefs. For example, by emphasising Maori land claims to be a threat to Pakeha property, ideological categories such as “bad Maori” and “stirrer” were triggered which thereby solicited support for the current argument. McCreanor considered these sorts constructions to appeal to ‘Pakeha notions of common-sense’. The process of triggering these ideological resources was seen as effective both in terms of persuading the audience and in the reinforcement of cultural values:

The patterns act as boundaries or fields within which the common sense of a social group can flow with ease and beyond which the speakers discourse can expect to be met with hostility and incomprehension. It is this reliance by media etc. that ensures the reproduction of our social order without recourse to an ideological police force (McCreanor, 1993a, 88).

McGregor (1991) also surveyed media performance in constructing realities about race relations issues in New Zealand. Presentations of Maori concerns were found to often rely upon stereotyping, misrepresentation, omission, lack of alternative information, absence of basic information and dearth of background exposition.

The emphasis, from a discourse analysis perspective however, would not be on the extent or measurement of the distortions, but that observations such as these contribute to understanding race relations as a socially constructed phenomenon. It may therefore be reproduced for particular functions by agencies such as the media, politicians or in more everyday conversation.

More comprehensive analyses of the specific discursive manoeuvres used to construct realities about race relations in New Zealand has been offered by McCreanor (1993a, 1993b) and Wetherell and Potter (1992). These draw attention to the discursive resources available to Pakeha to make sense of race relations in New Zealand's unique cultural context.

McCreanor's observations of everyday constructions of biculturalism, have drawn out many of the linguistic resources of those who wish to counter challenges from Maori or others concerning the state of Maori - Pakeha relations. Particularly informing is a study of the discursive manoeuvres of a political minister to reconcile Maori grievances with the interests of a conservative Pakeha audience (McCreanor, 1993b).

In attempting to gain support for governmental negotiations and settlements with Maori the minister positioned Maori and Pakeha according to Pakeha values or according to Pakeha notions of common-sense. For example, the minister worked to implicate Maori and Pakeha as responsible for progressive changes by citing ideological sentiments for example, 'it takes two to tango'. Similarly, governmental attention to treaty based claims for iwi recompense were made more palatable when Maori were

positioned as wanting to get out of 'grievance' mode and into 'production' mode. This encouraged the audience to feel that they were in control and therefore able to facilitate change with little threat to their own position.

This differentiation of good Maori and bad Maori was one of the themes or patterns which were conceptualised as highly flexible resources, from which a commonsense version of Maori/Pakeha relations can be constructed to meet the needs of any particular situation. They were seen as able to be employed in concert or in contrast to other patterns. Each could also be evoked by a few words but has plenty of room for qualification, explanation or justification. The appeals to themes such as this good Maori/bad Maori for instance could be further authorised for Pakeha senses, if accompanied with details and dates or other respected aspects of Pakeha narrative such as self experience and familiarity with competing views, for example;

Now to many New Zealanders that's a nuisance. They don't know what the grievances are. They believed they all occurred in 1840 or thereabouts and therefore it's far to long to worry about (Graham, quoted in McCreanor, 1993b).

These forms of presentation were seen to demonstrate that by expressing familiarity with the 'standard story' and presenting its tenets as understandable a speaker could gain a position of credibility, from which the 'standard story' could be undermined. This process secures the audiences attention, then redirects focus around undesirable areas and towards more desirable one. This observation confirms that the

construction of accounts according to culturally negotiated meanings is a critical component understandings in the persuasiveness of an argument.

The reinforcement of Pakeha systems of authorisation was seen consistently relied upon to secure the audiences attention and confidence. When talking about Treaty grievances Graham pointed out that “not all grievances are valid”. In doing this the speaker established a notion of valid and invalid and subsequently also reinforced Pakeha control of the process of legitimisation.

Also critical to effective delivery was the tactical move to present in line with Pakeha values of conceptualising the past. McCreanor cites Foucault “that while Pakeha do have a regard for history it is a very particular cultural form which is deeply inscribed with the ideological and epistemological traditions through which it was made and can only be coherently read in light of these traditions” This dictates how Graham presents the case for addressing treaty grievances i.e. “I don't feel guilty about what was done in the past I feel guilty about what isn't being done now.” This allows people to take the initiative to assume responsibility rather than be forced to.

The observations made by McCreanor about the functions of political/elite discourse draw attention to dynamics which are likely to play a role in the process of developing a more bicultural psychology. They indicate that sense making procedures in everyday discursive interaction, may, by reinforcing the value of dominant group understandings, marginalise minority group interests. This indicates a need to consider the exclusionary effects of everyday New Zealand discourse about race and race related matters, to understand how to develop more biculturally.



These observations also indicate that the marginalisation of minority group values is increasing based on more subtle and more complex systems of discursive accounting. Reeves also noted that there are many culturally exclusive systems worldwide which are maintained without showing outwardly recognisable signs of resistance (Reeves, 1983). This is noted in New Zealand society by McCreanor, who observes that;

...speakers wishing to avoid the real challenge of Maori sovereignty, can draw upon new levels of subtlety which have the advantage of dispelling anti-racist critiques currently in use (McCreanor 1993a, 58).

Researchers have approached this trend by focusing on subjects accounts, to detect racist views and analyse the cultural reproduction of racism. (Reeves 1983, Van Dijk, 1992, Wetherell and Potter 1992, McCreanor, 1993a). These analyses of accounts have been particularly useful in understanding the linkage between expression of attitudes and dominant ideological systems. They offer further encouragement for a discourse based analysis of the process of developing a more bicultural psychology. This may help understand why achievement of bicultural goals has not yet happened, despite the apparent absence of outwardly exclusionary accounting

## Summary

The practice and teaching of psychology in New Zealand has been experienced as alienating by Maori. The discipline in response has taken steps to conceptualise how to develop more biculturally. However these have not yet been converted into satisfactory structural practice. This has indicated that there is resistance to change. Understanding the nature of this resistance is important to being able to account for it.

How people make sense of such concerns has been highlighted as essential to how they will be dealt with. It has been suggested that although outward expression of enthusiasm may be prominent this may not pre-empt practical responses. Alternatively, people may construct versions of the need to develop more biculturally, which appear supportive but may reinforce existing systems which actively exclude.

Literature has been considered that has tended to the linkage between discursive construction and ideological systems of marginalisation. This was seen to encourage a case for investigating the discourses of those within the discipline, to see how they make sense of biculturalism and a perceived 'need to change'. This exercise may provide opportunity for a discussion of the role of academic constructions in the process of bicultural development, and the implications of their constructions for minority group concerns.

## *Chapter Two*

### METHOD

#### **Data Collection and Handling**

The data analysed in this study were ten transcripts of discussions held between the primary researcher and Non-Maori Psychology Department teaching staff. The first five discussions were held with staff from Massey University of Palmerston in late March and early April of 1996. The remaining five were conducted with staff from Victoria University of Wellington, during April and May of 1996.

Maori members of staff and those supervising the research project were ineligible to participate in the study. It was unnecessary for Maori lecturers to participate because the research was concerned with reasons why bicultural changes have not been undertaken. Opportunity to have given effect to such changes is seen to rest in Pakeha hands. The project is therefore concerned with Pakeha sense making procedures. The ineligibility of the research supervisors avoided conflict of interests issues which may have arisen in later interpretative work.

Participants were involved in the study on a voluntary basis. Recruitment of participants involved two stages of contact. Firstly, those eligible to participate were given a copy of the project information sheet (Appendix A). They were offered time to

consider the rationale and method of the study, and the issues of participation. The researcher returned to each person at a later date to answer any queries that they had regarding the research. Those willing to participate were required to confirm that they were comfortable to do so and give their written informed consent (Appendix B), prior to participation.

The interviews held between the researcher and participants were of semi-structured nature. The researcher asked each participant for their views on issues of bicultural development. The issues discussed were promoted as relevant to the process of bicultural development by a report on the findings of a New Zealand Psychological Society survey (1995).

A major area of concentration was the practice of presenting psychological theory in New Zealand universities. This included discussion about the presence, performance and experience of Maori students in the discipline, and the significance of the Western psychological theories for the local bicultural context.

Also discussed were the possible implications and practicalities of adapting psychological training toward increased acknowledgement of Maori values. Participants therefore provided their views on disciplinary efforts to develop more biculturally. Also sought were participants views on the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi for teaching psychology in New Zealand and the role of initiatives such as Kaupapa Maori tutorials in this process of change.

The researcher's primary role in the discussion settings was to facilitate the provision of interviewee discourses about these issues. Participants were therefore encouraged to elaborate on issues which they considered to be of significance.

The interviews ranged in duration from twenty five minutes to one hour. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed.

The transcription conventions used were chosen to facilitate readability and comprehension of the participants discourses. They were by no means expected to account for the differences between talk and text (Edwards and Potter, 1992). More technical devices, for example, timed pauses and changes of intonation, were not required, because analytical focus was directed at the content and broader argumentative patterns of the discourses provided. The more practical and less time consuming choice of conventions employed in the present study had been recommended by Parker (1992).

The researcher was particularly concerned at all times to maintain the anonymity of the participants involved. Pseudonyms were used in all reference to materials related to individual involvement from the time of data collection onward. Identifiers within quotations were also deleted. This was considered necessary because interviewees were requested to offer their reflections about departmental and individual performance on topics of internal and wider public political contention. Such measures to ensure participant anonymity were therefore used to maintain the confidence of the interviewees and to facilitate least inhibited expression possible.

None of the ten interviewees exercised their rights to withdraw from the research at any stage or to decline to talk about any issues.

The interview transcripts were managed with NUD\*IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorising) software. This was used to code and search the data.

### **Method of Analysis**

The analytical standpoint, maintained by the researcher, toward issues of bicultural development and Maori concerns, is informed by the literature outlined. Concerns have been voiced in relation to the representation of things Maori (knowledge, values, staff, students) by the discipline. These concerns were compounded by unsatisfactory disciplinary response. These themes are discussed in the interviews and the discourses analysed in term of how they contributed to the reproduction of this dynamic.

The appropriateness of the recommendations made to incorporate things Maori into the discipline so as to develop a more bicultural psychology, is not the concern of the researcher. Recommendations regarding Kaupapa Maori tutorials, Maori staff, Maori students and greater acknowledgement of the Treaty of Waitangi are embraced, in the sense that to the participants, they are expected to represent Maori concerns and issues of bicultural development for the discipline. They are used to gain access to the discursive resources available to Pakeha lecturers to make sense of issues of bicultural development in New Zealand psychology. This assumption is the rationale behind references, in the analysis, to 'Maori concerns'.

These concerns, are discussed with the participants to determine how the discipline, psychological theory, disciplinary practice, lines of accountability, Maori students, staff, tutorials and recipients of psychological services, are made sense of in the context of concerns for bicultural development. This is undertaken to enable a informed discussion about the implications of participant constructions, for the provision of a more bicultural psychology in New Zealand.

Of primary focus in this project are participant sense making strategies which may be used to account for disciplinary response to Maori concerns. In the interview context, participants were expected to offer what they consider to be 'sensible' in a medium that they deem to be socially appropriate and persuasive. In doing so they show what are acceptable ways of accounting for these issues and also draw attention to understandings that are expected to support them. For example, an argument that offers support for immigration of Asians to New Zealand, may be offered on the condition that they are not a burden in New Zealand society. This condition of acceptance is a component of the argument which is unlikely to be elaborated on by the speaker. It is an appeal to shared values or commonsense, and therefore is anticipated to not require justification.

The present analysis undertakes to deconstruct meanings and values associated with commonsense assertions such as this. This is anticipated to illuminate the processes by which they gain veracity or 'matter of fact' status. Asian immigration for example, may be seen as necessary to conform to Pakeha values of productivity and nationalism.

It may therefore reinforce a dominant discourse that 'immigration of Asians is acceptable so long as they behave like us'.

The delivery and acceptance of these dominant messages, reinforces existing power relations (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). When those in power present a Western system of authorisation as logical and commonsensical they work to preserve the status quo and resist change. These constructionist effects are the concern of the present analysis as they shed light on the processes by which changes are made, or resisted.

The analysis will uphold discourses which work to resist change toward a more bicultural psychology, however this focus should not be taken to indicate that a lack of constructive and supportive accounting was available to be considered. The focus upon resistant discourses represents problem-oriented nature of the research. It was developed from a context in which psychology was criticised for ignoring the concerns of Maori. The analysis therefore sets about to determine whether the realities constructed in talk, enforce, exclude or resist those concerns. This may facilitate increased consciousness about the subjectivity of constructed realities in everyday accounts of biculturalism.

Where an aspect of an extract is explained to have an effect to discredit, illegitimate, or invalidate Maori points of view the reader should be conscious of the assumptions made by the author about the legitimacy of Maori claims. The legitimacy ascribed to these claims is based on findings in the literature, which argue that a Maori point of view has been overlooked, and is deserving of greater attention. The extracts



will be analysed in terms of the functions that they have upon this situation however no attempt is made to construe the 'true' intentions of the speaker.

Once this analytical focus has become familiar to the reader, the depth of analysis of accounts will typically appear in more summarised form. This is intended to avoid reiteration of analytical standpoint information.

The number of extracts offered to illustrate a specific type of discursive accounting is restricted to allow consideration of the same effect in as many discourses as possible. The research is more concerned to draw attention to a process rather than specific manifestations of resistant accounting. The extracts are therefore primarily illustrative.

It is not important to this research that the extracts are not seen to represent the standpoints of particular individuals or departments, and such distinctions are therefore absent. The extracts included in the analysis represent discourses not people. They are offered as examples of discourses which are available to staff members to account for Maori concerns for the discipline of psychology. Their availability and employment in the interview context indicates their existence, and therefore their availability to effect the process of bicultural development.

Subject positioning receives considerable attention in the following analysis. The self-images available to the participants are considered for what they achieve for the speaker, immediately, inter-personally and in terms of wider social implications. The analysis undertakes to show what kinds of characters emerge in the discourses of participants, how these are constructed, and the functions they may perform.

The form used to assist understanding, for example, metaphor, undeniableity devices, extreme case formulations, generalisations or rhetorical questions receive attention as they are employed. They are discussed in the contexts in which they are used and their function examined with respect to the research questions. For example, a participant may narrate a personal experience of sexual harassment to authorise the generalisation that all men are sexist. This use of narrative in this case would be analysed in terms of how it constructs those concerned, the values that it appeals to and functions it claims to perform.

The management of location in participants accounts will also be considered. This acknowledges that how an argument is situated may reveal much about cultural values and the ability of speakers to appeal to them for particular functions. For example, an argument advocating protection of the environment, may be persuasive if located in a framework of generational responsibility, because 'providing for one's family' may be expected to be a principle which is highly valued by the audience.

Participants were expected to be familiar with topics covered and able to offer informed opinions about them. These may be derived from their exposure to issues through the media, the professional society, conversation with other staff, students, publications and other fora of discursive interaction. From these contexts they would acquire a range of discursive resources, which become available to them to construct their own accounts about the issues in question.

Participants were expected to account for aspects of social desirability (for example, anti-racist sentiments), and for role expectation factors (for example, teachers should...). These features of accounting were to be of particular focus in analysis because they offer information about the function that the speakers seek to perform with specific types of constructions.

There are other aspects of the interview context likely to affect the accounting of participants which warrant consideration. It should however be realised that pointing to these features does not indicate an attempt to eliminate or account for variable effects to authorise generalisation of findings. Attempts to contain this variation would be counter-productive to attaining an idea of the range of accounting devices available to participants.

The participants were expected to construct their presentations based on assumptions made about the motivation of the research and the position of the interviewer. The accounting procedures therefore will be considered for standpoint that they seek to legitimise. For example, the presentation of this topic for consideration by a student to a lecturer in the current social and political climate could be seen by the participants, as maintaining a supportive stance for the concerns to be recognised.

That the research was developed in response to criticisms raised by Maori, about the nature of psychological presentation, is a further factor in understanding the context within which participants provided their thoughts. From time of initial contact with the research, participants were expected to realise the significance of their positioning as

representatives of a system which had been criticised by this group. It was therefore expected that participants would construct their discourse, to account for this premise.

These variables indicate principally that the analysis of resistant discourses needed to be undertaken reflexively. The researcher needs to be sensitive to the process by which meaning is attributed to the data. Although the reading by no means claims to be exhaustive it must be stressed as being 'a' reading of the texts. The researcher will be seeking to ascertain and promote discourses which show how Maori concerns and the need to develop a more bicultural psychology are made sense of. This may then enable a discussion of the effects of these sense making procedures.

## *Chapter Three*

### ANALYSIS

#### **Discoursing Resistance**

This analysis of resistant discourses is organised and presented around a set of main themes, which are outlined below. Each extract analysed represented at least one of these themes. Often extracts contained appeals to more than one theme. This was considered to indicate the familiarity, flexibility and usefulness of deployment, of these discursive resources in everyday talk. The categorisations provided are primarily offered for purposes of readability than representation.

## **Main themes of analysis**

### *Conceptualising inclusion -*

In this section, accounts are considered which deal with significance of Maori psychological knowledge, the Treaty of Waitangi, and the ethnicity of staff members, to teaching psychology in New Zealand.

### *In all fairness -*

Analysis of accounts which claim to represent 'everyone's best interests' and 'their best interests'.

### *Comparatively speaking -*

This section considers rationalisations which draw international, institutional and departmental comparisons, to justify local performance.

### *Too Hard basket -*

Focus here is on accounts which point to difficulties of understanding Maori concerns and taking action in response to them.

## Conceptualising inclusion

### *Maori psychological knowledge*

'Exclusionary discourse' is a term used here to refer to accounts which legitimate the exclusion of things Maori (e.g. students, staff, language, constructs of mental health) from psychology in New Zealand universities.

This section looks at some of the ways that accounts justified the exclusion of Maori psychological constructs and meanings from psychology courses. In the first account, exclusion is justified through an elaborate determination of the incompatibility of traditional beliefs, with scientific enquiry.

I think that's like asking the question in Africa, where should traditional folk remedies and voodoo and that sort of thing sit alongside experimental medicine. I suppose their goals are the same thing they're trying to explain behaviour, the techniques that they use are different. I've always been taught and I teach my students that something has to be falsifiable, now voodoo is not falsifiable you can't prove it doesn't work, whereas if I find that by doing x, y and z to anorectics, does a, b and c you know, somebody can carry out an experiment to show that what I said was true. I call that science. If somebody else wants to say, you know like qualitative research they say well okay that may be science but it doesn't get at the questions that we want to get at. I say fine you know, I'm not trying to force, if you want to come here and learn what I call science I will be glad to teach it to you, and the university pays me to teach it to you. If you want to go and do voodoo or whatever or healing

medicine, then that's fine, you go where you want to go, and people who want your kind of medicine will go to you and people who want the kind of medicine that I teach will come to me. (Participant 6)

In this passage the participant justifies the exclusion of Maori knowledge, on the basis that it does not meet criteria of empirical validation. The dominance of empirical thought is explained empirically as rational, the product of testing and validation, and as a passive entity. Under such a system Maori knowledge would have every opportunity for inclusion, if it were to demonstrate validity according to these criteria. This is an important barrier to inclusion, that should be explored with attention also given to the speaker's chosen medium of delivery.

The participant seeks to justify this barrier by considering the position of voodoo medicine in relation to experimental medicine. This is offered as a comparison with Maori psychological knowledge, whereby the participant asks that 'this situation be considered in terms of that situation'. In drawing this metaphor, the author appeals to the resources that the audience has to understand 'that situation' (voodoo medicine). The speaker should therefore be seen to have predicted what these understandings may be, because if s/he had no idea, then a metaphorical comparison would be of little effect.

Typically, western understanding of voodoo medicine can be seen as derived from colonial contexts, in which activities such as the spread of Christianity, or land and resource acquisition, took precedence over respect and understanding of indigenous cultures and practices. These ambitions were facilitated by the suppression of indigenous forms of spirituality. Traditional healing practices were condemned by European value



systems, with little regard for the context in which they had evolved and been relied upon for centuries. Because of this understanding gap, Voodoo practice has been popularly conceptualised as strange and eerie. This is a stereotype, which has been reinforced in Western cultures through mediums such as cinema and literature. This extract illustrates how it is also reinforced in everyday communication.

The speaker can be expected to have a firm grounding in the working of western stereotypes about voodoo medicine. When the metaphor is drawn in light of these stereotypes with no distinction offered, it can be seen to be drawing on these subjective and sensationalised understandings. This does a lot more than merely describe or compare. If the audience takes ‘this situation to be like that situation’ the metaphor can be seen to undermine the significance of Maori knowledge, for psychology programs in New Zealand.

The speaker’s legitimisation of the exclusion of Maori knowledge, does not only rely upon an appeal to Western understandings of voodoo medicine. The case is also built around an assertion of the legitimacy of empirical thought and validation. The participant explains that exclusion is justified by an observed lack of scientific validity

To convince the audience, the participant draws heavily on standardised rhetoric of the empirical paradigm. From a scientist practitioner perspective, falsifiability is a concept that holds high value, because it allows sense to be made and value to be attributed, to that which is available for experimentation. The participant explains that voodoo has little value from this perspective because it can’t be ‘proved’ to be wrong. As such, it cannot be confidently attributed value, or ‘truth’ status.

This system of validation is presented as existing unthreateningly with impact only upon those who 'choose' to subscribe to it ("I'm not trying to force you"). This perspective under-rates the impact of the scientific paradigm. It also de-emphasises the significance of Maori psychological knowledge not being part of qualified institutional training programs, because the dominance of the empirical paradigm has been denied.

The author makes an appeal to the right of the paradigm to exist (as opposed to the right to dominate). In doing this, attention is diverted away from the mechanisms and effects of domination. In the account, students are conceptualised as voluntary subscribers to the paradigm, however the domination of the scientific paradigm can be realised as being of much greater significance. Its maintenance is validated by a system of self-regeneration through further testing and ensured by the marginalisation of other forms of knowledge such as those of minority groups. The under-estimation shown in the analysis therefore has an important preservative function, which is to manipulate understanding the status-quo.

The participants exclusionary discourses rarely challenged the validity of Maori knowledge as explicitly as in the previous extract. Alternatively, participants explained that Maori knowledge was 'incompatible' with existing teaching structures. The following discussion considers the function of critiques which positioned the status quo and Western values as 'more true and more real' than Maori versions.

### *Treaty of Waitangi*

The Treaty of Waitangi is an important source for legitimising the inclusion of Maori knowledge in psychology, and therefore for arguments which call for a more bicultural psychology. Recommendations which attend to the ‘spirit’ of the Treaty, draw on a theme of equality and partnership between Maori and Pakeha. These have come to be principles of significant value in Pakeha society.

Fulfilling treaty obligations however comes at a cost to Pakeha society. Successful claims for redress of treaty grievances have facilitated the return of Pakeha controlled assets into Maori hands, or forced room to be made for Maori in systems which have been managed exclusively by Pakeha. If such claims are seen to pose a threat to ones own security this may be represented in discursive accounts about the significance of the treaty.

Acceptance of the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi, to teaching psychology in New Zealand, could also be seen to accept that it could have been done a lot earlier. The availability and rejection of prescriptions for treaty based change, over the previous decade, would also become more apparent. Acceptance may therefore be seen as involving admission of neglect, resistance or avoidance, and, it could be seen as recognising a need for major structural changes.

These are some of the consequences of acceptance of the Treaty of Waitangi as an authoritative and prescriptive document. They could pose a threat to one’s own

activities. Such dilemmas appeared to come to the fore, when participants accounted for the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi, for teaching psychology.

In the first passage explored here, the participant changes the focus of attention from 'this treaty' to 'treaties in general';

I think that psychology should respond to other things rather than governmental treaties, I think if the government decides that their going to have a treaty with Hong Kong, like the British government had a treaty with China about Hong Kong I don't think that should influence psychology departments in Dundee. If the government who controls the finances of the university decides that it's important enough to step in and influence universities in Dundee because of the great importance of this treaty you know that's their power to do it and so on. But if you're asking the members of the psychology department whether they should be influenced by you know in Scotland by a Treaty that the English government set up in America in 1666 I think its unworkable and I think there are other things like moral values and what students want and what staff want, what people in their best kind considerate human judgement think are the directions that the people should go rather than say well you know we had a treaty with the people of America in 1666 and therefore we shouldn't drink tea on Thursday because of the tea party or whatever.

(Participant 6)

The first significant effect of this account is that attention is refocused from the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi, to the effects of being directed by treaties more generally. The participant has thereby started his/her response by moving the parameters

of the discussion, from the specific to the general. When this is done, the argument is refocused on a specific again, but one of the participant's choosing.

In this case, the participant considers how a treaty between Britain and China, regarding Hong Kong, could affect psychology departments in Dundee. This can be considered for the 'distancing' that it performs, or the 'safety' that it offers. For example, it is 'safer' to undermine the significance of the treaty between Britain and China, than to undermine a treaty which is of constitutional significance for New Zealand society.

Trivialisation, is achieved technically, by the use of a hypothetical extreme case formulation. The participant compares the implications of a treaty between Hong Kong and Britain, for a Scottish university, with implications of a treaty between Maori and Pakeha for New Zealand universities. The implied nonsense of the first scenario, undermines the validity of the Treaty of Waitangi, by its assumed similarity. The participant however offers no exploration of a possible linkage between them. There is also no differentiation between the treaties.

This trivialisation continues, with reference to a treaty between the British and the Americans which was said to have happened in 1666 (This mistaken dating could be taken to be an appeal to a sense that 'if one can't even remember when something happened, then the event is unlikely to be of great importance'). In the account, an even more ridiculous scenario is proposed as 'likely to eventuate', if a rule of unconditional adherence to treaties was followed.

This represents a further shift away from the original bone of contention. This can be illustrated by drawing attention to the units of comparison that the participant is proposing. For example, if the statement, “and therefore we shouldn’t drink tea on Thursday, because of the tea party” is compared with the notion that, ‘Maori knowledge has a place in psychology, ascribed to it, by the treaty of Waitangi’, then the comparison appears in a different light. If now the metaphor is considered in terms of New Zealand’s social and political contexts, it could be considered as anything from offensive trivialisation, to irresponsible neglect of ‘constitution type’ responsibilities.

The subject positioning involved in the presentation of the argument is also noteworthy. For example, at the conclusion of the extreme case formulation, the speaker offers rhetorical comment about the common-sense of the account; “I think there are other things like moral values, and what students want, and what staff want, what people in their best kind considerate human judgement think are the directions, that the people should go”. This is offered as an alternative, to being required to drink tea in recognition of a treaty every Thursday.

The participant offers it to the listener as an ‘undeniability device’. The rhetorical affirmation of its undeniability, is intended to be generalised, to the case for the incorporation of Maori knowledge based on the Treaty of Waitangi. If this appeal is considered for its applicability to the Treaty of Waitangi argument, it is less convincing. Incorporating Maori knowledge into psychology would be, a reaction to student and staff concern, and arguably one which is more kind, considerate and humane than the maintenance of an exclusionary system. It is the speakers ability to smudge over the link

between these two sides of the comparison which determines the persuasiveness of the argument.

Typically, participants seemed more comfortable to challenge by-products of the Treaty of Waitangi, rather than the legitimacy of the document itself. If, for example treaty based prescriptions for better bicultural performance could be undermined, the significance of the document would be minimised without having positioned oneself, as being against the socially desired principles of equality and partnership.

It's not a clean area in terms of getting opinions about it, there's such diverse opinions about what it means. There's such diverse, well this comes back to the issue when you've got people at one extreme saying this is what it, needs, very individual responses, so converting it into a meaningful sort of practice, you know it's very vague in that respect.  
(Participant 2)

In this instance, the participant externalises control of ability to implement changes, by drawing attention to difficulties of knowing what to do. From this perspective, Maori are seen as curtailing their own opportunities for change. Pakeha are presented as willing to action changes, but restrained by factors beyond their control.

The participant refers to a conversion of information into a “meaningful sort of practice”. This may be understood to mean that the opinions of people “at one extreme”, “diverse opinions” and “individual responses” ‘lack meaning’. Exclusion is therefore justified on the basis that the information about how to proceed, does not conform to

certain common-sense principles. In this instance, consensus and moderation are desired, instead of “very individual responses” and what “people at one extreme” say.

The pre-requisite for change can, by this analysis, be seen as a matter of conformity to a system of Pakeha legitimisation. It is presented as a more responsible, and preferable, way to proceed, through the use of words like “clean” and “meaningful”. “Diverse opinion” and “individual responses”, in this context are unproductive.

### *Maori staff*

Increasing the numbers of Maori staff within the academic psychology departments has been recommended as fundamental to the development of a more bicultural psychology. Reflection on how non-Maori members of staff make sense of this recommendation, may cast light on the dynamics of change, and the atmosphere into which Maori staff, students and ideas would be included.

The appointment of Maori staff is conceptualised openly by some, as a superficial measure, designed to subdue complainants, rather than to address bicultural practices. For example, in the following extract;

Our first Maori lecturer has been here four years and she has taught one course in all that time and she has taught twelve students, you know what's, what's happening? I don't know. She taught one of my students, I had a student who was failing, who never came to any classes, clearly



didn't have a clue, so she moved into a special class and she ended up getting an A. What she's learning? You know, if the answer is to give people who you know, in certain categories 'A's (grade) , well that's fine. If that's what the department wants to do then that's what I'll do. I was in another university where the head of department said I want all first year students to get an A 'cos that'll encourage them to stay in psychology and he was head of department and every student got an A. You know if that's the way people want to run things then that's the way they run things. I don't know how you do it. You sure as hell don't do it by hiring Maori lecturers that don't do anything. (Participant 6)

There are three functions of this extract that will be considered here. These are the participant's performance assessment, the narrative about unfairness, and the construction of self as rational and powerless. The potent combination of these three accounting devices in a short extract is alarming, especially when analysing for subtle reinforcing effects.

In the first case, the participant undertakes a quantitative assessment of the lecturer's performance. It is suggested that because the Maori staff member has taught twelve students in four years, s/he has been operating under-productively. In making this judgement, the participant appeals to Pakeha common-sense principle that everyone 'should pull their weight'. The lecturer, by this analysis, is considered to be carried by the efforts of others. The conditions of this judgement warrant further consideration.

The participant's argument is based on a notion of role equivalency of all lecturers within the department. The judgement of under-performance, is based on an assumption that the Maori lecturer operates under the same established conditions, and

same pressures as other lecturers in the department. If this judgement were accurate, the performance of the Maori lecturer could indeed be deemed poor, however their is little role equivalency between Maori and Pakeha staff within psychology departments.

There are differences between acting within an established sector of the department, for example, cognitive psychology, and acting to establish a new sector of the department, which involves implementing a disciplinary approach. Abbott and Durie (1986), for example, noted the difficulties of being a single Maori representative within the department. They indicated a tendency for anything related to culture to be forwarded to that staff member.

Without accounting for these features of the departmental context, the account may be considered negligent. It applies a theory of legitimisation, but is dismissive of variables which may cause such performance. The use of this accounting manoeuvre indicates how everyday exclusionary judgements of this sort, may not be expected to need grounding in contextual variables.

To strengthen his/her case the participant offers a narrative describing how a student's received a better grade in a Maori staff member's class, than they received in his/her own class. Personal familiarity is cited as the basis for expecting that the student could not perform to an 'A' grade level, in a different class. This implies that an exceptional and somewhat sinister grading process, has been used in the Maori staff member's class. The student's performance, (in what has now become a "special class") is implied to be an illegitimate product of bias, and a representation of the dubiousness

of the Maori lectureships. This first narrative, however, is swiftly followed by a second, which draws attention away from the contentiousness of the first.

The construction of self which the participant uses to express his/her frustration, could be expected to have a significant impact upon the audience. It is presented as unfair that a student who “clearly didn’t have a clue” should receive instant gratification, simply by moving classes. This sense was introduced with the phrase “what’s happening?”. This confusion is amplified once the two narrative examples have been offered. As the irrational decisions are described a position of ‘astute, but powerless consumer watchdog’ emerges for the participant.

A common and very skilful feature of this presentation, is the ability of the participant to seemingly identify a principle, which gives force to an argument, and use it in his/her counter-argument (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). For example, calls for more Maori staff, are often based on principles of equal or fair representation. This has been countered by the participant, by referencing the unfair grading of students in a Maori staff members class.

Lack of power is another theme within the complainants discourse, which is appealed to by participant in response, to undermine Maori arguments for greater acknowledgement of their values. In this instance, the participant positions him/herself as powerless to do anything about the unfair treatment of students in the ‘special’ class. This draws attention away from the initial argument, which was about why Maori don’t have significant power within the department.

## **In all fairness**

### *In everyone's best interests*

Participants appealed to equity or fairness, across the range of topic areas covered during the interviews. Sometimes, these claimed to acknowledge a need to act with the best interests of all students in mind.

The accessibility and flexibility of appeals to fairness was particularly noteworthy, in the context of previous observations. Discourse analysts have observed that appeals to fairness or equity, are highly effective, within specific cultural groups, because they evoke an ideological sense of justice and pride, to which individuals, groups and nations may aspire. In this context these appeals may be quite dramatic for speaker and audience alike (Van Dijk, 1992). Van Dijk (1992) for example, observed that participants asked to consider whether an aspect of their behaviour was unfair, drew attention to personal experience of unfairness to deny that it was. People may also spend time reconciling notions of unfair treatment, with ideological ideals of justice and equity (Billig, 1982).

Equity and fairness were prominent themes in accounts of why Maori experienced a sense of alienation when studying psychology at university.

Males are underrepresented in our clinical program so we also, there's also a need to encourage males to, to take you know again, I'm not sure if that's because its considered, traditionally more of a female field and whether its the whole idea of you know females are more nurturing and caring. Yeah I think its a multitude of factors but certainly there are some groups I think that if you want greater representation that we do to encourage and Maori would be one of those. (Participant 10)

From an action-oriented perspective of discourse, this account prompts several questions. For example, why does the participant refer to others experiences to account for Maori experience? What does it do for the speaker and those s/he is discussing? Also, what does it do to address the concern to address the concern that Maori are under-represented?

In the opening statement, “males are under-represented”, the participant draws attention to common experience of Maori and males, as two groups which are under-representation in the discipline. This observation identifies the speaker, as sensitive to the needs of minority groups in psychology. This asserts a standpoint of ‘reluctant observer’ as opposed to ‘perpetrator’ which offers the participant immunity from criticism about the maintenance of the dynamic. This is considered to be a highly effective, and commonly employed technique used by New Zealanders to dodge prejudice (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). By credentialising and disclaiming, the impact of a possible criticism can be absorbed, and responsibility for the problem deflected.

The observation that males are under-represented also repositions the concerns of Maori. The speaker facilitates a broader view of the problem, within which the Maori

experience is an example, which encourages the audience to question whether it is of paramount concern. The significance of a specific group's problems are diminished within a hierarchy of needs. Inaction is therefore justified on a common-sense basis, that 'you can please some of the people all of the time, or all of the people some of the time, but you can't please all of the people all of the time'

This type of relegation is performed in a more direct manner in the passage below;

I'm sure there are people who are dissatisfied with all kinds of services, I'm less sure about whether there are specifics with regard to Maoris whether they have specific dissatisfactions compared to Pakeha and so that's partly why I'm hesitant at this point. So the assumption I've got if you're asking me specifically about Maori, I mean I think there are always going to be people who are dissatisfied with a whole range of services.  
(Participant 3)

This extract also diminishes the significance of a Maori concerns, by positioning them in relation to those of other dissatisfied groups. As with the previous extract, it is considered reasonable for the discipline to deal with 'some' differences, but unlikely that it can account for 'all' differences. This is explained to mean that there will inevitably be some people unsatisfied. The justification makes no assessment of a need to address some more than others, and makes no allowance for 'specific case' arguments. Van Teeffelen (1994) noted a similar effect observing that popular writers often

depersonalised individuals and groups in their accounts to avoid facing their political, social and economic concerns.

A further variation on this theme is provided by the discourse below;

I think there's a number of things. I mean I think we can attempt to understand other peoples viewpoints, their perceptions, their attitudes, their sort of vantage points and certainly I think all those issues of cultural identity, ethnic identity, those kinds of things, but even within a fairly homogeneous culture, just the person's individual experience and upbringing and background obviously will determine enormously how they perceive things and react to different events and that kind of thing.  
(Participant 4)

This account also works to diminish the significance of Maori concerns, but it situates Maori concerns in an more individuated context. Whereas the previous extract considered Maori concerns in the context of other under-represented groups, the present analysis is more concerned with individual differences. In this account, the participant points out that everybody has different upbringings, and will therefore experience psychology differently. Once again, being able to address these differences is conceptualised as ideal, but one which is understandably unattainable. In this light, the present situation, or status quo, is available as a practical, and appropriate compromise.

If one considers how this account presents the current systems of operation, it can be seen to uphold, and reinforce, existing power structures. It defends the current system as adequate, given the impossibility of being able to recognise everyone's concerns. This overlooks, that the current system is developed and sustained by a

process of selection and selective regeneration. For example, if Maori are not represented in the discipline as staff members and students, it is unlikely that the next generation will be attracted into the discipline. It also underrates the privileged position that those whose values are catered for find themselves in. If such inequalities are not recognised in lecturer accounts they can be seen to legitimise and reinforce the dominance of Pakeha values systems.

The appeal to 'a need to treat all students fairly' was also presented in accounts of minority group experience at university;

I don't think it has anything to do with me, any more than you know I could get Asian people coming in and saying that I should be accountable for them, and I could get Africans coming in and saying I should, then I should get middle Eastern people coming in and I should get North Americans coming in, should get French people coming in and all those, and I'm saying hang on wait a minute, wait a minute, I'm here to teach psychology I'm not here to support French people who have emigrated or Dutch people who have emigrated uh to New Zealand, and and and maybe you could argue you know you should, maybe I should be.

(Participant 6)

In coming to terms with Maori concerns of unequal treatment, the participant equates Maori concerns with those of other minority group members at university. There is no acknowledgement of the status of Maori as indigenous people of New Zealand, as Treaty partners, or as overly represented recipients of the services of New



Zealand psychologists. Maori are classified as immigrants and their interests therefore considered to be of no greater merit than those of immigrant groups.

Another significant component of the extract, is the participant's conceptualisation of psychology and interpretation of his/her responsibilities accordingly. Psychology is presented as an entity existing of its own right, independent of culturally specific preconceptions or values and therefore in a position beyond culturally based critique. This is related to the practice of advocating universal applicability of Western psychological theory. The reproduction of this lineage here illustrates that these well criticised notions, (Lawson -Te Aho, 1993) are still available to legitimise the exclusion of alternative paradigms, from mainstream curricula.

The specific concerns of Maori are discarded by the extreme case presented. The participant implies that if s/he is to be accountable to Maori then s/he would need to be equally accountable to Asian, Middle-Eastern, African, or any other ethnic group that presents with concerns. The provision of example upon example, suggests that this would be a chaotic, uncontrollable situation to be in, and one which would hinder his/her ability, to carry out the role s/he is paid to fulfil. The cost of addressing Maori concerns, has thereby been magnified by being placed in a context of taxpayer funded education.

A need to act responsibly and to monitor with caution would also elicit considerable support from a taxpayer. The phrase "hang on, hang on" emphasises the participant is rational and alert to variation in standard procedure which may not uphold the best interests of the discipline. This subject position is further strengthened by the

closing phrase “maybe I should be”. This informs the audience that the participant is open-minded and democratic, even against his/her better judgement.

In hindsight however, the participant can be seen to have argued an exclusionist point of view, which was based on an appeal to Pakeha common-sense values of responsible management and an equation of Maori rights to those of immigrants.

Equity and fairness were also appealed to when participants accounted for the demand and supply of Kaupapa Maori tutorials by psychology departments.

Yeah my, I think the line I would draw is that in terms of equity is that they are kind of assessed along similar criteria, so that the assessment I would see probably would be the line that I would draw, then I think it does start to become unfair for other groups, I think you're creating a new problem, for instance you have different methods of assessing Maori as opposed to the requirements of different, the, I think that then, then I think that you're potentially creating another problem, while trying to address the issue of Maori being under-represented. (Participant 2)

The participant prefaces this account, as insuring the equal treatment for all concerned. The account is also described as representing the ‘line that s/he would draw’. This is an effective strategy for warding off criticism, because it asserts the parameters, within which negotiation may occur. The reference to ‘personal limitation’ performs a similar effect by suggesting that the speaker has been to some expense to come to such a conclusion. A counter argument, in this context, would be seemingly pointless because s/he can not be expected to negotiate outside of the asserted parameter. Also, counter

argument would involve taking a confrontational stance at an inappropriately personal level.

The employment of this method of accounting was not common. Participants rarely asserted boundaries, or a 'personal baseline'. This prompts consideration as to why it was volunteered in this context. It would not ordinarily be necessary, and was not requested. So what function could it perform for the participant here?

One possibility is that the participant is relying upon a cultural sense of conversational protocol to strengthen his/her argument. In this instance the argument is unlikely to be contested further, as to do so would require the listener to initiate an argumentative dynamic, which is understandably avoided by the interviewer.

The need for equity is cited as the rationale for accountability of Maori tutorials to a Pakeha system of legitimisation. This implies a commonality between equity and a Pakeha system of legitimisation. This implied commonality is the crux of the argument.

An alternative analysis may consider that there is little equity in the usage of a Pakeha system of legitimisation, in this context. That this is overlooked here illustrates that constructions which appeal to equity, may depend more on cultural versions of the ideological categories than be required to judge from a standpoint of neutrality.

*In their best interests*

The previous section discussed how passages appealing to a need for fairness and equal treatment of students could marginalise Maori concerns. These were often accompanied by positioning discourse that appealed to cultural values of productivity and responsible management. This combination was explained to legitimate inaction, by drawing attention to a need to function in the best interests of all concerned. The present section considers accounts which marginalise whilst claiming to operate in the best interests of Maori.

I don't think that we should be so arrogant as to assume that Maori people need psychology and that's what is good for them, because when you look at the areas where they've got big enrolments, in their own department and in law, it's a bit like Maslow's hierarchy, perhaps their first priorities are more important, perhaps they see other things as more important, of more immediate concern to them than, you know, visual perception, or psychophysics or, some of the things we teach may be irrelevant to them. So that's one thing, I don't think, I think it's arrogant to assume that they should be doing psychology or that we should have ten percent or twenty percent or, do you know what I mean? Maybe psychology is irrelevant to them, but having said that, the university is very keen on the sort of quota systems, you know you should have your ten percent and all this sort of stuff. Having said that, you know I think that's one issue, I don't think psychology is a priority for young Maori students. (Participant 4)

The participant's concern is that Maori shouldn't be manipulated into doing psychology, if pursuing other academic interests would be more profitable for them. S/He justifies the poor representation of Maori in psychology, by explaining that some people may just not find psychology appealing. On this basis, s/he argues that to force a mismatch would be irresponsible, and that Maori may be better off without psychology. This appeals to a common-sense notion that 'you can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink', because there would be no point in encouraging Maori into psychology against their interests. However, this apparently supportive stance can be seen to have other effects, when the subject positions created for Maori and the discipline are considered.

In the account, psychology and the wider population are presented as existing independently of each other. Psychology is conceptualised as an entity of its own right, which can afford to accept that groups of the wider population, may not enrol in the discipline. This may be seen as irresponsible on at least two accounts. Firstly, because Maori are disproportionately over-represented as recipients of psychological services and secondly because it constructs psychology, to be a static and unresponsive entity that can 'exist' as unaccountable to these groups. The discipline is effectively provided with a force field like immunity to their concerns, advocating that the discipline's character shouldn't change, because Maori are not participating. The discipline is constructed in a way that encapsulates it in a position, unaccountable to the wider community.

This was a similar feature in accounts about the poor performance of Maori at university;

I think Maoris drop out of university because they don't consider university valuable and I think that for us to presume that universities are valuable in spite of the evidence of the last twenty years that nobody else thinks they are and nobody outside of universities think they have any value at all is presumptuous. We should try to keep encouraging, you know maybe what we should do to say to these people you know what do you want to do with your life, and maybe what they do want to do is they want to sit their and smoke pot all day, and I don't know who we are to say, oh no you should go to university and you should get a PhD and they'll say what the hell do I need a PhD for, to learn how to do research, who the hell wants to do research? and lot of academics say the same thing. (Participant 6)

In this extract, the participant offers an archetype (which compare the best of one groups to the worst of another (Belich 1996)) to account for Maori performance. The participant is concerned to act in the best interests of Maori, explaining that it would be arrogant to assume that university degrees are what is best for them. The argument however, involves a stereotypical judgement of Maori behaviour. The association of Maori with inactivity and drugs, and the statement that they don't want degrees, construct Maori with stereotypes.

In a more socially considerate analysis, drug smoking and unemployment may be viewed as symptomatic. This would pay attention to variables which keep Maori from

attaining equal status with Pakeha, for example, policy and practice which work to marginalise Maori concerns at universities.

By this analysis, the account can be seen to do more to reinforce culturally specific moral codes, than offer an objective conceptualisation which works in 'their best interests'. In the longer term, this accounting would impede Maori development because it reinforces popular oppressive stereotypes, and justifies practices which marginalise.

Also 'working in their best interests', is the following extract which highlights a counterproductive aspect of Kaupapa Maori tutorials;

Yeah I don't know, I think its a bit of a double edged sword that business. I don't know what's happening at (omitted) right now, it would be interesting to know, but I do know from Auckland that when they were holding some special Maori tutorials with a Maori tutor that some of the Maori students made explicit that they resented that, they didn't want to be singled out and go in a special tutorial. I think on one hand it be a bit of tokenism and be seen to be politically correct, in another way it can be singling, it's like you have a special, well they run them here, computer classes for women only, because the women feel self conscious that the males in the class will scoff at them or be faster at it so they need to go slow, I suppose me of these same philosophies are bat to pat single sex schools and things like that, and I've never really ascribed to that, I think that we need to function in the real world as it is. (Participant 8)

The participant explains that Maori "didn't want to be singled out", as they were, by the tutorials. This is offered, as evidence of their counter-productivity. During

this account s/he also conceives of them as being tokenistic, politically correct, and having little to do with the real world.

The account can be seen to make several appeals, to a range of Pakeha values. For example, to not want to encourage something that 'singles Maori out', appears to nurture the better interests of Maori. The notifications of tokenism and political correctness show that the job is not being done properly. This means that not only are they offensive to Maori, but they waste effort and resources.

The participant has thereby justified the absence of Kaupapa Maori tutorials from the discipline. S/he has presented them as against the best interests of Maori, and against the best interests of the taxpayer. This has been shown to be an effective combination, especially when located in a historical context of superficial recognition, by appeals to tokenism and political correctness.



### **Comparatively speaking**

Comparatively speaking, or 'look on the bright side' discourses, refocus attention from perceived negative attributes to positive attributes. By comparing individual, disciplinary, institutional or national performance with another's of lesser value, the first appears in a better light.

The success of such reinterpretations however, is dependant upon a number of contextual factors. They may be offensive if the audience has different values, and inappropriate if considered in relation to issues of responsibility. If these features remain unaccounted for the comparisons can be expected to encourage complacency with regard to Maori concerns.

### *International comparison*

New Zealand's race relations record is believed to be enviable, particularly when compared with nations which have a similar colonial history, for example, Australia, and South Africa. This reputation was appealed to by participants, to deal with perceived criticism of race relations performance, for example;

Comparatively speaking isn't New Zealand supposed to be very progressive? (Participant 5)

Here, the significance of Maori concerns is diminished, by drawing attention to how other nations value New Zealand's race relations record. This renegotiation of terms appeals to a Pakeha value of competitive performance. It encourages the assessment of Maori concerns, based on the status of indigenous people in other nations, rather than unique national circumstances.

The participant has responded to the suggestion that performance could be better in the form of a rhetorical question. The participant can be seen, therefore, to have predicted its undeniability. This avoids dealing with the New Zealand context, by encouraging the audience to use this observation, to be satisfied with race relations in New Zealand.

### *Institutional comparison*

The performance of an institution in relation to other institutions, was also used to deflect criticism about departmental bicultural performance. In the extract below a participant refers to contentious attempts which were made to add cultural emphasis to nursing training programs, as justification for a more cautious approach;

I think it's a case of balance again, you know, certainly I think there's been, some mistakes in some of those domains made along the way in terms of overcompensating and losing too much of their traditional

emphasis so I don't know if it's a case of not wanting to go too fast there and sort of you know trying to learn from others mistakes certainly there's been great controversy with regard to the teaching of nursing and concerns that there's an overemphasis on cultural issues and sort of that's been a cost of learning the basic medical skills, and you know I've spoken to, you know, so I don't know, you know maybe it's an attempt to make sure that you know we do it but we kind of do it in a measured manner.

(Participant 4)

This account appeals to a common-sense notion that 'only fools rush in'. The participant compares the discipline's response with those of other domains. S/he points out that where others have made costly and controversial mistakes, psychology is able to learn, and undertake a more measured response.

This assessment however is not grounded in an observation of the changes made to nursing curricula. Walker observed that these amounted to an allocation of 1% of curricula to focus on Maori health constructs, complimented with a 1% focus on Pakeha health constructs (Walker, in Peters, Hope, Marshall and Webster, 1996). The argument can be seen therefore to rely on a stereotype. This reinforces the practice of judging cultural issues in this way.

Addressing Maori concerns is explained to have been at the expense of Western traditions. This appeals to senses of identity, history and development. A statement that positions Maori concerns, as threatening these cultural tenets, is likely to elicit a suspicious or defensive reaction. A Pakeha audience may, on this observation, be expected to give support to more measured approach to incorporating Maori values into

psychology. The discipline's response to Maori concerns, can therefore be seen to be justified, because it has ensured the protection of these cultural tenets.

Controversy, is a result which the participant would prefer to avoid (The terms, 'trouble maker' and 'stirrer' indicate how those invoking controversy are often conceptualised). The participant cites the efforts of the nursing profession, which resulted in a fervent Pakeha backlash, as illustration of the likelihood that psychology would have caused the same commotion. This sense of caution presents the discipline in a good light but does not necessarily encourage disciplinary reflexivity, with regard to the needs of the wider community.

The extract positions psychology as a follower. It suggests that the discipline is unlikely to change, unless similar changes have been undertaken elsewhere, with minimal disturbance to the status quo. For the purposes of this argument, disciplinary traditions are conceptualised as untouchable doctrine, which should be preserved in their present states. This offers little scope for development according to the changing character and changing needs of communities.

On these observations the account can be seen to construct versions of reality for specific functions. In this instance, incorporating a Maori cultural perspective was constructed as a threat to Pakeha values and tradition, and therefore judged as of too high cost to accommodate.

*Department comparison*

Performance at a departmental level could be accounted for by drawing attention to the performance of Maori in other departments.

My impressions of Maori students in enrolments at (omitted), there's, the big numbers are in two disciplines, one is obviously Maori in their own department and gosh that's healthy and I mean you wouldn't want it otherwise and the other one is law, that's the other big area they enrol in, and you can see why, obviously, you know considering they are the tangata whenua, but they are in such a I supposed depressed position really, that clearly that the more Maoris with law degrees the more they can do for themselves and their own people and fishing rights and all that kind of thing. (Participant 4)

The participant suggests that Maori effort at university is more appropriately expended, in departments other than psychology. This is based on two contextualisations. Firstly, the argument acknowledges Maori socio-political concerns, for example, fishing rights. Secondly, it is situated in a context of limited Maori opportunity to participate in tertiary education.

In referring to Maori as tangata whenua, the participant recognises that Maori have particular rights as indigenous people of New Zealand. This adds a considerable degree of persuasiveness to the argument that Maori needs are better served in the other

departments, because it asserts that the author's has a degree of familiarity with Maori self-conceptions, concerns and rights.

In this account, the discipline is encouraged to maintain a passive stance in relation to issues of cultural development and improvement. Alternatively, the discipline of law can be seen to constantly adapt its structure and content to reflect contemporary values, for example, the Treaty of Waitangi Act. Psychology, as a people science, which is more concerned with human functioning than most disciplines, could be expected to lead the way in accounting for such values.

It is also useful to shed light on the units of comparison in the account. The Maori need for lawyers, is held above a Maori need for psychologists. This acknowledges the over-representation of Maori as recipients of justice services, in New Zealand and ignores the over-representation of Maori as recipients of psychological services. The representation of Maori students in psychology is therefore considered to be acceptable because it has been shown to protect the best interests of Maori. Psychology is not expected to be well represented by Maori. This presents the discipline's performance positively whereas it is usually described negatively with regard to Maori representation. This construction can be considered to substantiate the claim that the discipline's stance on attracting students is too passive. This discourse dismisses the suggestion that Maori would participate if they saw their realities represented by the discipline.

The performance of the discipline in relation to other university departments was also cited by participants to deflect criticism.

I don't know that we are any worse than any other university discipline, you know, so I'm not convinced that psychology is doing it worse than, sociology or biochemistry or nursing, you know any of a number of other professions. I mean I think, I think Maori are underrepresented at university in general and particularly in advanced graduate training or research programs, and I think there are lots and lots of reasons for that, some of which are to do with the discipline and others which are really nothing to do with this discipline per se but just extraneous factors like it's expensive, it's a long time, if, yeah its, there's a whole lot of things that work against Maori coming through this system. (Participant 1)

This account defends the discipline, with similar effect to the previous account, but involves a different conceptualisation of the discipline's position in relation to other disciplines. For the purposes of this explanation, Maori representation in psychology is not 'justifiably lower than' their representation in law and Maori studies, but is not necessarily "any worse than, any other university discipline".

The account also draws attention to the context of limited participation of Maori at university. By doing this the participant can argue that opportunities for psychology to secure Maori enrolments are negligible from the outset. By refocusing the locus of control in this way, the responsibilities of the discipline are deprioritised and made dependant on the achievement of goals, which are out of its hands. This can be seen to encourage complacency with regard to Maori concerns.

The location of the discipline in a competitive environment was also offered as reason to regard Maori concerns with suspicion.

I mean, I wonder proportionately how many Maori number one are in universities, what's the proportion in psychology as opposed to other subject areas, how many do we have in the sciences, how many do we have in other areas. So I'm not, I don't know, I don't have the data to tell me that there is more of a problem in psychology than there is in other faculties, or in other departments. (Participant 7)

This account avoids dealing with specific circumstances that justify Maori concerns. It appeals to a Pakeha 'open market' ideology which locates control in the hands of consumers, rather than suppliers. By this assumption, psychology only needs to be competitive. This fails to account for the linkage between the discipline and the wider community. Psychology as a discipline devoted to the study of human behaviour, may be expected to differentiate itself from other disciplines when alerted to variation in human experience.



### **The too hard basket**

This section is concerned with accounts which deflect criticism related to Maori concerns, by appealing to the difficulties of doing the job properly. A noticeably accessible way to account for departmental performance was to assess the value of prescriptions for change. Participants highlighted points of contradiction, disparity, vagueness or irrationality, as reason for delays in implementing changes. These accounting manoeuvres exonerated the discipline of responsibility, because it is seen as 'unable' to make sense of how to proceed.

There needs to be information about what's happening out there and if you don't understand the nature of the problem it's kind of hard to address the problem, and I don't have that information so you know I can't, and who takes responsibility for that well again at a departmental level and in this case it could be the undergraduate co-ordinating committee who would then look at geez are when then losing people at second year or, we have a cultural committee in the department, it maybe an issue for them to look at. But I think they need to raise the awareness of the staff in the department to these issues, I mean your asking me questions I don't have answers for really, I, you know when you say we've got a problem in psychology you know, and the problem is that nobody is making a sound about the problem. (Participant 2)

In this extract the participant indicates that it is the responsibility of the complainants to inform the discipline of a need for change. A consumer driven dynamic

is depicted by the phrase “they need to increase the awareness of staff in the department”. This can be considered to indicate conditions under which the discipline could be expected to take responsibility for addressing the grievances.

In the following extract the consumer driven nature of the discipline is seen to unfairly advantage Maori.

I think groups respond as a function of how much the squeaky wheel gets the noise, or gets the grease or whatever it is and I think in psychology because there are not a lot of Maoris either teaching or students it hasn't been considered a, nobody's said we want, we want things. We're spending, I mean now I would think, the contribution for Maoris as opposed to the contribution for Americans or for British or French or Asians or Africans must be astronomical. The financial contribution of this university towards people in wheelchairs per unit of the population must be astronomical, compared to other people with other deficits such as I don't know perhaps dyslexia or difficulties in learning or older people who have difficulty with memories, where I would think there is no, the amount of financial support toward them is zero, and that's simply because these people have got I think, not simply, because in my opinion because these people have gotten together and they've kicked up a fuss and they've managed to get laws passed which says that that even though there is nobody with a wheelchair, if there was they'd need to have access and their building a new building over there for whatever the hell it is the cost, a hundred thousand dollars, so you know I think its a function of how many people are saying we need that service and I think very few people have said that. (Participant 6)

In contrast with the first extract, this claims that Maori are unfairly advantaged by the process by which the discipline responds to concerns. The first claimed the opposite, saying that Maori didn't make enough noise to evoke disciplinary response. The following extract represents a further variation on this theme, by claiming that the discipline is wise not to respond as a result of consumer pressure;

Well there are lots of things I'm not sure about there, like I don't know who your protesters are, and what's basically being said about that, to the extent that we who control what gets taught, yeah I suppose that's true, and I guess it reflects the fact that we know more than the students about what is taught and what could be taught and what is important to teach or what isn't, you can disagree with that or not but I'm sure that's what most people would think, most academics would think, and that we'd be in real danger if psychology or anything becomes bottom driven, because you could ask lots of students what would be important to teach and they'll give you a whole lot of dribble, you know astrology and mind-reading and tripe like that. (paranormal stuff?) yeah paranormal stuff. There needs to be somebody whose in charge of directing the traffic, not that that person or people are impervious to what's going on, we never can be, nor should we be. I don't know if that's answering your question.  
(Participant 1)

This discourse can be seen as antithetical in character to the previous “squeaky wheel gets the grease” discourse. The participant argues that the discipline should not be consumer driven. To do this s/he presents an undeniability device; “we know more than the students about what is taught, what should be taught...”. This asserts a common

sense hierarchical system of decision making. S/He seeks to validate this system with a prediction, stating that, if given the opportunity, students could be expected to choose “astrology and mind-reading and tripe like that”.

This appeals to a popular (and almost clichéd) interpretation of the value of astrology and mind-reading. More importantly, it is an extreme case formulation which indicates that the participant is prepared to account for the present concerns, with stereotypical and sensationalised beliefs.

Functionally, what has been evidenced by this and the previous discourse is that the participants have the discursive resources, to argue oppositional arguments, with the same marginalising effect (both sides of the coin for the same function). The former argued that implementation of bicultural change was dependant on demand, and changes were not forthcoming because demand was lacking. The latter argued that the supply of changes was not forthcoming, because the demand was irrational.

It is important to note, that both serve to alleviate the discipline of responsibility. Maori are conceptualised as responsible for their own demise, or progress. By this assumption, the issue of biculturalism is essentially avoided. It is not conceptualised as a partnership issue but a Maori issue. This could be seen to indicate a lack of assumed responsibility to play an active role in the development of a more bicultural psychology. This point of construction deflects responsibility and facilitates inaction.

There was much in the latter account’s use of the extreme case formulation which warrants further consideration in the context of this research. Consultation is conceptualised to be pointless, or a risk to the quality of student education. This places

teachers in the dangerous position of being beyond fallibility. The protectionism proposed in this construction, is also of risk to the quality of education, because it downplays the importance of staff reflexivity.

If this dynamic does not involve accountability, then concerns are likely to be perceived as threats to ability, and the requested changes become conceptualised as admissions of failure. In the context of New Zealand's bicultural development this may be an understandable reflex, but it is considered by some to be irresponsibly maintained, and posing a serious threat to the ability of the education system, to produce culturally sensitive psychologists.

The high cost of implementing changes was also considered as justification for inaction.

I think what you are talking about there is the effects or the importance of culture as a variable in determining how people perceive the world and react to it, and I think, I'm not disparaging it in any way because I think one of the most interesting areas of cognitive psychology is that sort of overlap with some of the anthropologists, even going back to Lévi-Strauss and those sort of people who have had a huge impact, I don't think we can underestimate those things but I guess what I object to is that sometimes it's almost like well we should throw all the empirical research out the window and we'll all just have our own opinions, and it's all equally valid, and to be honest I don't actually believe that.

(Participant 4)

The participant here suggests that recognising the “importance of culture as a variable determining how people perceive the world and react to it”, would be at the expense of all the empirical research done. This is a powerful argument as it triggers a sense of wastage, particularly by suggesting that this ‘new way of thinking’ will render all the years of investment and productivity pointless. This evokes a sense that what was previously thought to be, and presented as fact or knowledge, will be deemed to be completely wrong. If this is the case then we who believed it could be depicted as somewhat foolish at worst, or mistaken at best. The apparent hypersensitivity of this reaction should be further considered.

Attention to the context in which this extreme-case formulation is offered, shows that the ‘all or nothing’ reaction is presented alongside praise for the contribution of Lévi-Strauss (someone whom may here be best referred to as ‘representative of ‘that’ way of thinking’) to the development and presumably the betterment of the discipline. The participant’s account is therefore defensive in the face of a theoretical development to which s/he attributes value (‘of huge impact’). This could be interpreted to illustrate that although a theory of cultural variability can be glamorised in the past, it may pose significant threat in the present.

The participant’s defensive reaction represents a feature of Pakeha ideological sensitivity, which was highlighted in a recent study. McCreanor (1993b) observed that arguments claiming that Pakeha had responsibilities based on the Treaty of Waitangi needed “to facilitate acceptance rather than blame Pakeha for the wrongs of the past, to

avoid paralysis by guilt and indignation”(McCreanor, 1993). A similar effect can be seen to have occurred in the participant’s extreme reaction.

Hypersensitivity however, was also used to undermine the character of protesters, and therefore the credibility or value of their concerns;

It’s hard to say, one of the things I’ve become aware of last week, a matter of days ago, I had a conversation with an editor of a journal in Australia and we had submitted an article and I mean, he asked me in the course of the conversation that we had, whether I had heard about a controversial incident that had occurred at this conference that he, that they had run and the incident was basically around a walk out by a group of therapists, after a presentation which addressed the issue of should Pakeha New Zealand counsellors counsel Maori clients, and he was very very worried about this therapy and you know I won’t be specific about the therapy given that, although he was very worried about this therapy and the development of therapy in New Zealand because of this and essentially what had happened was, that there was some people who felt very strongly, a contingent from New Zealand that felt very strongly about this issue, the presenter, it was at the plenary session had made, indicated this statement, this is what I do this is how I handle the issue of Maori clients. Now this is a Pakeha counsellor, this is how I handle the issue of Maori clients coming in and how I deal with, you know, am I appropriate to see them, do I need to consult more widely with other cultural counsellors, how do you make the decision about choice in terms of, and so she was presenting how she did that and the issues involved in that. Apparently, and again this is second hand, this group of counsellors became very irate at this point and this is second hand but, and staged a walk-out and made it kind of political statement saying essentially, and

very emotive language was used and stating that, you know Pakeha should not be involved in the counselling of these Maori clients and that you know the statement something like, you know don't dip your pen in our blood, kind of emotion words were used. So it was not kind of a comfortable scene. (Participant 4)

The description of a “walk out” is offered as testimony to the temperament of those espousing a need for change in psychological practices. The plenary speaker is credited as having offered a clear, openly subjective and humble presentation about his/her work with Maori clients. S/he is depicted as being careful and considerate of cultural variables and sensitive to her/his limitations. The plenary speaker has appeared to make every conceivable effort to work in the best interests of his/her client. The participant has thereby constructed an atmosphere of rationality and humility. In this context the following event is intensified and a sense that ‘one can never do enough’, is seemingly justified.

The opposition is constructed as dramatic, emotive, unreasonable, and trouble-making. In the context of humility and sensitivity outlined, their reaction is unprompted and bewildering. This is a vivid demonstration of the liberty that narrative expression offers. In this medium the speaker offers a selective interpretation of a much broader context. This can be relatively harmless, however a problem arises when this interpretation is presented as description of reality. In this instance it is used to exemplify how Maori issues are dealt with and as such seeks to establish these interpretations as characteristic. The construction illustrates what the participant sees as



important to understand about the dynamic and therefore offers information about the atmosphere for change.

As a result of this analysis cultural concerns can be seen to need to conform to Pakeha common-sense values of rationality, before they can be taken seriously. Although this seems to place responsibility for change in the hands of Maori, it more importantly asserts a process of validation. Although process is usually considered to be commonsensical and of little consequence to Maori, it may seem to Maori that 'although they may be offered the ball, Pakeha maintain control over the goal posts'.

Another way of putting responsibility in Maori hands, is to point out how Pakeha have been told that they do not know how to proceed, or that it is inappropriate for Pakeha to manage Maori affairs;

I don't know what the goal is, I don't know if the goal is to teach Maori values, if that's what it is, from everything I've heard is that they can't be taught. Pakehas cant understand them. That Mason Durie thing that was given out in my course said Pakehas cant understand it, so that's impossible. (Participant 6)

This discourse works to legitimate inaction, by undermining the significance of Maori concerns as 'unreasonable'. In this case the participant argues that Pakeha have their hands tied, because Maori have said that 'Pakeha can't understand Maori values'. On this basis the participant rationalises, that they can not be taught. Maori however, argue that this is justification for there to be more Maori members of staff. This

argument can be seen as further example that legitimisation by Pakeha values is considered a necessary prerequisite to the incorporation of Maori values into psychology.

## *Chapter Four*

### CONCLUSIONS

This study has been concerned with discursive resources available to Pakeha psychology lecturers to make sense of issues of disciplinary bicultural development. A focus has been maintained on discourses which worked to resist Maori concerns, and justify the disciplines responses. Of specific concern has been the way that the participants used Pakeha values to legitimise Maori concerns. This is considered to be of significance because it happens in a context of Pakeha managed psychology.

In the resistant discourses Maori concerns were presented as unfounded, unnecessary, unfair, too difficult or too costly to respond to. These understandings appealed to Pakeha interpretations of principles such as fairness, equity, productivity, and organisation. The participants accounts required Maori concerns to conform to Pakeha values for these principles.

The exclusion of Maori concerns by this system of legitimisation was often explained as a matter of common-sense. For example, one participant mentioned that Kaupapa Maori tutorials "must be sensible", whilst another recommended, that such flexibility would result in students studying "mind-reading and tripe like that". These interpretations were produced by the participants as 'realities', as 'what is sensible' or 'the truth of the matter'. They were made further 'real', by being presented in culturally

familiar or valued form. Narrative, undeniability devices, and other rhetorical mechanisms were used to present the arguments believably. Also, references to culturally specific values of egalitarian and hierarchical structuring were used to authorise, for example, "I'm sure most academics would agree".

The attribution and confirmation of worth by this process has critical implications for the development of a more bicultural psychology in New Zealand. Firstly, this process of legitimisation denies the significance of the systems of control and management within which the issues of Maori representation persist. Secondly, discursive reinforcement of this system, allows the continued alienation of Maori values, and/or encourages the incorporation of Maori values which have been essentially Pakehafied. Thirdly, lecturers role model for students how Maori concerns and bicultural issues can be made sense of, and demonstrate the extent to which they need to be reflexive in their activities as psychologists. After a discussion of these points, implications of these dynamics for the bicultural development of the discipline in New Zealand will be considered.

## **Issues of representation**

It has been explained that Maori are over-represented as recipients of psychological services, and under-represented as students of psychology. Maori pointed to the lack of representation of Maori values by the discipline, as contributing to and sustaining this situation. The present study's finding, that Maori concerns need to conform to Pakeha values systems to gain legitimacy, should be considered in relation to issues of representation.

The process of critiquing Maori recommendations for change does not, take into account that the criticisms of performance have arisen from a context of Pakeha managed psychology. It therefore suggests that Pakeha systems are able to solve the representational dilemmas, or alternatively, that they are not of significant concern. This provides an obstacle for the process of bicultural change, as it indicates that Pakeha may be more concerned to maintain control over systems of management, than to consider how the issues have arisen and whether they have the resources to deal with the representational dilemmas at hand.

## **Educational location**

The process of legitimisation undertaken by lecturers to account for Maori concerns, sees Maori values critiqued by Pakeha values. The modelling of this process within an educational context is important to consider. This environment is one in which examples are set, which others learn from.

This process becomes available for students to understand as an appropriate way of making sense of Maori concerns. This works to ensure the continued alienation, low performance and absence, of Maori students from the discipline (Durie and Abbott, 1996, NSBCI, 1993, Lawson -Te Aho, 1993). As a result, fewer Maori psychologists will graduate, and the ability of the discipline to deal with Maori mental health issues is likely to remain unimproved.

This interpretative dynamic has been explained to neglect to acknowledge culturally specific pre-conceptions or the values basis of its judgements. By failing to do so, subjective interpretation is presented as objective, and as able to be employed, in multiple contexts. It teaches Pakeha students that these forms of resistant accounting are appropriate ways to attribute value to Maori values, and psychological constructs. They are thereby encouraged to feel that rationality can be determined and resistance justified, by these criteria.

The participants constructions of self also have important role modelling implications. The self images supported discourses of ineffectuality, of victimisation, manipulation, or denied ability to effect the process of dealing with Maori

representation, or of addressing Maori concerns. They suggested the speaker, discipline or country should not be implicated in issues of responsibility, and encouraged an interpretation that Maori concerns, were not as consequential as assumed or in other words, worthy of resistance.

These positions were considered to under-estimate the significance of Pakeha academic constructions and actions for the incorporation of Maori concerns into psychology. This was especially the case where extracts were found to position the discipline as a passive entity, whose opportunity to progress with bicultural changes was impaired by lack of clear Maori guidance. For example, one participant accounted for the lack of Maori participation in psychology by positioning the discipline as predisposed to being overlooked by Maori students because of their more immediate need for training in law and Maori studies. This equips students with a discursive resource to externalise responsibility for the monocultural nature of psychology, and thereby expect to maintain a passive role in the process of change.

This opportunity was enhanced by the constructions of Maori offered by participants. These constructions, attributed status to Maori as drug takers, unemployed, immigrants, indigenous people (with rights equal to those of other nations), or as responsible bearers of the economic and developmental future of their ethnic group. This encourages Maori concerns to be dealt with according to present argumentative concerns, rather than attributing them value, as valid to those who hold them. It encourages conception of Maori concerns, as they suit dominant group interests, rather than in terms of the dynamics of power operating in New Zealand society.

When these observations are made in the context of disciplinary ambition to develop more biculturally, it may be that lecturers are unconscious of their role in the reproduction of exclusive systems of psychological education. This also has important role-modelling implications, because it indicates that psychologists may openly support bicultural changes whilst operating an everyday system which works to actively impair bicultural development. This encourages students to understand that bicultural development is about incorporation of other, rather than everyday marginalisation. Alternatively, students could benefit from being made conscious of mainstream constructions of reality, to prepare them to graduate into New Zealand's multicultural context.

If encouraged from an early stage of their psychological education to be reflexive, students would be better prepared for their future professional contexts. However without this demand, students are encouraged to believe that their versions of reality have some greater legitimacy than Maori versions. They are encouraged to consider their interpretations are unconditionally applicable, rather than unconditionally accountable. The assertion of such a standpoint in a professional setting is likely to magnify a client's sense of alienation or abnormality. Encouragement of reflexivity can therefore be seen as one of the steps that the discipline could take, toward the provision of a more bicultural psychology.

However, the recommendation that students be made more sensitive to the subjectivity of their constructions and their realities does not recommend, that "we should throw all the empirical work out the window". It draws attention to the process



by which veracity is established, to demonstrate that similar conclusions drawn by other cultural groups are likely to have as much validity, and foundational significance to members of those groupings. It requires psychological teaching to encourage students to be reflexive about the processes by which they attribute meaning, so that as psychologists they can take this form of sensitivity into their professional environments.

In realising this, it can be understood that members of ethnic minority groups may not require training to alert them to systemic biases. This is because they learn through experience on a daily basis that their own versions are of no greater reality than those of Pakeha. Maori, for example have no option but to develop biculturally in New Zealand society. They have their own cultural values, but have to function according to Pakeha values, and systems in most aspects of everyday life.

Pakeha experience, stands in significant contrast to those who grow up with minority group values. For example, Pakeha psychology students learn that their experiences, their realities or interpretations, are normal and that minority group experience is abnormal, or of lesser significance. It may be more practical for Pakeha students to be sensitive to the situation, that although Maori values are abnormal to Pakeha, Pakeha values are also abnormal to Maori.

It is however, Pakeha norms that are reinforced in the broader social context, and therefore there is little opportunity for them to gain sensitivity to such effects, and the discursive constructions which support them. Maori and other ethnic minority group members, experience the opposite effect on a daily basis. They learn that realities are socially constructed, because their realities, and values of other cultural groups have

minority status, in what is their own society. They gain an understanding that Pakeha and Maori have completely different values, and perspectives. Pakeha however, are not forced in the same way to recognise these differences. The analysis of lecturer resistant discourses indicated the absence of such acknowledgement from the process of making sense of Maori concerns.

With respect to the process of developing more biculturally then, a new role may be fashioned for psychology lecturers, in which they work to make explicit processes of alienation and abnormalisation. Alternatively, if Pakeha lecturers do not present features which actively reinforce a system of Pakeha hegemony, then they offer a message to students about their role in the process of change, and ensure the maintenance of resistant systems.

### **Developing a more bicultural psychology**

The discipline has expressed a desire to develop more biculturally and work more in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi. However the process of evaluation and exclusion of Maori concerns by Pakeha values observed in this study, can be considered inconsistent with the 'spirit and intent' of the Treaty of Waitangi. The dynamic portrayed is more patriarchal in nature than one of representing the type of partnership, depicted by the Treaty of Waitangi. Maori in this equation, are accountable to Pakeha, but Pakeha not accountable to Maori, in the same respect.

Maori values are required to conform to Pakeha values, before they can be incorporated into psychology. In this instance, Maori are asked to demonstrate an ability to 'be like Pakeha', before investment can be made toward recognising their concerns. Fulfilment of this criterion by Maori, could be expected to require an erosion or alteration of their present values, and therefore the extent to which they represent a Maori world-view.

For example, the incorporation of Maori values into the discipline was depicted, by one participant, as too hard due to the hypersensitivity which was often displayed by those concerned with this issue. When Maori attend tangihanga (period of mourning surrounding a death in which visitors pay their respects) grief is expressed not with an expression such as "I'm sorry" but with tears. To Pakeha this is likely to be experienced as over-emotional, especially if one does not know the deceased, however to Maori this is not the case. Both groups have different values which define who they are and how

they make sense of the world. To demand the alteration of such values must therefore be seen to diminish the purpose of attempting to develop a more bicultural psychology.

The support offered by the resistant discourses to a process of legitimisation by Pakeha values, has similar implications to that observed in three previous decades of attempts, to develop more bicultural educational systems in New Zealand (Irwin, 1988). When Pakeha attempted to determine the shape and nature of bicultural changes, the end product was seen to offend all concerned, with acknowledgement which represented neither Pakeha or Maori values. The present analysis also observed discourses to reinforce a system of Pakeha control over the process of bicultural change. On this basis, it would seem that quality, longevity and satisfaction of changes, may depend on the steps taken to account for past tokenism, and recognition of Maori values.

The discourse of competition, was seen to place similar demands on Maori values. In this discourse, Maori concerns were implied to be dealt with, in an open and fair competitive arena. By that interpretation, they were justifiably required to compete for resources, as any other concerned group would. Closer analysis of the wider environment however, indicates that the social, economic, educational and political contexts of New Zealand society, advantage Pakeha on most counts. Pakeha and Maori do not have equal power or opportunity in this society. Pakeha values receive much greater positive reinforcement on a daily basis, and therefore a much more accommodating environment is available, for Pakeha concerns.

Legitimation by Pakeha values therefore does ensure that Maori have the same opportunities to have enacted the measures that they consider are important.

Implementing bicultural measures becomes a matter of performance and impression, rather than a matter of mutual commitment to improved performance. In this process developmental differences and hiccups are of greater consequence because the process by which the resources would be allocated, allows them to be taken away. This was exemplified by the participants descriptions of the need for the discipline to be consumer driven. This form of accounting reinforced a situation in which Maori are expected to convince a Pakeha audience that they have valid case.

The requirement for Maori to compete for resources, at least at this stage of bicultural development, is therefore seen to impair the development of a more bicultural psychology. It omits to account for the unique case that Maori have, to be represented by institutional practices in New Zealand. It also omits to account for socio-economic and representational dilemmas already mentioned, and reinforces the dominance of one cultural group and their meanings in this country. It also encourages an assumption that Pakeha versions of reality, have some inherent truth to them, which Maori versions do not.

It has already been argued why this should not be encouraged, but what is important is that Pakeha versions are enforced and upheld normatively. This process was demonstrated in the resistant accounting of lecturers. Once these norms are established, behaviour outside of them, for example, practice based on minority groups values, can be alienated. Pakeha versions of normality, are presented in university curricula around the world. People receive qualifications and therefore social approval, based on their

ability to demonstrate familiarity with them, but this should not be seen to offer them an inherent truth, reality or veracity.

It has been explained by many local authors, as it has been within this research, that many Pakeha versions of reality are antithetical in nature to Maori experience. Whereas Pakeha consider these to be 'alternative' ways of looking at things it may be more conducive to change for Pakeha to realise that Pakeha ways of looking at things would be just as alternative if Pakeha were not the dominant ethnic grouping in New Zealand society. This effect was illustrated in one participants comparison of voodoo with Maori knowledge. This argued the colonised position of voodoo knowledge justified the colonised positioning of Maori knowledge. As long as Pakeha do not recognise the weighting that dominance affords such judgements there maybe little opportunity for the type of union and equal representation idealised in notions of bicultural development.

It is important to realise that Pakeha could not be expected to understand what it means to be an ethnic minority grouping in their own country because this has not been the case, since the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, they could be expected to be aware of the difference of social positioning between Maori and Pakeha, in this society. Among those who could be expected to be hypersensitive to the effects of these differences of experience, upon performance are psychologists.

This promotes a similar conclusion previously recommended (Nikora, 1991) that because Pakeha may easily justify the exclusion of Maori concerns from the discipline and resist bicultural changes, achievement of bicultural goals is dependant on Pakeha

ability to depower themselves in relation to Maori concerns. This suggests that it is inappropriate for Pakeha, to assess Maori concerns on their values systems. Partnership is instead seen to require reservation of judgement upon that which one cannot understand, or the maintenance of a dynamic of mutual accountability, in which each partner is accountable to the other.

This analysis of the resistant accounting methods of Pakeha psychology lecturers encourages a sensitivity to the effects of dominant group constructions for minority group representation. It may be by appreciating the forms of fallibility and limitations which have been described, rather than by defensiveness, that the discipline can be expected to improve its performance, in relations to bicultural responsibilities. A discipline such as psychology, a people science, needs to be particularly responsive to the values of the wider population. Such reflexivity may enable it to operate more efficiently, be able to better appreciate the mental functioning of those it represents, and thereby be better able to cater for the mental health needs of minority group members.

The conclusions of this study can be seen to fit comfortably into the context from which it was generated. Disciplinary practice was seen to have been criticised for alienating Maori values. The present study explored the manifestation of resistance, in the accounts of Pakeha academic psychologists about the need to develop a more bicultural psychology. Although the discipline the had expressed a desire to develop and function more biculturally, surveys had indicated that the discipline may be resistant to the required changes. This study has offered further indication that Pakeha discourse

provides several barriers to this process. Resistant practices have been explained to be actively reinforced, by Pakeha academic constructions about the need to develop more biculturally. The study thereby reconfirms the observation that Pakeha do not have the understanding and ability to maintain a heavy hand in the process of change (Nikora, 1991).

Although this study suggests that Pakeha may be able to indicate that a discursive construction may work to undermine, for example, the legitimacy of Kaupapa Maori tutorials according to Pakeha values of qualification and assessment, the dominant group member biases in the commentary explaining this effect are still unaccounted for. In other words, the interpretations forwarded can be expected to represent but a drop in the ocean, compared to the experience of resistant discourses from a minority group member's point of view.

The functions of these discourses have been determined with the researchers own resources and should be seen to represent a Pakeha perspective. The findings of this study may therefore be evaluated by the same process which judged the participants discourses. In other words, it is unlikely that the findings are new information to those who experience psychology, with a different set of cultural values. These people would be expected to have a clearer view of the ways that Pakeha discourses work to marginalise their points of view and reaffirm exclusionary practices. This findings of this study therefore can most significantly predict that the development of a more bicultural psychology is dependant upon the extent to which Pakeha appreciate that they may not



be able to appreciate the significance of difference, from their position in New Zealand society.

This conclusion should not be understood, to encourage efforts to identify and systematically eliminate factors which represent these resistant aspects of discursive performance. The movement toward 'political correctness' is considered evidence enough, that rather than encourage mutual appreciation and respect, this may work to offend those concerned. What this conclusion suggests is that bicultural development requires an active commitment by Pakeha psychologists to a process of sensitisation about the implications of their constructions, for minority group members.

The present study therefore offers a contribution to the process of developing a more bicultural psychology by drawing attention to an everyday process which may keep psychology substantially monocultural. It recommends that the process of developing a more bicultural psychology needs to be undertaken more biculturally. This requires consultation, accountability and depowerment. However the study also suggests that ability to undertake such steps toward a more bicultural psychology, may first require that Pakeha realise the role that their values play in determining how they make sense of the world, so that an appreciation may be gained for the sense of alienation experienced if these are oppressed.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, M.W. and Durie, M.H. (1986). *Biculturalism in health and health-related professional training programmes: Taha Maori survey*. Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.
- Abbott, M.W. and Durie, M.H. (1987). A whiter shade of pale: Taha Maori and professional psychology training, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 16, 58-71.
- Awatere-Huata, D. (1993). Challenges to psychology in Aotearoa, in L. W. Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural justice and ethics*. Proceedings of a symposium held at the annual conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, 13-20.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of the New Zealanders, from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Billig, M. (1982). *Ideology and social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D. and Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage.
- Brady, E.C. (1992). Cross-cultural issues in clinical psychology training programmes, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 21, 56-61.
- Burman, E. and Parker, I. (1993). Discourse analysis: The turn to the text, in E. Burman and I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and reading of texts in action*, 1-17. London: Routledge.
- Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, P. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Gergen, K.J. and Kaye, J. (1992). Reflection and reconstruction: Beyond narrative in the negotiation of therapeutic meaning, in S. McNamee and K.J. Gergen, (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction*, 166-185. London: Sage Publications.
- Gergen, K.J., Gulerce, A., Lock, A. and Misra, G. (1996). Psychological science in the cultural context, *American Psychologist*, 51, (5), 496 - 503.

- Gibbs, A.C. (1983). Value conflicts in cross-cultural counselling, *The New Zealand Counselling and Guidance Association Journal*, 5 (1), 1 - 10.
- Goldberg, D.T. (1993). *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Harré, R. and Davies, B. (1990). Positioning: the discursive production of selves, *Journal of Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20, 43 - 63.
- Irwin, K. (1988). Racism and education, in W. Hirsh and R. Scott (Eds.), *Getting it right: Aspects of ethnicity and equity in New Zealand education*, 49-61. Auckland: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Kaai-Oldman, T. (1988). A history of New Zealand education from a Maori perspective, in W. Hirsh and R. Scott (Eds.), *Getting it right: Aspects of ethnicity and equity in New Zealand education*, 22-29. Auckland: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lawson -Te Aho, K. (1993). The socially constructed nature of psychology and the abnormalisation of Maori, *New Zealand Psychological Society Bulletin*, 76, 25-30.
- McCreanor, T. (1993a). Mimiwhangata: Media reliance on Pakeha common-sense in interpretations of Maori actions. *Sites*, 26, 79-90.
- McCreanor, T. (1993b). Settling grievances to deny sovereignty: Trade goods for the year 2000. *Sites*, 27, 45-73.
- McGregor, J. (1991). *Te Orenga Waha Ki: 'In search of a voice'*. Auckland: Race Relations Office.
- Nairn, R. (1993). Cultural justice, ethics and teaching. In L. W. Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural justice and ethics*. Proceedings of a symposium held at the annual conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, 38-41.

- National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, (1993). The New Zealand Psychological Society and the Treaty of Waitangi: Proposed implementation plan. In L. W. Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural justice and ethics*. Proceedings of a symposium held at the annual conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, 74-79.
- New Zealand Psychological Society. (1995). *Developing a Bicultural Psychology for Aotearoa: A resource guide for the teaching of Psychology and Education*. Report of the Society's National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues.
- New Zealand Psychological Society Bulletin, (1993) 76.
- Nikora, L.W. (1991). *The learning preferences of Maori university students: co-operative, competitive, individualistic or intra-ethnic*, Unpublished Masters of Social Science thesis. Hamilton: Waikato.
- Nikora, L.W. and Robertson, N. (1995). Parallel development: A model for the delivery of culturally safe social services. *Summary of a presentation at the fifth conference of the Society for Community Research and Action* (Division 27 of the American Psychological Association). Chicago.
- Older, J. (1978). *The Pakeha Papers*. Dunedin: McIndoe.

- Owens J.M.R. (1981). New Zealand before annexation, in W.H. Oliver and B.R. Williams: (Eds.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, (28-57). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London: Routledge
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes of behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Reeves, W. (1983). *British racial discourse: A study of British political discourse about race and race related matters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riger, S. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values and the study of women, *American Psychologist*, 47, 730 -737.
- Sawrey, R. (1990). *A survey of psychologists opinions and behaviour on aspects of Maori mental health*, Unpublished MA (Applied) thesis, University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Stanley, P. (1993). The power, the glory and the great white hunter. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Psychological Society*, 76, 18-21.

- Stewart, T. (1993). Hohonu kakii, paapaku uaua. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Psychological Society*, 76, 12 - 15.
- Sue, D.W. (1993). *A theory of multicultural counselling/therapy (helping)*. Videotaped recording of a keynote address at the international counsellors conference. Palmerston North: New Zealand Association of Counsellors videotapes
- Thomas, D.R. (1993). What are bicultural psychological services? *Bulletin of the New Zealand Psychological Society*, 76, 31-33.
- Trinh, T.M. (1989). *Women, native, other: Writing, postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1992). Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse and Society*, 3 (1): 87-118.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. California: Sage.
- Van Teeffelen, T. (1994). Racism and metaphor: The Palestinian - Israeli conflict in popular literature. *Discourse and Society*, 5(3): 381-405.



- Verkuyten, M., de Jong, W. and Masson, K. (1994). Racial discourse, attitude and rhetorical manoeuvres. Race talk in the Netherlands. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13, 278-198.
- Walker, R.J. (1996). Maori resistance to state domination, in M. Peters, W. Hope, J. Marshall and S. Webster (Eds.), *Critical theory, poststructuralism and the social context*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992) *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Yensen, H., Hague K., and McCreanor, T. (Eds.) (1989). *Honouring the Treaty*, Auckland: Penguin.
- Yensen, H. and McCreanor T. (1993). Pakeha students and a pro-treaty analysis: teaching issues in a diploma of Clinical Psychology Programme. In L. W. Nikora (Ed.) *Cultural Justice and Ethics*. Proceedings of a symposium held at the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington, 23-24 August 1993, 43-46.
- Zammuner, V.L. (1987). For or against: The expression of attitudes in discourse. *Text*, 4, 411-434.

## APPENDIX A

### THE RELEVANCE OF VALUES TO PSYCHOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC STAFF DISCOURSES

#### INFORMATION SHEET

This study is being conducted by Tony Waldegrave in partial fulfilment of a Masterate of Arts degree in psychology which the researcher is completing at Massey University. The research is being supervised by Kerry Chamberlain and Mandy Morgan. Prior to the commencement of the research the proposed study has been granted ethical approval by the Human Ethics Committee of Massey University.

The researcher seeks to undertake an enquiry into the way in which New Zealand psychology teachers talk about the relevance of values to teaching and practising psychology. It is concerned with how psychology as a discipline is conserved, challenged and changed in response to the needs of the communities it seeks to serve. The researcher anticipates that by collecting psychologists' reflections about contemporary challenges put to the discipline insight may be gained as to whether the way that psychologists talk about such issues is relevant to the practicalities of addressing them. This is considered to be a pertinent and constructive endeavour to undertake for all those who will be involved with the research as it will stimulate qualitative reflection about current social, political and ethical issues that are facing New Zealand's educational system.

Non-Maori psychology staff at Victoria and Massey Universities are invited to participate. Participation will involve being interviewed for up to one hour, on an individual basis by the primary researcher. During the interview participants will be invited to consider a wide range of contemporary challenges put to the discipline by, or on behalf of ethnic minority group members in New Zealand. Potential participants will be asked to give their informed consent for the interviews to be audio-taped and transcribed by the researcher and for quotations to be utilised in presentation provided the anonymity of the participant is maintained.

From the point of data collection onward reference to any materials related to a participant will be by pseudonym only. A list linking pseudonyms to participants will be accessible only to the primary researcher throughout the course of the study. By this method participant anonymity will be maintained, during the research, in the final presentation, and in any publications arising from it.

Those who participate in the study will be required to confirm that they understand their rights as participants to a) decline to answer any question or to talk about certain topics, b) to ask for the recording device to be turned off at any stage, and c) to withdraw from the study at any time. If a participant wishes to withdraw from the study all materials related to the individual's involvement in the study will be returned and no reference or evidence of past reference to the individual will be made in presentation.

During the course of the study the audio-tapes, consent forms, and the list of names linking pseudonyms to individuals will be stored securely and be accessible only to the primary researcher. At the completion of the research these material and transcriptions will be destroyed. A summary of the research will be offered to all who participate.

Potential participants are urged before and after agreeing to participate in the study under the conditions set out on this sheet to seek clarification on any matter related to the research and/or participant involvement that may be unresolved. The researcher and research supervisors are contactable at the locations below, by e-mail, facsimile or telephone throughout the course of the study.

As an eligible candidate for participation in this study you are invited to consider participating under the conditions outlined in this information sheet. Once you have been given time to consider your involvement I will be in contact with you. At this stage any outstanding queries that you have related to the research and participancy can be dealt with. When all questions that you wish to raise before deciding whether to participate have been answered satisfactorily, I will ask whether you are willing to be involved. If you wish to participate we will again discuss the issues of informed consent and you will be asked to complete a consent form confirming your understanding and acceptance of conditions under which you agree to participate.

Researcher: Tony Waldegrave  
 Address: c/- Psychology Department  
 Massey University  
 Private Bag 11222  
 Palmerston North  
 Telephone: 'Messages to Tony Waldegrave' c/- 3504118

Research Supervisor:	Kerry Chamberlain	Mandy Morgan
Address:	Psychology Department Massey University Private Bag 11222 Palmerston North	Psychology Department Massey University Private Bag 11222 Palmerston North
Telephone:	3504123	3504133
Facsimile:	3505673	3505673
E-Mail:	K.Chamberlain@massey.ac.nz	C.A.Morgan@massey.ac.nz

## APPENDIX B

**THE RELEVANCE OF VALUES TO PSYCHOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF  
ACADEMIC STAFF DISCOURSES****CONSENT FORM**

I have read the Information Sheet and am satisfied that I understand the objectives of the study and what participation in the study involves. I know who the primary researcher is and how to contact him. I also understand the role that the researcher's supervisors will have in the study and know how to contact them.

I understand my rights as a participant to decline to answer any question or to talk about certain topics. I also understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any stage and that if I decide to do so all materials related to my involvement will be returned to me.

I understand that all materials related to my involvement will be identifiable by pseudonym only and that the primary researcher is the only person who will have access to the list which links my identity to a pseudonyms. I understand that this list will be destroyed on completion of the study.

I agree to the interview being audio-taped and transcribed. I understand that I may ask for the tape to be turned off at any time during the interview. I understand that all tapes related to my involvement will be stored securely and accessible only to the primary researcher until the completion of the research, at which stage the tapes and transcriptions shall be destroyed. I understand that materials related to my involvement in the study will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the information sheet.

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_