

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.

Weaving 'Muka' and 'Iron'? : A Content Analysis of How Māori and Pākehā/Western Inter-relationships are Articulated in Academic Texts for Māori Educational Benefit

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master in Education at Massey University, Palmerston North**

Timu-o-te-rangi Hirini Niwa

2006

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Professor Don Miller who passed away suddenly two months before I completed this work.

Your mentorship and guidance, your quiet and humble manner and endless encouragement of my potential as an educational researcher will last long in my heart and memories.

Thanks for all your support Don.

We'll still go out for that beer sometime.

This one's for you.

Ngā mihi e te Rangatira.

Abstract

This thesis analyses and describes how different academics articulate and define inter-relationships between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological worldviews. In examining a selection of four academic texts, it aims to provide an insight into how varying definitions and articulations of Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relationships are utilised for varying philosophical, theoretical and political purposes. In comparing and contrasting the content analytic findings with a review of historical and more contemporary exchanges between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies in the realm of education it aims to probe into the over utilisation of monoglossic binaries to inform theorising heavily influential in education spheres concerning Māori.

In noting that a small number of academics are beginning to move beyond the sole use of binaries to inform their position of how education for Māori ought to be conceived and conceptualised, this thesis suggests that what is lacking in educational academic discourse impacting upon Māori people is a more carefully considered theory of Māori heterogeneity, diversity and ambivalence. This research aims to provide some significant sign-posts from which a more thoughtful and careful examination of the blurring of Māori and Pākehā power and identity boundaries and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological worldviews can take place. It is suggested that when the political, philosophical and epistemological diversities of Māori people are legitimated and validated in academic discourse, more appropriate and purposeful strategies can be devised to provide suitable forms of education for them.

Acknowledgements

I do want to take some time here to acknowledge the numerous people who have supported and guided me throughout not only this thesis, but throughout this entire post-graduate journey. I firstly want to thank the staff, students and whānau of Glen Taylor School in Auckland. Thank-you for your quiet support when I began this degree in 2002 while I was still teaching there. To the wonderful group of children I taught, you will always remain with me as a form of constant inspiration. You provided me with the much needed fuel to get back into study. Kia-ora.

To the staff of Te Uru Māraurau. I have greatly appreciated the opportunity to work and study here. Special thanks to Professor Arohia Durie who gave me the chance to be unleashed upon tertiary students while continuing on with my own development as an educator and researcher.

To Hine and Peti- your assistance and feedback throughout my thesis journey has been invaluable. Thanks for your ongoing support, nurture and motivation for me to keep going, despite the many times when the going got too tough for me to handle.

To Don, Pani, Marilyn and Carolyn- I think our expert panel was awesome. We were able to bounce off one another, assisting and challenging where need be over our respective theses while managing to have a few laughs and giggles along the way too. Our team dynamic was great. Ngā mihi nui e te roopu manaaki.

To my whānau- Thank-you for your encouragement and support along the way. To my Dad, who when the going got tough for me, you provided me with the extra encouragement I needed to stand my ground, and to stick to what I know and believe. Kia-

ora. To my Mum, your regular question of ‘How’s it going with your thesis?’ was always welcomed. You displayed your concern for my work and study in your own quiet and unassumingly supportive way. Thank-you.

To Laura, my wife- Thank-you for the unenviable task of putting up with the irregular sleeping patterns, the constant mood shifts and the ups and downs I’d encountered throughout this journey. Your patience, confidence and numerous hugs have provided me with an ongoing and selfless source of motivation and comfort when I felt I had nobody else to turn to. I look forward to the next leg of our journey together.

Most of all I would like to give thanks to God. I have struggled with your nature and existence over the past three years as I’ve wrestled with huge theoretical, philosophical, theological and epistemological issues upon this journey. Without the guidance of your Holy Spirit and the work of Christ I would not have been able to complete this. Thank-you for the experiences encountered, roads traversed and people met along the way.

Looking forward to the next part of my journey, Lord.

Table of Contents

	Page
<i>Title Page</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Dedication</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>ix</i>
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
2.0 Introduction.....	9
2.1a Māori and Pākehā Inter-relations: Mission and Native Schooling Eroding and Challenging Māori Worldviews	13
2.1b Māori Integrating into Pākehā Society: State Schooling for Māori	16
2.2 Māori ‘Speaking Back’ to Pākehā Dominance	19
2.3 Articulating Māori and Pākehā/Western Inter-relations in Academic Discourse	20
2.3.1 <i>Theme One: Unequal Māori and Pākehā Power Relations in Education</i>	24
2.3.2 <i>Theme Two: The Knowledge/Power Nexus</i>	31
2.3.3 <i>Theme Three: Contemporary Māori Realities</i>	36
2.4 Summary of Literature Review.....	40

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.0	Introduction.....	43
3.1	The ‘Western-Objectivist’ Research Paradigm.....	44
3.2	Māori Critiques of the ‘Western-Objectivist’ Research Paradigm.....	47
3.3	‘Western-Subjectivist’ Research Paradigms.....	51
3.4	Māori Ambivalence Toward ‘Western-Subjectivist’ Research Paradigms.....	56
3.5	Outline and Critique of Māori Research Paradigms.....	59
3.6	Articulating a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-Centred Research Methodology....	69

Chapter Four: Method and Procedure

4.0	Introduction.....	76
4.1	Content Analysis.....	77
4.2	Procedure.....	82
4.2.1	<i>Getting Focused, Articulating Questions and Selecting Material to Analyse.....</i>	87
4.2.2	<i>The Content Analytic Process.....</i>	91
4.2.3	<i>Sorting the Data, Constructing Categories.....</i>	94
4.2.4	<i>Reliability, Validity and Bias.....</i>	96
4.2.5	<i>Ethics.....</i>	98
4.2.6	<i>Limitations.....</i>	102

Chapter Five: Results and Analysis

5.1	Major and Minor Themes.....	104
5.2	Analysis of Themes.....	108
5.2.1	<i>Major Theme D1.....</i>	109

5.2.2	<i>Major Theme D2</i>	112
5.2.3	<i>Major Theme D3</i>	115
5.2.4	<i>Major Theme D4</i>	118
5.2.5	<i>Minor Theme D5</i>	119
5.2.6	<i>Minor Theme D6</i>	120
5.2.7	<i>Minor Theme D7</i>	121
5.2.8	<i>Minor Theme D8</i>	122
5.3	Summary of Themes.....	123
 Chapter Six: Discussion		
6.0	Introduction.....	125
6.1	Articulating Power, Identity and Epistemological Inter-relations.....	127
6.1.1	<i>Discussion of McKinley Article</i>	127
6.1.2	<i>Discussion of Rata Article</i>	133
6.1.3	<i>Discussion of Durie Article</i>	139
6.1.4	<i>Discussion of Tau Article</i>	146
6.2	Working With and Beyond the Binary: Critically Representing Inter-relating Power, Identity and Knowledge Boundaries in Educational Academic Discourse.....	151
6.2.1	<i>Working With and Beyond the Binary: Theorising Ambivalence</i>	153
6.2.2	<i>Concerns Over Theorising a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-Centred Approach</i>	157
6.3	Conclusion.....	162
<i>Appendix 1:</i>	<i>Full Outline of all Major and Minor Themes, Contributing Variables and Distribution Rates</i>	165
<i>Appendix 2:</i>	<i>Number and Distribution of Unsorted Content Units</i>	187
<i>Appendix 3:</i>	<i>Number of Content Units Per Theme</i>	188
<i>Appendix 4:</i>	<i>Number of Total Content Units Constructed</i>	189
<i>Appendix 5:</i>	<i>Inter-Coder Reliability Coefficients Results</i>	190

<i>References</i>	192
-------------------------	-----

List of Tables

	Page
<i>Table 4.1 Pre-Sorted Distribution and Total Number of Content Units.....</i>	94
<i>Table 4.2 Post-Sorting Distribution and Total Number of Content Units Utilised.....</i>	95
<i>Table 4.3 'Hi-Ha' Māori-Centred Research and Ethicality.....</i>	99
<i>Table 5.1a: Four Major Themes.....</i>	104
<i>Table 5.1b: Four Minor Themes.....</i>	104
<i>Table D1: Distribution Table (Theme One).....</i>	105
<i>Table D2: Distribution Table (Theme Two).....</i>	106
<i>Table D3: Distribution Table (Theme Three).....</i>	106
<i>Table D4: Distribution Table (Theme Four).....</i>	106
<i>Table D5: Distribution Table (Theme Five).....</i>	107
<i>Table D6: Distribution Table (Theme Six).....</i>	107
<i>Table D7: Distribution Table (Theme Seven).....</i>	107
<i>Table D8: Distribution Table (Theme Eight).....</i>	108
<i>Table D1a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D1.....</i>	109
<i>Table D2a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D2.....</i>	112
<i>Table D3a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D3.....</i>	115
<i>Table D4a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D4.....</i>	118
<i>Table D5a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D5.....</i>	119
<i>Table D6a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D6.....</i>	120
<i>Table D7a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D7.....</i>	121
<i>Table D8a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D8.....</i>	122

<i>Table 6.1a: Examples of Elizabeth Rata's binary theorising.....</i>	134
<i>Table 6.1b: A Critical 'Ha' Māori-Centred Re-orienting of Rata's Binaries.....</i>	138
<i>Table 6.2a: Examples of Graham Smith's binary theorising.....</i>	160
<i>Table 6.2b: A Critical 'Ha' Māori-Centred Re-orienting of Smith's Binaries.....</i>	160
<i>Table 4.4a: McKinley Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table.....</i>	190
<i>Table 4.4b: Rata Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table.....</i>	191
<i>Table 4.4c: Durie Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table.....</i>	191
<i>Table 4.4d: Tau Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table.....</i>	191
<i>Table 4.4e: Overall Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table.....</i>	191

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

*They have stolen the land of my ancestors.
They have taken my language, the core of my being.
They have occupied my mind and consciousness.*

I have lost my authentic self.

I must resist the Enemy.

*Give our land back.
Give our language back.
Give my true mind and consciousness back.*

Growing up I knew that I was Māori. I was marked by my skin colour, by my name and by my extended whānau experiences on varying marae throughout Aotearoa. There are many memorable moments for me that signify my Māori identity. I remember my whānau and I having to bathe in the Motu River when the ablutions were ‘out of order’ at Maraenui just up the coast from Opotiki. I recall my grandmother, Huia Esther Niwa’s (nee Bird) tangi at Rangitahi Marae in Murupara in 1990 where she had returned to the family homestead to spend her final moments with us after leaving Wellington Base Hospital. In 1999 when my Niwa whānau had a reunion at Kairau Marae in Waitara, counting 69 first cousins on our growing whakapapa on the dining room wall has always left an indelible mark on me. Another memorable time was when my wife and I had our wedding service partly in Te Reo at St. Michael’s Māori Anglican Church in Palmerston North. It was these and many countless other moments where being Māori has been reinforced within my consciousness as an integral part of who I am. But I was also different too. There were many other experiences that I had which differed from some of my whānau and friends.

Such experiences also greatly influenced who I am and how my sense of identity has evolved over time.

During some school holidays my sister and I would stay with our grandfather at his place in Waikanae. I relished the opportunity to eat Huntley and Palmers crackers, admiring my grandfather's penchant for photography and nature and being in the company of our English grandparent was always enjoyed. My great-grandmother who also immigrated to New Zealand from England was another source of insight into my evolving understanding of my identity. Upon my winning of a national essay competition on world peace at age 17 with the prize being a trip to Japan, my great-grandmother wrote me a letter somewhat excited as she not only congratulated me on my efforts but she also vividly shared with me her own experience of winning an essay competition when she was growing up in England. She wrote,

'My dear Timu,

I expect by now you have got used to all the congratulations of your successful efforts of the last few months. May I add mine and say what a joy it was to receive the package your mother kindly sent to me...Unfortunately I was unable to see your photograph but I am told you are a very nice looking young man!

Having gone through two world wars I have had plenty of experience at the permanent scars it leaves, the tragedy of all the wasted young lives, and the heartaches which never go away.

We lived across the marshes near the oil wharves, and being also on the direct line to London, bombings, doodlebugs, and rockets were no strangers to us.

I was ten when the first war broke out, and a few days before I was sitting in the little schoolroom writing an essay competing for a prize organised by the R.S.P.C.A.

Although I won a prize I was unable to receive it as expected. Living in a village in the country, a trip to London to see the sights would have been really something. There weren't any cars around in those days. It would have meant horse and trap to the station to catch the train. Then to receive the prize from one of the Royals would have just about topped everything.

But the first air raid on London put a stop to all that, but the beautifully illustrated book of animals I treasured for years.'

I was astounded. Not only had the topic I had written about connected with a huge part of my great-grandmother's life when she was growing up in England but I thought as I was reading her eye-failing scrawl on the white Croxley pages, 'I'm like my great-grandmother in showing some skill in writing!' I was soon to discover that a world of resemblance and similarity existed within my Pākehā side as well. Numerous other 'aha' moments have occurred for me over time. Thoughts of my-'self' deriving from my Pākehā side have always been there in the back of my mind but have never really come out to others as I was always seen as solely Māori.

While my great-grandmother passed away shortly after my return from Japan, her legacy and love still lives on in my grandfather, my mother and in my own acknowledgement of my mixed ethnic and cultural background. Such acknowledgement has propelled me to see differences somewhat differently from how they are sometimes articulated in academic texts pertaining to what is beneficial for Māori in education. Seeking to consider difference from a different tangent than the homogenising representation articulated by some scholars when positioning Māori people and worldviews in a place of distinctiveness and uniqueness to Pākehā people and Pākehā/Western worldviews, I have been driven to more carefully take into account the complexities and diversities of Māori identity, representation and epistemological viewpoints. The

symbolism utilised in the title of this thesis denotes part of my consideration of such complexities.

The piece of prose that I have written at the outset of this chapter serves as a symbolic lead-in to how discourses of strategic monoglossic¹ rigidity have tended at times to make absent the complexities that occur at the meeting and crossings-over of cultural, social and epistemological borders. I became increasingly conscious over my times of reflection and reading that the ‘They’ described in the piece of prose at the outset also partially referred to me. The ensuing theoretical, philosophical and moral dilemma of coming to terms with such contradictions led me to embark on a journey of searching, questioning and debating how theorising for Māori in education could more explicitly take into account the positive aspects of the physical and epistemological presence of the ‘Other’ in such discourses without solely resorting to assertions where Māori ways are framed as ‘good’ and Pākehā ways as ‘bad’.

The initial part of the title of this thesis ‘Weaving ‘Muka’ and ‘Iron’?’ also serves as a symbolic guide towards a heteroglossic² consideration of the tension and potentiality that exists at the borders of Māori and Pākehā/Western differences. ‘Muka’ as a connective image for all Māori in terms of a whakapapa epistemological worldview and genealogical links to one other through varying iwi, hapū and whānau affiliations is considered

¹ Utilised largely throughout this thesis, *monoglossia* is a term derived from the work of Bakhtin (1973, 1981, 1986 in White, 2005) who states that it is a rhetorical strategy utilised by people (and for the purpose of analysis in this thesis, academics) to articulate a position or point of view about social reality in which there is no doubt in the mind of the aforesaid regarding the value of his or her truth statement. Truth statements are coded by researchers and analysts to be monoglossic in orientation when language is used in an emphatic and declarative manner, with no room for doubt to sway their view.

² Also of extensive use in this thesis is the term *heteroglossia*. It is again derived from Bakhtin’s theorising (1973, 1981, 1986 and also Foucault’s, 1972 account of intertextuality and Fairclough’s 1989, 1992 analysis of intertextuality and orders of discourse in White, 2005) but it differs from monoglossia in that its rhetorical strategy is one which seeks to acknowledge a particular point of view, evidencing a willingness for a speaker or author of academic texts to negotiate meanings. The position of deference assumed by the speaker or author for differing views is symbolised in the manner in which they utilise language and articulate such complexities and tensionalities in their discourse.

alongside the imagery of ‘Iron’, symbolising the foundations of a Western epistemological worldview based on notions of scientific critical rationality, manifest evidence and objective logic. The more important symbol however is the question mark which follows. It symbolises a heteroglossic consideration of the potential over-laps, borrowings and weavings that occur across and between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews which serves as a fundamental sign-post of my approach as a researcher and educator regarding the meanings that are derived from this thesis. Approaching the task of research heteroglossically is not one which indicates my own lack of commitment or confidence in the truth value of certain position statements made by varying academics or researchers in educational theorising. Rather it acknowledges the contentiousness of particular propositions with a willingness to negotiate with those who might hold a different view on matters of concern (White, 2005 following Bahktin 1973, 1981, 1986).

In the thesis that follows I have woven in my journey of heteroglossic consideration while examining a series of academic texts which articulate and provide some definition on how inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies are conceptualised by a small selection of academics. It is hoped that through such an analysis a more carefully considered perspective on how Māori people are constructed in educational academic discourse and how they/we are constructed in relation to Pākehā people and their/my attendant worldviews would come to the fore for the purpose of critically discussing, negotiating and challenging ideas about educational provisions for them/us.

Chapter Two begins contextualising the research undertaken by reviewing how the literature articulates inter-relationships between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological worldviews. An historical review of mission, native and state schooling is provided with an insight into how Māori were dominated and oppressed through acts of colonisation, with colonial values and mandates perpetuated and reproduced through such schooling initiatives for Māori. In response, Māori have ‘spoken back’ to such dominance in education, articulating the need to resist Pākehā control, moving into spaces where notions of self-determination prevail.

The latter part of the chapter notes that a large proportion of the literature tended to utilise a binary approach to conceptualising Māori and Pākehā differences to give effect to such ‘speaking back’. The literature review simultaneously appraises and critiques such an over-emphasis of binaries in pursuit of a more complex reading of the inter-relationships that occur across Māori and Pākehā borders. This chapter also notes how a small number of academics are beginning to more readily theorise the multifaceted spaces and diverse realities in which Māori are located to give effect to a broad-ranging approach to Māori educational provision and advancement.

Chapter Three offers a methodological review and justification for the procedures of the research selected in order to give some insight into the issues being problematised. In providing a philosophical and theoretical gaze at the task of educational research, it aims to outline some of the key characteristics of both objectivist and subjectivist Western research paradigms and how they have been critiqued and/or supported by Māori academics to advance their/our social, cultural and political purposes.

This discussion leads into the latter part of the chapter which outlines a philosophically eclectic methodological position seeking to draw from Western objective and subjectivist paradigms and Māori research paradigms to inform and give strength to an emerging ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research methodology. While such a methodology is currently ‘in gestation’, it builds upon Mason Durie’s Māori-centred framework in the acknowledgment of his principle of diverse, contemporary Māori realities. The ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodological approach aims to give space for a more essentialised Māori epistemology to be legitimated while also providing a more clearly articulated theoretical and philosophical space for ‘Other’ ways of knowing to be conceptualised and developed in dynamic tension with aspects of such essentialised Māori ways of knowing for educational research purposes.

Chapter Four provides an outline of the procedures and steps undertaken in the content analysis of the four academic texts under review. Included are accounts of how data was coded and sorted into categories, issues of reliability, validity and bias were also considered in tandem with an account of ethical concerns and limitations that arose throughout the research process.

Following this Chapter Five outlines the four major and four minor themes that were educed from the content analysis of the four texts as outlined in Chapter Four. The frequency and distribution of content units are included alongside percentage totals for each academic in a series of tables. The eight themes are discussed and analysed with statistical indications of the degree of attention afforded to each theme by each of the academics concerned.

Chapter Six pulls in both the findings from Chapter Five and review of the literature in Chapter Two to interpretively discuss each of the articles in specific relation to the research questions being addressed. They are,

- i) ‘How are inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity, articulated in four academic texts for Māori educational benefit?
- ii) ‘How are inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies articulated in four academic texts for Māori educational benefit?

It must be stated here that while the second research question aims to address inter-relationships between epistemologies specifically, the terms ‘worldviews’, ‘ways of knowing’ and ‘ways of being’ are utilised interchangeably with the word ‘epistemology’ to broaden the scope of the discussions and analyses throughout the thesis.

The final part of this chapter attempts to outline a theory which can dynamically work with and beyond the monoglossic binary approach to articulating Māori issues in education. In offering a theory of ambivalence through the tentative ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach, this thesis concludes with a number of concerns with the utilisation of such a framework, opening up a space for a continued dialogue with readers, fellow researchers and educators interested in advancing Māori, in all their/our diversities, in education.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter addresses how Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations are articulated in four academic texts for the purpose of benefiting Māori in education by contextualising the research in light of the available literature. While no systematically comprehensive research could be located which specifically analysed how Māori and Pākehā inter-relations are strategically articulated in academic texts, a large body of literature was found which denoted, through the tools of critical historical analysis, rhetoric and academic persuasion, a variety of perspectives on how inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews are articulated in educational academic texts for the purpose of benefiting Māori.

This review of the literature is divided into three sections. The first notes how discourses of assimilation and colonial superiority heavily impacted upon the educational lives of Māori in the past (*Section 2.1a*). It acknowledges that in the past Māori were constructed as being inferior to that of the growing colonial Pākehā population with their superior technologies and access to literacy (Jackson, M.D., 2003; Simon, 1998). The role of mission, native and state schooling for Māori in perpetuating notions of colonial superiority and Pākehā epistemological dominance is seen in the literature to have left an indelible mark not only on the identities of generations of Māori people but also in regard to their views on the value of mātauranga Māori in contemporary times (Jackson, M.D., 2003; Simon, 1998; Smith, G.H., 1991, 1992). An historical back-drop is provided for the

purpose of offering an insight into how Māori educational resistance movements which began in the early 1980s through the use of declarative, monoglossic Māori and Pākehā dualisms, gained impetus amongst Māori people as a form of transformative education which privileged Māori social, cultural and language interests and preferences through the development of Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Wānanga.

It is from the past that such monoglossic, binary notions of Pākehā dominance and superiority over Māori people and Māori ways of knowing are said to continue in varying educational spaces in contemporary times by an exceptionally large portion of the literature (Bishop, 1996, 1998, 1999; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003; Durie, A.E., 1992, 2002a, 2002b; Durie, M.H., 1998; Greenland, 1984; Jackson, M., 1998; Johnston, 1998, 2003; McKinley, 2005; McMurchy-Pilkington, 1996; O'Regan, 1999; Pihamo, Smith, K., Taki, & Lee, 2004; Smith, C., 1998; Smith, G.H., 1988, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002, 2003; Smith, L.T., 1999; Spoonley, 1993; Te Ariki, Spoonley & Tomoana, 1992; Waitere-Ang & Johnston, 1999; Walker, 1991, 1996a, 1996b). Forming the latter part of the first of this chapter Section 2.1b discusses how the continual domination of Māori within the current state schooling system in contemporary times is articulated in the literature. Following this is Section 2.2. This second section of the review denotes a sense of Māori 'speaking back' to the dominant forces of Pākehā colonisation, reified notions of universality and unequal relations of power.

While the bulk of the literature, as noted above, demonstrates that the Māori community is well versed in commentaries which decry the severity of the colonial experience for Māori including the loss of land through illegitimate warfare and confiscation, the devastating experience for many of our tupuna who were punished for

speaking Te Reo and the large corpus of statutory acts which promoted heavy handed tactics to control our lives and prospects, ‘speaking back’ to Pākehā dominance in education through notions of unequal relations of power and the questioning of claims of the superiority of Pākehā/Western ways of knowing over Māori ways of knowing in some of the literature tended to monoglossically construct Māori and Pākehā entities as distinctive and wholly different from one another, through the articulation of distinctive oppositional relations of power between Māori and Pākehā people (*Pākehā dominant and Māori subordinate*) and distinctive and dissimilar epistemological boundaries between Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing (Bishop, 1996, 1998, 1999; Smith, G.H., 1988, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002, 2003). Such theorizing tended to negate the complexities that occur when considering notions of power, ethnic identity and epistemological borrowing.

It was also noted that a number of others cited in the literature tended to utilise such distinctive monoglossic boundaries between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing while also seeking to complicate conceptions of rigid power, ethnic and epistemological boundaries for Māori educational benefit (Durie, M., 1998; McKinley, 2005; Walker, 1996a). And yet others have articulated a necessity to critique the proclaimed transformative potential of Māori ways of knowing by suggesting that Māori need to more readily embrace the characteristics of an open society (Popper, 1962, 1989, 1992), which include concepts of critical rationality, scientific conjecture, refutation and fallibilism for their ultimate educational benefit and advancement (Rata, 1996a, 1996b, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2005a, 2005b; Tau, 2001a, 2001b, 2002).

The enormity of the terrain to be traversed in this review of the literature as noted above is somewhat condensed in the third part of the chapter (*Section 2.3*). It is here that three themes have been educed from the literature for a more focused discussion. The first theme talks specifically to notions of power relations between Māori and Pākehā people in education. A large proportion of the literature notes that Māori are in an oppressive or subordinate relationship to Pākehā while others call for a more complex view of power relations between the two groups to be considered. The second theme discusses the literature which promotes the idea that Māori knowledge is subsumed by dominant Pākehā/Western ways of knowing through the effects of unequal relations of power as outlined in the first theme. Inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological boundaries are considered here. The third and final theme discusses the notion of contemporary Māori realities and how theorising around such a conception might invoke a multitude of possibilities for Māori educational benefit.

The literature confirms that while a number of academics utilise distinctive, monoglossic Māori and Pākehā/Western boundaries and group distinctions to inform their discourse, such ‘speaking back’ is necessary when supported and counter-balanced by a view of Māori heterogeneity, which considers the numerous complexities and subtle intricacies that occur at the borders of Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western knowledge inter-relations. The literature reviewed evidenced that such complex articulations which take into account (following Bahktin, 1973, 1981, 1986 in White, 2005) both the monoglossic and heteroglossic contradictions and complications of inter-relations between Māori and Pākeha people and Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing are only beginning to gain momentum and speed as Māori re-think, re-theorise

and debate their views not only about the philosophical and psychological presence of ‘the physical Other’, but also about the philosophical and psychological presence of ‘the epistemological Other’ as well. As is shown here, the predominant use of distinctive Maori and Pākehā/Western boundaries is borne from a deep understanding of the historical, social and political context in which Māori have been and are located in. The question to be kept in the back of one’s mind as reading through the review of the literature though is whether the sole use of monoglossic Māori and Pākehā boundaries provides the full theoretical, philosophical and political picture to enable and advance Māori in education in contemporary times.

2.1a Māori and Pākehā Inter-relations: Mission and Native Schooling Eroding and Challenging Māori Worldviews

The review of the literature begins with an analysis of mission and native schooling for Māori. It is clear from the literature that a monoglossic dualism provided the motivation for the Christian imperative to provide considerate compassion to and protection of Māori. Such a binary between the ‘civilized European’ and ‘uncivilized Māori’ underpinned missionary schooling which began in Rangihoua in 1816. Set with the job of introducing Māori to Christianity and the ways of the European, missionaries were the first group to establish and control schools in New Zealand (Durie, A.E., 2005). While the first mission school in Rangihoua failed to ignite much interest amongst Māori in the early 1800s, Judith Simon (1998) notes that it wasn’t until the 1830s that Māori began to interest themselves in European-style schooling (p3).

Of note was the enthusiasm for European notions of literacy amongst Māori. From 1840 onwards, reading and writing were an ‘immensely important means of communicating’ (Jackson, M.D., 1975 in Simon, 1998 p5). Simon states that while there were instances where Māori were highly enthused with gaining literacy skills what was of concern at that time was that the focus for developing literacy skills was centred on the Bible and European values rather than Māori values, culture and worldview. What this meant for Māori was that their traditional culture and knowledge systems were being challenged and beginning to become marginalised and eroding away as Māori were increasingly exposed through literacy to European social practices and European views of the self. Jackson (2003) has noted a number of examples of how this impacted upon Māori.

He states that ‘the values and authority of the written word challenged the authority of specialists in traditional lore’ (Jackson, 2003; p46). Māori were confronted through the act of literacy with the ‘relative truth or falsity’ (p31) of their traditional values such as tapu and mana (Jenkins, 1991 in Simon, 1998; p7) when compared to the values of the European. The utilisation of the ‘civilised European’/‘uncivilised Māori’ monoglossic binary was seen to impact upon Māori in regard to views of time and reality. Jackson (2003) notes how literacy ‘produced an hiatus in the continuity of traditional time’ where the ‘present and the future no longer recreated or recapitulated the past’ (p46). Māori found themselves in a juxtaposing and comparing position having to make a moral choice between two fairly different and distinctive worldviews. Such moral dilemmas were compounded through literacy which enabled a new view of ‘the self’ to be evoked among Māori.

Literacy, Jackson (2003) states, ‘enabled the critical detachment of mind’ where the written word was not only abstracted from the context of social action, but that the literate person was in effect detached from the social group (p47). Literacy changed the intensity in which oral-aural forms of knowing were utilised in Māori society (pp46-47)³ and Māori began to witness the deprecating impact of literacy upon mātauranga Māori and Māori ways of living. Both Simon and Jackson note that over time Māori realised that the literacy offered through mission schools ‘was not as efficacious as they had anticipated’ (Jackson, 2003; p47) so began to return their attention to Māori knowledge and worldviews. But such a return was seen to never be fully regained (Simon, 1998; p6) as the hallmarks of a colonial worldview seeped their way into Māori consciousness, social structure and being.

It was amidst this space of ambivalence in which Māori found themselves, between their own ways and the ways of the European, that in 1847 Government began to have impact upon the schooling of Māori children. Seeking to further impel an ideology of assimilation upon Māori through assimilatory education policies and practices, the Government provided subsidies for mission schools who complied with certain regulations and conditions such as providing industrial education⁴ and instruction in the English language. Despite disruptions by the land wars, the 1860s saw the advent of a secular, state controlled system of schooling for Māori. Furthering the perpetuation of the assimilation policy of the colonial Government, the village Native Schools emphasised English knowledge through the English language, omitting Māori knowledge and Māori language in the process. Judith Simon (1998) suggests that Native Schools *appeared* ‘to offer Māori what many of them were seeking- the skills and knowledge which they perceived to be the

³ See also Kawharu (2003).

⁴ Industrial education and training for Māori was aimed at creating the labour/ working-class in the newly emerging capitalist society of New Zealand.

key to Pākehā economic success' (p12). Māori however were coming to the realisation that complementing Māori culture and knowledge with Pākehā knowledge was necessary for effective survival within an increasingly Pākehā-dominated society. Despite a few spaces where selected aspects of Māori culture were incorporated into schools, the desire for hegemonic dominance was clearly evident in the colonial schooling system for Māori.

As Māori struggled for control over the livelihoods and prospects for their children and youth, state involvement in the education of Māori steadily increased in multifarious forms and guises. As a new act for the establishment of a national, compulsory state-oriented education system was being introduced alongside the transfer of control of the Native Schools from the Native Department to the new Department of Education, the rationale for Māori integration into Pākehā-dominated society continued to perpetuate the 'civilized European' and 'uncivilized Māori' monoglossic binary.

2.1b Māori Integrating into Pākehā Society: State Schooling for Māori

The advent of the 1877 Education Act saw a universal system of schooling made available in New Zealand. Based upon ideals of egalitarianism, racial harmony, economic growth and social control, the Education Act sought to eliminate the inequalities that had occurred under a rigid class-based system which many of the settlers had escaped from in Great Britain. Despite sitting parallel to the Native Schooling system there were no official restrictions of access to either system based on race. While both Māori and Pākehā children attended both, it seemed that the intention of the Department of Education at that time was to vigorously move towards an integrated public schooling system.

It is clear to see that from the early 1930s, the notion of assimilation was giving way to the new discourse of integration. Māori were located within both a Pākehā dominated society and Pākehā-controlled schooling system which promoted their integration rather than their assimilation. An official statement in the Education Gazette of 1941 emphasised this change in thinking. It stated,

‘...that instead of trying to make the native people like themselves (European) the better plan might be to recognise the social realities of the Māori and then to assist him to make the necessary adaptations to the new conditions. This completely new conception acknowledges the values inherent in the native culture and the right and need for any people to be actively co-operative in adjustments to new conditions...’

(cited by Ramsay, 1972 in Durie, A., 2005; p11)

In line with this, during the 1930s and 1940s, D.G. Ball introduced a policy of ‘cultural adaption’ which saw an increase in emphasis on things Māori in Māori schools. Native Schools were expected to follow the same syllabus as in public schools but were given space to make ‘appropriate’ modifications for Māori. It was noted that policy disallowed Te Reo to be spoken within schools grounds, but Māori arts and crafts were accommodated in schools (Simon, 1998; ppxii-xviii). But it wasn’t until the 1950s and early 1960s that Māori views and experiences within the schooling system were more attentively considered. Three key reports noted by Judith Simon (1998) signalled another turn in the tide of competing discourses.

The first was produced by the National Committee of Māori Education established in 1955. For the first time ever, the Department of Education sought Māori views on the education of their children when they invited representative Māori leaders to participate in

a national committee. The committee made a number of recommendations, one of which saw in the following year a new position of Officer of Māori Education created. The second report was formulated by J.K. Hunn, the secretary of Māori Affairs. For the first time a report was available which statistically highlighted the plight Māori were in, not only in terms of education, but in terms of health, employment and housing as well (Simon, 1986). The picture of poor Māori educational achievement rates in the Hunn Report was again re-iterated in the 1962 Currie Report. This report recommended the transfer of all Māori/Native Schools to education board control. Simon (1994) notes the indifference and hostility education school boards had towards Māori children if they didn't fit into the Pākehā-oriented system (p72). Such tension forced Māori to more readily face the realities of a discourse of integration if they were to succeed in the Pākehā-dominated system.

What has been of interest to note is that while more power was seen to be 'given over' to Māori since the time of mission and native schooling evidenced in the appointment of a Māori Education Officer, opening up the curriculum to selected Māori cultural aspects and the involvement of Māori representatives in the education of their children and youth, Māori were becoming increasingly 'vocal in protesting about the education system' (Simon, 1994; p72) and the inequities it continually perpetuated against Māori children. The tide of a discourse of *tino rangatiratanga* in education was approaching where education was designed by, with and for Māori, challenging Pākehā dominance and Pākehā/Western epistemological supremacy in the lives of Māori children.

2.2 Māori ‘Speaking Back’ to Pākehā Dominance

In the early 1980s Māori began to take educational matters into their own hands. The advent of Te Whare Wānanga o Raukawa, the first Kohanga Reo in Wainuiomata and the first Kura Kaupapa Māori at Hoani Waititi in Auckland began an explosive chain of educational initiatives centred in Te Reo Māori, privileging Māori pedagogical and organisational preferences right throughout Aotearoa. Graham Smith (1992) notes that two key ideologies curbed Māori interests which propelled them towards theories of resistance and self-determination in education. The first was the ideology that Pākehā knowledge and culture was seen as superior to the inferiority of Māori knowledge and culture. The second was the ideology that Pākehā knowledge held the liberating potential that Māori knowledge lacked (p92). Smith notes that such ideologies undermined Māori cultural norms and perpetuated Pākehā dominance in education ‘to the exclusion of Māori preferred interests in education’ (pp99-100). The discourse of Māori resistance over the educational lives of Māori children resulted in educational structures mirroring Māori cultural capital and Māori educational interests and aspirations.

In support of this, Johnston (1994) has noted that Kohanga Reo recognises and is built upon the notion of Māori difference being positive and not negative (p22)⁵ privileging Te Reo and Māori ways of being and doing in opposition to Pākehā ways of being and doing. Linda Smith (1994) iterates such comments when she states that Kura Kaupapa Māori support Māori interests in education through whānau-based organisation and preferred pedagogical relationships (p347). But the question that has failed to be considered is how have more recent theoretical articulations in academic discourse, constructed Māori

⁵ See also Katene (1992).

and Pākehā inter-relations in order to bring benefit to Māori in education? To what effect have they potentially emphasised a Māori and Pākehā dualism (similar to that conveyed by the colonialist idiom of the ‘civilized European’ and the ‘uncivilized Māori’) in an almost mutually distinctive and absolutist manner negating to a large degree the complexities and diversities that occur across Māori and Pākehā/Western power, identity and epistemological borders? Such concerns are raised and examined in the latter part of review of the literature that follows.

2.3 Articulating Māori and Pākehā/Western Inter-relations in Academic Discourse

With a back-drop of historical loss and compromise leading to theories of educational resistance by Māori, a number of contemporary educators have over the past twenty years entered into discussions articulating varying perspectives on how such inter-relationships are to be conceptualised in educational academic discourse. As is evident from the preceding review of some of the literature, such conceptualisations have both informed and impacted upon educational structures, policies and practices in Aotearoa in numerous capacities both for Māori children and in respect to the utilisation of Māori knowledge in a variety of educational spaces.

What is noted at the outset of this section is that the bulk of the academic literature reviewed tended towards articulating Māori and Pākehā peoples being located in unequal relations of power where Pākehā are seen to be largely in control or dominating the educational landscape over Māori, with minimal opportunity for Māori to have control over

their own educational aspirations and goals. In many instances such an articulation of unequal power relations was connected to notions of Māori resistance to such Pākehā dominance in the form of Māori educational self-determination. Such a view at times tended to over-emphasise and attribute Māori underachievement in education to the twin forces of colonisation and unequal power relations.

In contrast to this articulation was a small body of literature which suggested that such conceptualisations of loss, dominance and resistance are too simply expressed negating the complexities which exist in regard to the functioning of power in contemporary society between varying groups and in regard to the power/knowledge nexus in which all Māori are constituted and implicated by. While overseas literature tended to express this position more than local literature, there seems to be a growing number of Māori academics and researchers who are beginning to articulate such a view.

The link between power and knowledge was readily expressed in a large portion of the literature as well. Many Māori academics note that Pākehā/State dominance over Māori tended to be utilised through the symbolic representation of the legitimacy of Pākehā/Western knowledge, epistemologies and ontologies over that of Māori ways of knowing. The solution articulated by varying academics tended towards re-establishing and re-invigorating Māori epistemologies, practices and cultural values in education for the expressed purpose of minimising levels of underachievement and addressing the lack of success historically experienced by Māori in schools. While such views of the knowledge/power relationship were re-iterated in the voices of some indigenous academics from around the world (Almeida, 1997; Barnhardt, 2000; Battiste, 2000; Battiste & Henderson, 2001; Dei & Calliste; 2000; Henderson, 2000; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist,

2003; Iseke-Barnes, 2003; Kawagley, 1995a, 1995b), as before, a small number of academics including some Māori have begun questioning the degree of utilisation of Māori knowledge and epistemologies to inform the lives of our tamariki. Such positions tended to critically engage with specific aspects of mātauranga Māori (Tau, 2001a, 2001b, 2002) and also take into account the contemporary diverse realities facing Māori youth today (Durie, 2003) including diverse ethnic Māori identities, (Rata, 2004c) diverse Māori socio-cultural practices and diverse Māori political, economic and spiritual positionings (Durie, M.H. with Black, Christensen, Durie, A.E., Taiapa, Potaka & Fitzgerald, 1995; Durie, 2001, 2003).

In line with the recognition of contemporary Māori diversity the literature confirms that there seems to be a level of borrowing that occurs at the border of Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing which is not readily recognised by some Māori academics. Pākehā/Western notions of scientific rationality, objectivity and critical detachment are oftentimes disavowed by such academics often demonising their use in Māori education and research contexts to the point of creating a discourse morphing into varying degrees of exclusivity. The irony of such a situation is that Māori academics conceptualising inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing in such a vein tended to unconsciously replicate modes of scientific rationality, objectivity and critical detachment in their own work despite the downplay of such ways of knowing and being in their articulations. A growing body of literature from both New Zealand and overseas is beginning to more readily acknowledge the borrowings and overlaps that occur across the borders of cultural difference in educational discourse (Atkinson, 2003; Durie,

M., 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 2003; Lopez, 1998; Minh-Ha, 1991; Somerville & Perkins, 2003; Tillman, 1998; Tyson, 2003; Waitere-Ang, 1999).

This chapter highlights the varying literature that exists pertaining to the articulation of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and between Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing in contemporary education. The three themes deal specifically with Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations with a number of links to indigenous and other overseas material. These three inter-woven themes are; i) unequal power relations between Māori and Pākehā in education ii) the knowledge/power nexus, and iii) contemporary Māori realities.

It is evident from the review of the literature that inter-relationships between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western views and their place within New Zealand educational structures are continually being theorised, challenged, implemented and even pulled out after intense levels of critical examination and dispute. The literature suggests that theorising inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity and Māori and Pākehā/Western views in education by varying academics has taken a number of shapes and forms, from articulating ethnic and epistemological relations in a more binary and dualistic manner to one which connotes the varying overlaps that occur at the border of Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing.

2.3.1 Theme One: Unequal Māori and Pākehā Power Relations in Education

A number of Māori academics highlight the uneven nature of power relations between Māori and Pākehā in education. The majority of discourses highlight that Pākehā adopt a role of dominance while Māori are subjugated to positions of subordination, left to the sway of Pākehā/State demands. The potentiality for Māori aspirations, goals and aims to be fully realised under such an articulation of unequal power relations are deemed impossible.

Graham Smith (1995) in articulating Kaupapa Māori theory suggests that there is a need to critique Pākehā dominance in education (p2). He notes that the real struggle facing Māori at present is in the need to preserve the ‘emancipatory space won by Kaupapa Māori against the domesticating forces of the dominant Pākehā state’ (p7). At the outset of his article he seems bent on critiquing Pākehā dominance, which in turn suggests that Pākehā do not have *all* the power in education, they are just in a position of dominance. Such an articulation suggests that Māori resistance is possible. But in the latter part of his article Smith suggests a feeling of animosity towards the state, labelling it with the ethnic descriptor of ‘Pākehā’. Attributing Māori woes in education to the prevailing force of the dominant Pākehā state continues in his PhD thesis.

Smith (1997) outlines that Māori and Pākehā are struggling within what Gramsci (1971 in Smith, 1997) calls ‘a war of position’. Here it is suggested that dominant Pākehā and subordinate Māori are ‘engaged in proactive and reactive contestations’ in education (p278). While it is acknowledged that such a war of position is well documented in the literature, the automatic labelling of Pākehā as ‘dominant’ and Māori as ‘subordinate’

seems to fail to consider the complexities of power relations in any real depth. Smith does note that Māori have succumbed to Pākehā hegemony through consenting to such dominance but he fails to explore any other critical nuances of Māori/Pākehā power inter-relations. The crux of Smith's articulating suggests that those Māori who have consented to Pākehā dominance must 'critically examine the ways in which they have been overtaken by hegemony to the point that they may contribute to upholding dominant: state: Pākehā interests, as a 'taken for granted' part of their lives' (p280). He argues that there is a sector of Māori society that unconsciously and uncritically contribute to their own oppression and exploitation in being unable to perceive the dominant ideologies in which they are trapped. What Smith seems to lack consciousness of is the rigid manner in which he articulates the 'Pākehā dominance'/'Māori subordination' oppositional binary in his discourse. The potential ensuing victim mentality that might arise from such an uncritically examined binary rigidity and the accusatory academic showdown that could occur between Māori and Pākehā seems plausible. The most pressing concern in regard to such binary articulations which needs further critical analysis is whether or not such rigidity heavily contributes to homogenising the Māori population through polarisation tactics, which in effect can isolate numerous individuals who readily locate themselves in variant ethnic and epistemological spaces from the dualism outlined by Smith. This 'for' or 'against' articulation is repeated through a large proportion of his work.

Smith (2000) goes on to further explain his articulation of an unequal power relationship between Māori and Pākehā. He maintains that Pākehā power and control is exerted through hegemonic decision making. In noting that until the 1980s policy decisions relating to Māori 'were generally made by Pākehā policymakers and thus likely to reflect

Pākehā interests', Smith fails to discuss any leverage Māori may have had within the mechanisms of the state since the 1980s (p63). He neither supports nor appraises any worth from the state for Māori in any depth. He argues that the state is to be only used as a last resort measure for Kura Kaupapa Māori schools. His PhD thesis suggests that Māori interests with the state have been derived solely from urgent needs to 'access financial support' to maintain their alternative sites. Smith's proposition of Māori 'flirting' with the state to access appropriate funding for Kura Kaupapa suggests that Māori are cornered into a position not of their own making whereby they are forced into a life of political prostitution. Again, Graham Smith chooses to re-iterate the rigid dualistic mentality where Pākehā are the sole perpetrators of ills towards Māori, dismissing notions that Māori themselves are in any way responsible for the situation in which they find themselves and absenting aspects of his ideological perspective from critical perusal. The heavy use of Māori/Pākehā binary oppositions by Graham Smith continues throughout his works.

In a more recent article Smith (2002) critiques dominant Pākehā values implicit within capitalist market notions of neo-liberal education. He suggests that notions such as 'consumer choice', 'user pays', 'accountability', 'meritocracy' and 'standards' all work together under the rubric of neo-liberalism to reinforce Pākehā values and 'marginalize and subjugate Māori people and their cultural preferences' (p5). While it is suggested that there needs to be a level of critique directed at such neo-liberal reforms and their impacts upon educational policies and programmes for Māori, Smith fails to critically analyse the issue propounded at any depth by simply articulating that Māori values and cultural practices in education are mutually exclusive from the evil that is neo-liberalism. In summary Graham Smith seems from a brief review of a sample of his literature to purport that Māori and

Pākehā ways and cultural practices are distinct and different at a level almost at the point of absolutism. This difference is so strongly articulated by Smith that he argues that for Māori to ‘cross-over’ into Pākehā values and ways of doing things in education, edges on condoning and consenting to one’s own hegemony (Smith, G., 2003). Other academics share similar views to Smith in articulating strong binaries, yet there are some critical differences in their work.

Ranginui Walker (1991) has noted that historically, both the government and Māori have contested one another in a ‘political tug-o-war’ over the education of Māori children. He acknowledges that ‘for more than a century the education system has been used as an artefact of colonialism to maintain Pākehā dominance and Māori subjection’ (p14). While articulating that the state holds a position of dominance over Māori in education, Walker does not ascribe the ethnic descriptor of ‘Pākehā’ when referring to it. While he does argue that ‘relations of Pākehā dominance and Māori subjection’ are ‘maintained by current institutional arrangements’ in education, Walker considers a more complex arrangement of power relations. Like Graham Smith, Ranginui Walker (1996) suggests that a number of Māori in leadership roles are ‘vulnerable to manipulation and co-option by the state’ through an ascribed subaltern status but rather than simply stating that Pākehā are dominant and Māori subordinate, he concludes that because the contestation of power by subordinate classes of people within a nation state is active, ‘power is multi-layered, and must be interrogated at every level’ (p6). Walker calls for a more thoughtful critique and conceptualisation of power relations between Māori and Pākehā in education than that of a simple binary offering.

Patricia Johnston (1994) likewise builds upon Smith's binary understanding of educational issues affecting Māori. She articulates that unequal relations of power between Māori and Pākehā are maintained because 'Pākehā have control over the context for which changes can take place for Māori' (p25). Such relations are said to serve the interests of Pākehā above those of Māori in education. This is furthered in her binary understanding of how Pākehā control what differences count in educational provision (p68). In noting that the role of power in defining difference is often overlooked, Johnston maintains that Pākehā notions of difference control what is deemed a 'normal' education for Māori. While her strong position of 'speaking back' to Pākehā dominance potentially denies the inherent complexities that underpin Māori and Pākehā power and epistemological inter-relations, there seems to be have been an inherent benefit of such monoglossic strategising (Bahktin, 1973, 1981, 1986 in White, 2005) for those Māori located in Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Wānanga. The question to ask however is whether such strategic articulations provide answers for all those who identify as Māori?

While there is a notable lack in the cited literature in outlining a more complex view of Māori and Pākehā power inter-relations in education⁶ the impacts of such a binary inter-relationship between Māori and Pākehā are suggested to mandate specific transformative responses by Māori. Graham Smith (1992, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2002, 2003) suggests that such dominance needs to be countered through active notions of resistance. In articulating Kaupapa Māori as a resistance strategy born from a view of unequal relations of power, Smith pushes for a clear dichotomy between Māori and Pākehā ways of seeing the world

⁶ See Lukes' (1974) radical view of power, and Gramsci's (1971, 1977 in Entwistle, 1979) notion of hegemony (see also Adamson, 1980; Bocock, 1986; Darder, 1991; Salamini, 1981) which considers power relations in a more complex and dynamic way than through simple, over-deterministic, reductionist theorisations.

and suggests that ‘cross-over’ into the ‘Pākehā world’ is a compromise to one’s own freedom from Pākehā hegemony. The discovery of one’s ‘true Māori self’ and the stripping of one’s ‘colonised self’ seems to be an emphasis promoted by Smith.

Such a rhetorical strategy is highlighted in Judith Simon’s (1990) PhD thesis which focuses on Māori and Pākehā inter-relations in education. She notes in citing the work of Giroux (1983) and Foucault (1976) that resistance is a galvanizing mechanism for collective political action against oppression and domination but rather than emphasising internal Māori differences, resistance theorists are more often ‘concerned with essence rather than appearance’ (p61). What this means is that such theories tend to emphasise a commonality of position, situation or history experienced by the total Māori population in order to critique Pākehā social and political domination in education. While she notes that Giroux’s (1983) view that resistance ensures that opportunities arise for self-reflection in the interest of self and social emancipation, oppositional rhetoric, an integral part of critical resistance suppresses Māori social contradictions while simultaneously merging with, rather than challenging, the logic of ideological domination (Simon, 1990; p61). She maintains that such discourses of opposition may fail to consider the self-reflexive aspect of resistance which inevitably places it not under the category of resistance, but under its opposite, accommodation and conformism to an idealised Māori norm. Simon’s comments seem to suggest that some articulations of Māori educational resistance might actually negate the power complexities that occur between groups.⁷

⁷ Smart (1985) notes Foucault’s proposition that a relation of power does not constitute an obligation or prohibition imposed upon the ‘powerless’. He states that power invests and is transmitted by and through people (p77). Foucault maintains that power is not conceived as a property or possession of a dominant class. Oliga (1996) supports this when he blends the views of Habermas and Foucault to conceive of power, not as inherently repressive, a noxious expression of class domination in Marxist terms, but rather as being ‘immanent in all human activity.’ Thus it is assumed that ‘power is exercised through its invisibility’ (p77).

Ranginui Walker (1991, 1996a) does offer a slightly different articulation than that offered by Smith. While he maintains that Pākehā dominance is secured through current institutional arrangements in education, he also stresses that while there is potentiality for Māori leaders to become subsumed under state ideology, there is a need to analyse the multi-layered and complex nature of power relations in education. Walker's statement here has some parallels with the theorising of Foucault (1976) who suggests that power is not dispensed from one point to another, that is from Pākehā upon Māori- rather, power circulates and manifold relations of power exist which constitute the myriad of bodies as a result of power effects (p98). In linking Foucault to the New Zealand context, his ideas seem to suggest that not only are Pākehā and Māori leaders who are involved within the state machinery in need of critical analysis but that Māori educationalists, researchers and academics who claim to be speaking for Māori, whether it be in articulating Kaupapa Māori or Māori-centred educational practices, are also constituted by ideological and power effects that need to be just as readily analysed and critiqued.

Johnston's (1994, 1998) mandate for resisting Pākehā dominance focuses on the privileging of Māori notions of difference in the form of Māori language, culture and values in education while at the same time talking back to the differences which privilege Pākehā values. She states that Kohanga Reo is an education initiative which is built on a notion of difference- that Māori are different from Pākehā, that the language and culture are different. She maintains that such 'differences' are not negative or normal' (1994; p22). But to what degree are the heterogenous differences within Māori society capitulated in such monoglossic articulations? Does Māori educational resistance which 'speaks back' to Pākehā dominance while clearly beneficial to numerous Māori provide answers for all? It

seems clear that a broader philosophical and theoretical consideration of the variant complexions of power between Māori and Pākehā people is necessary to open up further space for dialogue regarding Māori in education.

2.3.2 Theme Two: The Knowledge/Power Nexus

A second theme articulated by a number of educationalists who conceptualise Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations is the notion of the knowledge/power nexus. It is proposed that what goes hand-in-hand with a position of dominance is the ability to define what counts as valid knowledge and what does not. That is, if one holds power, one also holds the power to decide ‘what is’ and ‘what isn’t’. Unequal relations of power between Māori and Pākehā people are seen to be exacerbated and reproduced by Pākehā/Western definitions of what constitutes valid knowledge. How this is played out in the realm of education has been articulated by numerous academics.

Linda Smith (1999) states that the imperial mandate to assimilate indigenous peoples’ into the prevailing dominant order was enabled through a process of legitimating colonial values, practices and knowledge and de-legitimising indigenous values, practices and knowledge. In an earlier piece of work Smith (as Mead, 1996) talks about how Māori knowledge was de-legitimised through being labelled ‘irrelevant’ and ‘detrimental’ to positive Māori development. In supporting the work of Johnston, Smith states that colonial educational policies regarded Māori ways of knowing as ‘other’, ‘primitive’ and ‘irrational’. Such policies were informed, as noted in Sections 2.1a and 2.1b, by deficit views of Māori cultural difference (p371). This saw Māori ways of knowing being cast as

‘inferior’ and ‘undeveloped’ when judged against the ‘superior’ civilisation with its capacity to read and write, think critically and objectively and have a measure of distance from ideas and emotions propounded (Smith, L., 1999; p28).

In articulating how the West supports knowledge which is rational and scientific, Smith formulates a defence of Māori cultural values, practices and knowledge (Hemara, 2000) as valid and legitimate compelling the need for the physical, ideological and the wider structural spaces of the education system of New Zealand to be transformed. In doing so she articulates how Kura Kaupapa Māori not only set out to authenticate and give space to Māori ways of knowing but aimed to incorporate excellence in both Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing (p392). Like Smith, a number of academics have criticised the power of Pākehā/Western knowledge over Māori/indigenous knowledge and its impact in education.

Colleen McMurchy-Pilkington (1996) criticises Pākehā knowledge for locating itself in a superior position to mātauranga Māori (p27). Graham Smith (1992) likewise suggests that early views of Māori ‘illiteracy’ have been translated into notions of Māori knowledge inferiority against Pākehā knowledge superiority (p91). He goes on to suggest that Māori knowledge is as rational and as complex as Pākehā/Western frameworks despite often being labelled ‘myth’ or ‘superstition’ (p91). In criticising dominant knowledge-frames Puketapu (1993 in citing Lyotard, 1984) suggests that Western scientific knowledge does not represent the totality of knowledge despite tendencies for such a claim to prevail. Other indigenous academics have similarly made criticisms about Western/Eurocentric knowledge holding a position of dominance over indigenous epistemologies and ontologies.

Henderson (2000) in considering the Canadian context argues that Eurocentric scholarship posits a diffusionist perspective which ‘accepts that the world has one permanent centre from which culture-changing ideas tend to originate’ (p66). He criticises the notions of universality and rationality underpinning diffusionist logic as it creates a form of cultural and cognitive imperialism which establishes the dominant group’s knowledge, experiences, culture, and language as the universal norm (pp67-68).

Another key aspect of Henderson’s theorising is the criticism of Western materialist modes of thinking which disregards aspects of indigenous knowing perceived as being ‘unknowable’, ‘immeasurable’ or ‘immortal’. Western critical rationality rejects the idea of intelligible spirits or essences existing within the ecological order as they are classified as ‘unknowable’ (p60). Such a view is well considered by Henderson as he articulates the need to not only recover indigenous epistemologies and ontologies, but to also develop ‘new syntheses of knowledge to lead the existing education system into a post-colonial era’ (p61). However, one small point to make in regard to Henderson’s discourse is that while he criticises the tendency of Eurocentric forms of knowing to provide ‘ultra-theories’ seen to be universally applicable to all, Henderson himself utilises the exact same method of providing a totalising, universalist ‘ultra-theory’ regarding the diffusionist nature of *all* Western/Eurocentric scholars. Reminiscent of the rigid dualities expounded by Graham Smith in the previous section, Henderson utilises the same tools he is critiquing to advance his own indigenous perspectives. Such use of totalizing, monoglossic statements about the colonial ‘Other’ by indigenous and Māori academics forms an integral part of the analysis of academic texts commenting on Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations.

What is evident from the above texts is that Māori/indigenous ways of knowing are pedestalled as being ‘equally valid, complex and open’ as Western epistemologies. In highlighting the political power of the West to control whose knowledge counts as valid and legitimate, the re-asserting and re-invigorating of Māori epistemologies to counter such arrogance has opened up space for Māori ways of knowing to be legitimated and validated; confronting, resisting and denying the West’s power to control and decide for Māori ‘what counts’. The irony of such a politically charged discursivity is that, as noted in the commentary on Henderson’s work, the potentiality for replicating similar modes of domination through the provision of totalizing, ultra-theories about the dominant ‘Other’ and ‘their’ epistemological perspective is one which potentially locks out any criticism of their newly invigorated position. Some Māori and indigenous academics are signalling the view that there is a necessity for a re-think of how Māori/indigenous epistemologies are depicted in relation to Pākehā/Western epistemologies with a desire to move away from such rigid, Māori versus Pākehā/Western binary conceptualisations in favour of a more synthesised blend of worldviews.

Jeannie Herbert (2002) in her inaugural professorial lecture as Chair of Indigenous Australian Studies at James Cook University articulates that effective change for indigenous peoples’ in education requires the re-defining of Aboriginal beliefs and values and setting their own parameters concerning what is important knowledge for Aboriginal groups. This potentiality for adapting one’s own indigenous cultural knowledge so as to possibly co-opt ‘outsiders’ theories as outlined by both Henderson and Herbert is supported by some Māori academics.

Stewart-Harawira (2003) notes that the current challenge facing Māori educationalists at present is the goal of re-centering ‘the relevance of traditional ontologies and epistemologies’ in constructing educational policies and programmes for Māori (p11). While she notes that traditional indigenous principles have been re-articulated by recent movements of indigenous politicisation, she suggests that a new ontological framework is necessary. Set on articulating a new view which moves beyond resistance theories prevalent in Māori education circles over the past twenty years, Stewart-Harawira contends that Māori must confront the issue of ‘whether to relinquish their traditional cosmologies and ontologies grounded in oneness and interconnectedness in favour of economic freedom’ (p11). It is somewhat implied that she wishes to capitalise on both indigenous and Western, economic views to inform a new global order. This blended thinking is mirrored in her suggestions that Māori re-examine the notion of sovereignty in relation to indigenous structures, values and ontologies rather than simply suggesting that it negates Māori development within the global world. Stewart-Harawira’s call for a multicivilisational framework which blends the material and the spiritual and re-frames the scientific rather than blindly negating its potentiality to benefit Māori which is readily done by a number of indigenous academics, propels her to adopt a more inclusive, pluralistic and spiritual framework for Māori and global well-being.

As is evident in the literature an array of perspectives on the nature of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western knowledges are articulated. The majority of positions have argued that Pākehā definitions of ‘what counts’ as knowledge remain dominant, largely impacting upon Māori education movements centred in Māori language, culture and organisation preferences. A number of Māori and indigenous academics

emphatically state that there is a need to revive, re-introduce and re-invigorate indigenous epistemologies and ontologies in education. Such moves of resistance against the dominance of Pākehā/Western ways of knowing are said to be implicated within a dyadic relationship with notions of dominant power relations. A small number of others seem to differ in their articulation of Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations suggesting that discourses for Māori ought to move with and beyond such notions of resistance and towards re-thinking and re-orienting Māori ontological and epistemological perspectives. What is clear is that while a number of academic texts tend to emphasise a Māori-Pākehā/Western epistemological dualism in their theorising, a small number of Māori/indigenous academics are beginning to move beyond binary oriented monoglossic discursive strategies towards offering discourses which build upon both monoglossic and heteroglossic strategies for Māori educational benefit.

2.3.3 Theme Three: Contemporary Māori Realities

A third theme evident in the literature when analysing Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations in academic discourse is the notion of contemporary Māori realities, experienced and encountered on a day-to-day basis. While not seeming to be specifically aligned with addressing Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations in academic discourse, an analysis of contemporary Māori realities has uncovered a body of literature which is seeking to question the sole benefit of re-invigorating traditional epistemologies, pedagogies and traditional beliefs and practices for *all* Māori. A growing body of literature is surfacing in New Zealand which suggests that the contemporary realities Māori face

ought to have greater influence in more adequately reflecting educational policies and programmes structured for Māori rather than through the sole reliance on monoglossic discourses which strongly articulate a Māori-Pākehā ethnic dualism and mandates that the tools of Te Ao Māori will provide the panacea to alleviate Māori social and economic ills, while simultaneously discounting Pākehā/Western ways as dominating and acts of colonisation.

Mason Durie's (with Black, T.E., Christensen, I.S., Durie, A.E., Taiapa, J., Potaka, U.K. and Fitzgerald, E.D., 1995) Te Hoe Nuku Roa Framework considers specific measures which not only distinguishes contemporary Māori realities apart from the contemporary realities faced by non-Māori but it also provides a picture of how Māori are located socially, culturally and economically, countering any possibility for Māori identity to be 'traditionalised' and subsumed under potentially idealised notions such as *collectivism* and *whanaungatanga*. The common modern day experience for Māori evidences itself to be one of diversity and dynamism. Durie et al. (1995) highlight a number of characteristics including Māori ethnic diversity, and cultural and socio-economic realities which constitute such diversity when they state,

'Far from being members of a homogenous group, Māori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities. The relevance of so-called traditional values is not the same for all Māori, nor can it be assumed that all Māori wish to define their ethnicity according to classical constructs. At the same time, they will describe themselves as Māori and will reject any notion that they are "less Māori" than those who conform to a conventional image'.

(p464)

They go on to say that most frameworks which consider Māori tend to stress links with traditional knowledge and skills while ‘failing to capture the range of activities, lifestyles and multiple affiliations which characterise Māori people in modern society’ (pp469-470). Such a heteroglossic articulation of Māori diversity, which seeks to challenge the more monoglossic, oppositional binary discursive theorising largely evident in the literature is supported by other academics.

In regards to the relative importance of the provision of Māori cultural input in education, Edna Tait’s (1995) research pointed out that rangatahi Māori were not primarily concerned with education which provided a Māori cultural base. Their principal concerns centred on their future economic positioning and on an education which prepared them to build a sound economic base. In challenging notions of Māori cultural homogeneity, Jill Bevan-Brown (2003) suggests, as Durie does, that Māori cultural heterogeneity exists when she articulates that people working with Māori learners with special needs ought not to make assumptions about what is culturally appropriate for them. Such decisions are to be made in consultation with the learners, parents and whānau concerned because as Bevan-Brown notes from her research, parents’ views on how much Māori cultural input was desirable for their tamariki varied over time (p13).

Peti Kenrick (2001) notes in citing comments made by Chapple and Gould that problems exist in aggregating data based on Māori educational achievement as many Māori consider themselves to hold a more fluid ethnic background rather than solely Māori. Australian Aboriginal academic Jeannie Herbert (2002) similarly supports Kenrick’s comments when she notes that while indigenous Aboriginal students are predominantly located in Western institutes, there are numerous students who locate themselves amongst

the gradations between the polarities of an ‘aboriginal resistance identity’ and a ‘universalised aboriginal identity’ (p16). While she does not specifically talk to the point of indigenous ethnic diversity as Kenrick does, she does similarly provide an insight into a theory of heterogeneity amongst Māori and indigenous peoples throughout the world who ascribe and define themselves in multiple and diverse ways through varying labels and identity markers. One local writer suggests that such heterogeneity complicates the Māori/Pākehā dichotomy evident in some educational discourses.

Te Ahu (n.d.a, n.d.b) notes that the downfall of Māori identity politics reminiscent of the 1980s cultural nationalist middle-class movement is that it leads to an ‘ultimate showdown’ between Māori and Pākehā. In arguing that such conflicts are unhealthy it is suggested that Māori cultural nationalists often discuss Māori as if they form one homogenous entity, with ‘its members possessing exactly the same experiences of oppression and exactly the same political aspirations’ (p12). Te Ahu further states that such an articulation ‘ignores the fact that there exists a dynamic range of aspirations and political strategies within so-called Māoridom’ (p12). Te Ahu’s views highlight the limited and constrained nature of monoglossic theorising in light of a large diversity of Māori realities which exist in relation to the modern, Western world. But does that mean such strategic theorising ought to be discounted altogether?

While a large body of research from the 1980s onwards has called for the reinstatement of Māori epistemologies, pedagogies, views and practices into education and schooling, there is a growing body of literature which suggests that such views tend to portray a difference (from Pākehā epistemologies, pedagogies, views and practices) which in and of itself potentially fails to self-reflexively convey the diversity and difference

(within Te Ao Māori) located within its very own realm. The potential homogenising of Māori voices, experiences and aspirations needs to be critically examined if positive changes for all Māori are to move beyond the sole reliance on monoglossic discursivities. The call for ‘subordinate Māori’ to resist and speak back to ‘dominant Pākehā’ in some of the academic work presented here has offered much to numerous Māori throughout Aotearoa. However, as this section of the literature review has articulated, not all Māori conform to classical or idealised notions of Māori desiring access to Māori culture and language for life improvement, nor do all Māori hold the same political positioning or reside in similar socio-economic circumstances, and yet a large number of Māori people readily identify themselves as belonging to both Māori and Pākehā ethnic groups. Such conflicts and contradictions have only begun to surface in Māori educational theorising as a number of academics move into theoretical spaces which consider the complexities and diversities of contemporary Māori realities while also acknowledging but not solely relying on, the necessity to ‘speak back’ monoglossically to issues of Pākehā dominance in terms of power and knowledge in education for Māori benefit.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review

A number of key points in regard to Māori and Pākehā/Western relations in educational academic discourse have been raised from the review of the literature. It is noted that academics employ a diversity of strategic articulations in regard to inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western views of the world for Māori educational benefit.

In light of the complex historical back-drop it was noted that a large portion of the literature articulated the existence of an unequal power relationship between dominant Pākehā and subordinate Māori. While the majority argued that such a view was generally accurate, a few were bent on acknowledging a number of complexities and recognise the multi-faceted nature of the constitutive force of power. A number of academics articulated that Māori theorising educational self-determination outside the dominant Pākehā state offered a space whereby Māori could re-invigorate and re-establish Māori pedagogical preferences and Māori administrative structures while simultaneously privileging Māori language and tikanga Māori in a taken-for-granted manner. Such a movement has been celebrated as transformative and emancipatory for Māori.

It was noted however that monoglossic theorising tended towards articulating Māori knowledge and Māori ways of being in direct opposition (through the use of a binary or dualism) to Pākehā/Western knowledge and ways of being in the world. Embracing a sharp form of absolutism and mutual exclusivity by some academics has evidenced itself to deny some of the complexities and variances more readily articulated by other academics in education. A small number of academics are beginning to not only utilise the monoglossic strategies in parts of their discourse to ‘speak back’ to Pākehā dominance in education but they are also embracing a more heteroglossic strategy to give effect to a conceptual complexity with the hope of devising and articulating increasingly inclusive Māori educational frameworks and theories for the benefit of the wider Māori population.⁸ This

⁸ Apirana Ngata’s well-known kōrero: ‘*E tipu e rea mō ngā rā o to ao. To ringa ki ngā rākau a te Pākehā hei oranga mō to tinana*’ serves as a sign-post in support of this. I have linked in his kōrero here to appeal to Māori to more critically engage in conceptualising the complexities, dynamism and potentiality that exists at the borders between Māori and Pākehā people in terms of power and identity and Māori and Pākehā epistemologies to give effect to increasingly inclusive Māori educational frameworks for wide Māori educational benefit.

research aims to closely analyse four academic texts which all specifically discuss Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological inter-relations. It is hoped that through such an analysis, a critical insight into the varying strategies employed by academics in their articulation of such Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relationships for Māori educational benefit will be provided.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

While Chapter Two reviewed the literature which addressed how Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations are articulated in academic texts for the purpose of benefiting Māori in education, Chapter Three builds on this by considering a number of methodological concerns related to the research carried out. In light of a review of the literature relating to the issue being problematised in this study (Cooper, 1984 cited in Creswell, 1994; p22), this research examines data and themes drawn from the content analysis of four academic texts which offer a particular slant on inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological views and how such inter-relationships might enhance, constrict, or elicit particular challenges regarding the educational opportunities for Māori students. Through the content analytic framework a number of identified themes have arisen from the articles illustrating how authors of textual materials not only ‘view their social worlds’ (Berg, 2001; p242) but also how they envision future possibilities for Māori in education.

However, before going into details on the methods employed it is imperative to couch the approaches utilised in this study within a philosophical back-drop (Scott, 1999). This chapter analyses and discusses some of the fervently contested issues relating to power and epistemological differences in educational research contexts, attending closely to the ‘taken-for-granted’ educational research processes predominantly utilised in light of recent Māori advances within the research sphere.

The critique however does not end there. In an attempt to open wider the doors already opened by a number of Māori, indigenous, critical theory and anti-positivist researchers, my aim is to also critically address the burgeoning number of Māori research methodologies currently on the research scene. It is from this critique that a Māori-centred research methodology is privileged and built upon while utilising inductive content analytic methods to carry out the research. While it is noted that a Māori-centred methodological approach is privileged here, the flexibility inherent within the newly emerging paradigm affords the researcher with the benefits of drawing from Western methodologies as such traditions are not discounted (Durie, M., 2002) nor are they simply opposed with counter-rhetoric. What follows is what Cooper (1984, cited in Creswell, 1994; p22) describes as a *methodological review* which considers some of the theoretical and philosophical aspects which underpin the methodological choices for this educational research endeavour.

3.1 The ‘Western-Objectivist’ Research Paradigm

The objectivist tradition (the realist metaphysic tradition) in educational research is widely written about from both angles of support (Nash, 1999; Rata, 2004c) and from angles of critique (Griffiths, 1998; Scott & Usher, 1999; Shipman, 1997). Others like Holbrook (1977 cited in Cohen & Manion, 1997) offer both support and critique of objective approaches to educational research arguing that there are potential advantages and disadvantages in utilising such a paradigm.

Replicating similar conventions, methods and assumptions utilised within the natural sciences, dominant-objectivist social scientists tend to suggest that a singular,

convergent and fragmentable reality exists which can be known by researchers who, in acting independently from the subjects of their research, make generalisations and nomothetic statements about ‘reality’ as it ‘truly is’ (Scott & Usher, 1999; p2). Scott and Usher (1999) go on to say that for those of a dominant, positivist bent ‘the world consists of independently existing objects of which there can only be one *true* description’ (p14). This ‘truth’ element is also noted by Schatzki (1995) who states that for many people objectivity is more or less identical with ‘truth’ and ‘fact’ with other more subjectively oriented research ultimately being framed as ‘falsity’ and ‘opinion’ (p137). Methods employed by researchers who embrace competing views of social reality are often labelled by ‘truth’-wielding objectivists as subjectivist, post-modernist or irrational.

Cohen and Manion (1997) have clearly articulated some of the key features of this predominant view of social science inquiry. They state that under this tradition the epistemological foundations are positivist. This suggests that all knowledge produced within this paradigm is accepted as fact and based firmly in the human experience. While the former point of fact (as related to ‘truth’) has already been discussed, the latter notion of experience refers to knowledge attained and elicited through human affairs and interaction. The dominant-objectivist paradigm strongly articulates that no external reality exists outside of the human experience. Such a position discounts and rejects the idea of intelligible spirits or essences which are foundational in indigenous knowledges (Henderson, 2000; p60).

Under the objectivist paradigm the place of the researcher is that of a disinterested observer who claims allegiance to the methods of natural science while maintaining distance from their subjects or phenomena of analysis (Bunge, 1998; Cohen & Manion,

1997; p6). The separation of knowing subjects from objects to be known is said to enable objective thinking and scientific rationality (Rata, 2004c). Such ‘objectivity’ and ‘rationality’ is said to be closely related to knowing the world as it ‘truly is’ as opposed to subjective values and concerns which construct the world as it is understood from one particular segment of society. Both Bunge (1996, 1998 cited in Phillips & Burbules, 2000; p45) and Lakomski (1999) criticise the interpretative-subjectivist endeavour which ‘interprets’ human actions rather than critically objectifying concepts within the ‘shared’ social reality. Labelling interpretations as mere hunches, conjectures and speculation they appraise the objectivist methodological paradigm which rationalises knowledge based on notions of universalism and modernist thinking. Rata (2004c) extends Bunge’s concept to suggest that those who act and perceive the world objectively and rationally have access to a form of critical reasoning that those from a subjectivist view are incapable of arriving at.

Related to this is the belief which suggests that ‘the universe does not behave capriciously’ (Cohen & Manion, 1997; p13). From this paradigm there is a sense of regularity and order to the social world which can be objectified and analysed through carefully constructed methodologies. What this entails for the objectivist researcher is the practice of identifying patterns and consistencies for the expressed purpose of positing hypotheses and ‘truths’ about social reality which are deemed widely applicable to the ‘homogenous’ world-wide human population. Such an approach not only places an emphasis on the procedures and methods employed in the research with the hope of discovering general universal laws for society but following the natural sciences, causal links are eventually uncovered and understood and all social events are explicable in terms of their scientifically deduced antecedents (Cohen & Manion, 1997; p13).

While these characteristics are not exhaustive they do highlight some of the key aspects of the Western-objectivist research paradigm. There are alignments with the natural sciences and an epistemological perception of the world based on a singular, convergent and universal view of reality. The researcher plays the role of distant and disinterested observer who seeks patterns and regularities within the social world in order to hypothesise and make generalisations and predictions by way of carefully constructed methodologies which creates knowledge often regarded as social fact or truth. These characteristics are all underpinned by the epistemological view that no external reality exists outside of the human experience. What is of note is that dominant-objectivist paradigms in educational research have and continue to be contested by varying groups including post-modernists, critical theorists, feminists, ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples and more specifically Māori (Atkinson, 2003; Belsey, 2002; Gore, 1998; Griffiths, 1998; Johnston, 2003; Martin, 2001; Medawar, 1990; Rigney, 1997; Shipman, 1997; Schatzki, 1995; Smith, L., 1999). Such critiques have questioned the notion of a universal reality and conceptions of truth, they have queried forms of knowing which separate object and subject, and they have articulated ‘new’, ‘natural’ or ‘recovered’ research paradigms previously marginalised or negated under the historically dominant, objectivist framework.

3.2 Māori Critiques of the ‘Western-Objectivist’ Research Paradigm

A number of Māori academics have critiqued and talked back to the historically dominant nature of the Western-objectivist research paradigm offering varying arguments surrounding its exclusionary nature in regards to what counts as valid knowledge, its

potentiality for representing Māori in ways not supported by Māori themselves and its tendency towards replicating and reproducing dominant-subordinate relations between powerful Pākehā researchers and dominated Māori communities. The literature addressing such issues focuses heavily on the power/knowledge relationship between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews. The assumed position of Pākehā/Western dominance in research by the critics is seen to be an inherent characteristic of the objectivist-Western research paradigm.

Arohia Durie (2002b) supports this when she argues that dominant research approaches suggesting the necessity to solely utilise Western methodologies to grow and develop knowledge holds Māori people captive (p2). She expands on this in her doctoral thesis when she states that Māori were traditionally subjects of research rather than the makers and constructors of research methodologies (2002a; pp166-167). As research subjects, Māori were located in a position of subordination under the microscopic gaze of the Pākehā/Western researcher. The space for Māori views of knowledge to be effectively utilised in the research process were seen as unnecessary.

Kiri Powick (2002; p5) builds upon such power/knowledge arguments when she cites Linda Smith (1992) who argues that research practice was part of the colonisation process because it was concerned with defining the limits and boundaries of legitimate and valid knowledge. She notes that this was especially the case for institutionally based research as it was used ‘primarily for the benefit of Pākehā, providing Pākehā answers to Pākehā questions’ (Manukau Institute of Technology, 1998 in Powick, p5).

This notion of research on and about Māori historically being of little benefit to Māori (Durie, A.; 2002b; p3; Jahnke and Taiapa, 1999; p39) and benefiting Pākehā is

raised by Te Ariki, Spoonley and Tomoana (1992) who re-iterate similar points when they note that research has been used to sustain one group while simultaneously disempowering another. In citing the work of Te Awekotuku (1991; Te Ariki et al, 1992; p2) they argue that research is about control and power, declaring that social science research in particular is focused on political management and political planning.

In line with this Pihama, Cram and Walker (2002) note that traditionally Māori have struggled for control over how Māori children are educated. Educational research which continues to deny Māori access to control over the research process for Māori is suggested to not only concretise Pākehā hegemony but validate and legitimate Pākehā definitions and constructions of Māori people and Pākehā knowledge (p35). Jahnke and Taiapa (1999) iterate such comments when they suggest that Eurocentric approaches, characteristic of the classical scientific model of research are based on the notion of universality which fails to take into account Māori cultural knowledge, values, realities and needs (p44). Such appeals to reified notions of universality are seen to support status quo research relationships where Pākehā are dominant and Māori subordinate.

Russell Bishop (1999) in supporting a Kaupapa Māori approach articulates a strong standpoint against traditional, dominant research practices and epistemologies. In stating that traditional researchers and their methods are preoccupied with notions of neutrality, objectivity and distance to give credibility to their work, he argues that such processes have ‘consequently misrepresented Māori experiences, thereby denying Māori authenticity and voice’. He goes on to say that ‘such research has displaced Māori...with the “authoritative” voice of the methodological “expert” appropriating Māori lived experiences in terms defined and determined by the “expert”’ (p1).

The crux of his critique centres on launching into an outright attack on what Heshusius (1995 in Bishop, 1999; p1) calls the *alienated mode of consciousness* reproduced through what are framed as neo-colonial research paradigms. He argues that an alienated mode of consciousness, the form of knowing which involves the separation of the subjective consciousness and the object to be known, will deny researchers and their research participants the ability to operationalise agentic positioning and behaviour. In other words, Bishop is suggesting that dominant modes of universalistic, neutral, objectivity deny Māori the ability to participate in acts of self-determination as the research process is controlled from the ‘outside’ and not from within Māori communities (p1).

Bishop’s attack is not solely against the ‘universalist-outsiders’ from whom he fears potential domination. He also targets the more subjectively oriented, left-wing radical, Western researchers as being equally able to potentially dominate Māori in suggesting varying formula for freedom and emancipation. He states,

‘...from the neo-conservative voices who deny Māori culture any legitimacy and liberal notions of integrating what is the best of both worlds in order to create a rosy future for all New Zealanders to radical/emancipatory voices who claim that they have the formula for emancipation of Māori as oppressed and marginalized people. These positions have in common the notion that “insiders” are incapable of an appropriate critical distance from which to understand their experiences, because they are incapable of sufficient “detachment” or that they do not understand the “reality” of their own lives’

(Bishop, 1998; p212)

It is paramount at this point to give some space to the Western-subjectivist research approach. As has already been noted many groups have contested the dominating nature of the traditional Western-objectivist research position. Post-modernists, critical theorists,

feminists and varying ethnic minority groups, (Atkinson, 2003; Belsey, 2002; Gore, 1998; Griffiths, 1998; Medawar, 1990; Shipman, 1997; Schatzki, 1995) have all questioned the notion of a universal reality and objectivist conceptions of ‘truth’, alongside queries regarding forms of knowing which separate object and subject. As can be seen from the list of examples above, subjectivist-Western approaches have articulated ‘new’ or ‘recovered’ research paradigms often marginalised or negated under the dominant, Western-objectivist framework.

3.3 ‘Western-Subjectivist’ Research Paradigms

It has been noted that the Western-subjectivist research paradigm reflects in part a reaction against the constraints of dominant, Western-objectivist positivism. More qualitatively oriented research attempts to embrace a more naturalistic way of knowing which not only unifies the object-subject divide but also includes approaches which typify non-Western cultural perspectives (Gall, Gall and Borg, 1999; p289). ‘In this view of knowledge, social reality is seen as a set of meanings that are constructed by the individuals who participate in that reality’ (Gall, Gall & Borg, 1999; p289) rather than a view of knowledge where social reality is constructed by an ‘expert’ or ‘experts’ from ‘the outside’. Such an anti-positivist approach contends that knowledge is something gained from personal experience rather than through the acquisition of knowledge where the ‘self’ is bracketed out (Gadamer, 1975 in Scott, 2000; Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999).

Beck (1979 cited in Cohen and Manion, 1997; p26) supports this when he articulates that such subjectivist research undertakings strongly urge that ‘the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the ongoing action being investigated’. Here Beck argues that individuals’ behaviour can only be understood by a researcher sharing their frame of reference so that an understanding of individuals’ interpretations of social reality will come from ‘the inside’, not ‘the outside’. Social science from a subjectivist position aims not to reveal ultimate truth, which is the task of the positivist, rather it helps people make sense of their world(s) and to understand that social reality is seen differently by different people (Beck, 1979 cited in Cohen & Manion, p26).

Creswell (1994) notes a number of the intricacies with this research paradigm. He states that it is an ‘inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting’ (pp1-2). In this methodological research paradigm inductive logic prevails whereby categories emerge from informants, rather than being identified by the researcher and their frame of reference. The emergence of categories from the informants ‘provides rich, ‘context-bound’ information leading to patterns or theories that help to explain a phenomenon’ (p7). Unlike objective approaches to research which are rigid and highly controlled, rules and procedures in the subjectivist paradigm are not fixed, but rather are open and inclined to change and evolve (pp9-10). While a number of approaches come under the umbrella of the subjectivist-Western research, two distinct but at times inter-related paradigms are outlined in more detail here as they form an integral part of the methodological approach adopted here.

Elizabeth Atkinson's (2003) postmodernist research, works towards fracturing the certainty evident in objectivist-Western research paradigms suggesting that Derrida's notion of deconstruction is an approach which seeks to question the assumed educational, theoretical and moral superiority of dominant paradigms in educational research and practice. She notes that under a post-modernist frame of reference, multiple views and multiple voices from the 'margins' 'serve research as a tool for reshaping our world-view, for reinterpreting what 'is', and for challenging social and political hegemonies' (p37).

Atkinson also notes that the post-modern research perspective is more likely to raise questions throughout the entire research process rather than provide answers. Such is the nature of the research work being carried out here with a more heteroglossic reading of the literature and research findings to inform the discussion in Chapter Six (Bahktin, 1986 cited in White, 2005). She claims that it is from this heteroglossic perspective that potential is harnessed in enabling researchers to rethink their taken-for-granted assumptions about the methodologies they employ and the manner in which they educe interpretations from their data.

Critical theory is another subjectivist approach to educational research. The basic work of research in the critical theory tradition is one of 'cultural critique' (Alway, 1995; Apple, 2000; Callewaert, 1999; Fendler, 1999; Popkewitz & Fendler, 1999; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999; p361; Gibson, 1986; Marshall, 1999; McLaren, 1995; Torres, 1998, 2003; Tripp, 1992; Young, R., 1990). Gall, Gall and Borg (1999) state that 'the term *critical* is used in critical theory to refer to a systematic process of review and analysis (i.e. critique) of cultural phenomena. In the process, hidden assumptions underlying accepted but

problematic cultural practices are exposed, along with their negative aspects' in an interpretative mode of social science analysis (p361).

A key aspect of critical theory is that researchers working within this paradigm view most of the texts in education and research as problematic (i.e. capable of misrepresenting experience) (p363). In stressing over-laps with post-modern theorising, Gall, Gall & Borg (1999) highlight the role of deconstruction in critical theory research which 'asserts that a text has no definite meaning, that words can refer only to other words, and that "playing" with a text can yield multiple, often contradictory interpretations' (p363 see also Parker, 1988). The authors say that in deconstructing a written statement or piece of text for educational research, they examine the connotations of each term, opening the text up to multiple interpretations, with none privileged over any other (p363).

Another key assumption of critical theory research is that 'facts' can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription. The first part of this assumption reflects critical theory's rejection of the notion that educational researchers' quest for truth is an objective, value-free process. Critical theory researchers question the notion of objective reality itself (Gall, Gall and Borg, 1999; p364). The latter part of this assumption critically locates all 'truth' statements and 'facts' within a knowledge/power inter-relationship. Critical theorists recognise that the furnishing of 'truth' in educational research is inscribed ideologically, unable to be removed from the possibility that statements are implicated and inscribed with power effects.

This is an interesting point to make in light of criticisms of Western-objectivist research practices by Māori academics, who from the review of the literature tended to criticise the dominant 'Other' through the tool of rhetoric and point out that the dominant

‘Other’ has a propensity to ideologically control Māori. Such censure often overshadows a critical analysis of Māori research paradigms and their potential forms of ideological inscription and variant power effects over other Māori. This often poorly recognised possibility is not left unattended by some critical theorists (Marrow & Brown, 1994). They acknowledge that a dynamic movement exists between the throes of control and resistance in a complex and variant ‘-control-resistance-resistance-control-resistance-control-’ manner. Creswell (1994), in citing the work of Thomas (1993), states that critical researchers begin from the premise that *all* cultural life is in constant tension between control and resistance.⁹ This highlights the argument that those who resist are concomitantly in a position of control and have the potential within this resistance/control dyadic to be both dominant and subordinate in varying moments, spaces and times.¹⁰ The ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodological approach which builds upon Mason Durie’s work and embraced in this research aims to capitalise on such criticality to unpack and critique the over-emphasis on the use of binaries in academic discourse, opting instead to embrace a more complicated reading of such power dualisms.

While the coverage of subjectively oriented, Western research paradigms in this section is not exhaustive, it does highlight a number of key points. First, the subjective paradigm is not limited to a singular, objective view of the world, instead opting to embrace a multitude of views, voices and perspectives into its framework. Secondly, its pursuit of ‘truth’ in educational research involves participants and researchers located ‘inside’ not ‘outside’ the social reality from which a set of meanings are derived. Thirdly, it

⁹ Young (2004) notes Homi Bhabha’s view that power is a vacillating phenomenon (p188).

¹⁰ Foucault argued that where there is power, there is resistance and that power depends for its existence on the presence of a ‘multiplicity of points of resistance and that the plurality of resistances should not be reduced to a single locus of revolt or rebellion’ (Smart, 1985; p77). Differing from Marx’s reductionist theorising, Foucault focused on the multiple and diverse forms in which power is exercised.

acknowledges that the ‘self’ is unable to be bracketed out of the research experience as claimed in objective research methodologies. A final key aspect of the subjective approach is its critique of power relations in society in general and education and educational research in particular. For numerous Māori researchers and academics there has been a degree of over-lap in their theorising with subjectively-oriented, Western researchers. At the same time there have been attempts by some Māori academics to clearly distinguish their research methodologies as separate and unadulterated by any framework, subjective or otherwise, delineated by the ‘dominant Other’.

3.4 Māori Ambivalence Toward ‘Western-Subjectivist’ Research Paradigms

Māori positions on varying Western, subjectivist research paradigms are shaped by a degree of ambivalence. As noted previously, Russell Bishop notes the potential domination by subjectively oriented, Western groups in their suggestions of a variety of principles and formula in educational research for Māori to follow to enable freedom and emancipation. He equates such potentiality to that of the dominant, objectivist research approach. Others have articulated varying perspectives on the value of subjective research approaches.

Jahnke and Taiapa (1999) note that the outcomes of most Western models of research, including subjective approaches tend to fragment constructions or provide negative representations or wholesale misrepresentations of Māori people, in so far as they do not always make cultural factors explicit (p44). Arohia Durie (2002b) notes that rather

than simply suggesting that it is potentially dominating against Māori, numerous Māori researchers have sought to transform and redefine subjective research positioning to place Māori people, culture and Māori thought at the centre of a distinctly Māori research framework (p5).

Graham Smith's (1997, 1999) Kaupapa Māori theoretical approach certainly fulfils this view outlined by Durie when he considers a large body of work from subjectively oriented academics alongside the work of Māori educationalists. In suggesting that his work aligns closely with the efforts of critical theorists, Smith builds upon such notions as conscientisation which he suggests needs to be accompanied by transformative outcomes (1997; pp152-153). He utilises the subjectivist work of Western educational theorists by placing them alongside the work many Māori are already doing for additional support, direction, validity and confirmation (1999; p36). Other academics have challenged particular aspects of the Western, subjectivist research tradition.

Waitere-Ang and Johnston (1999) critique inclusive research methods highlighting that while there have been developments in research agencies in response to a number of challenges laid down by Māori regarding the inequities born out of research practices, they suggest that the inclusion of Māori in more "appropriate" ways positions Māori as marginal to the research, decision-making process (p1). The question of whether or not Māori have been *really included* in such research processes is critically discussed by the authors.

The notion of bicultural educational research is seen to be another strategy whereby Māori are 'included' but rarely the centre of the research process. Mason Durie (2002) supports the position propounded by Waitere-Ang and Johnston (1999) when he states that at Massey University, 'We do not do any bicultural research'. He argues that rather than

adapting research approaches to ‘suit Māori’, that is, parading work as bicultural material, research with Māori should be Māori-centred where Māori experience, Māori values, and Māori aspirations are at the middle of any methodology.

It is posited here that while bicultural and inclusive approaches to research are steps in the right direction towards countering the epistemological dominance and embedded social and political hegemony of Western research traditions, it is still some distance from where it potentially could be. The necessity for a Māori-centred research tradition grounded in Māori epistemologies, values, and language from which to dialogue with Western research traditions is pivotal in cementing any bicultural educational research approach where the sharing of power and exchanging of views is more genuinely in existence between two groups.

Linda Smith (1999) also makes comment on Māori inter-relations with the subjectivist-Western research paradigm. While she makes a link between indigenous research and post-modernist theorising and critical aspects of poststructuralist theory and cultural studies, Smith asserts that the issues which are debated by such subjectively oriented Western researchers are not new to indigenous peoples, nor are they unfamiliar (p29, p33). She asserts that indigenous theorising preceded that of poststructuralist and postmodernist thinking and that while related and linked in a number of ways to postmodern epistemology, Smith readily distinguishes all indigenous knowledge systems, including Māori, as separate and distinct in their own right (p17).

What is evident from this section is that Māori locate themselves in variable positions regarding subjectivist, Western research approaches. While some readily acknowledge links and ascertain support from certain aspects of the subjective paradigm,

resistance towards other aspects of this paradigm such as bicultural research, which are seen to negate Māori control over the research process or minimise the value of Māori knowledge, values and epistemologies is also forthcoming. What is clear from the literature however is the need to posit and affirm research approaches which centre and locate at the core, Māori world-views, values and knowledges in a taken-for-granted manner while not denying the possibility for over-laps and borrowings to occur.

3.5 Outline and Critique of Māori Research Paradigms

There have been a number of changes and developments within the realm of research in New Zealand over the last twenty years. These changes have sought to challenge, critique and build upon some of the assumptions made by Western research methods by pursuing the growth of new knowledge that specifically benefits Māori (Durie, A., 2002b). Contributions made in the early 1980s saw the development of Māori research frameworks where Māori thoughts and values were incorporated into research arenas. This saw a shift from research being regarded as a Western approach to knowledge making, to research being implicated in the production of Māori knowledge as well. This shift has seen the emergence of distinct methods that simultaneously counter and build upon established disciplinary research approaches (Durie, M., 1996 in Jahnke & Taiapa, 1999; p44). The two research methods noted here are Kaupapa Māori and Māori-centred approaches.

A Kaupapa Māori research approach is founded on confronting the controlling of knowledge (Young, 1971 in Smith, G., 1992) in New Zealand which has historically sustained Pākehā interests over the interests of Māori. In turn, its social and political

directives serve to challenge the Western academy (Henry, 1999), its privileged position in asserting epistemological dominance and its propensity towards co-opting Māori knowledge into its fold. Graham Smith (1997), a leading advocate of Kaupapa Māori theory, states in support of this that Māori theorising questions the embedded processes of social and cultural reproduction of dominant Pākehā interests (p64). In response to dominant interests, Smith has articulated a number of Kaupapa Māori principles that have challenged such dominance through the assertion of Māori autonomy, Māori preferences and Māori philosophies in education. A number of others have built upon his principles to inform and articulate different views about what a Kaupapa Māori research mandate might look like (Bishop, 1996, 1998, 1999; Nepe, 1991 cited in Smith, L., 1999; Pihamo, Cram & Walker, S., 2000; Pihamo, Smith, K., Taki & Lee, 2004; Powick, 2002; Smith, L., 1999).

One of the key principles articulated by Graham Smith is tino rangatiratanga. Tino rangatiratanga is about advancing the desire for Māori to be in control over key decision-making aspects affecting Māori people. While his work does not specifically address issues regarding educational research his theorising is utilised by many to inform their research processes. Smith's principle of tino rangatiratanga suggests that when Māori people are in charge of research decisions not only would 'the buy-in and commitment by Māori participants to making the ideas work' be more certain and solid than if Pākehā were in control of the situation, but because Māori are making such decisions for themselves Māori cultural, political, economic and social preferences would be reflected in educational spaces (Smith, G., 2000; p66). It is noted that because he fails to outline in more depth, specific aspects of Māori cultural, political, economic and social preferences nor suggest that a diversity of cultural, political, economic and social preferences are actually

articulated by ‘Māori’ people, Smith seems to infer that the Māori population is homogenous culturally, politically, economically and socially. A research mandate which unconsciously sets out to solely reproduce a ‘new’ exclusivity, similar in power and impact to that historically cast upon Māori by dominant researchers, fails to capture the internal differences and heterogeneity that currently exists amongst the broader Māori population. A research approach which accounts for both stasis and flux is needed to more genuinely reflect the simultaneously fixed and dynamic nature of ‘Māori’ thinking.

Bishop (1999) holds a similar stance on the principle of self-determination as Smith but provides more specifics of Kaupapa Māori’s impact on the educational research process. As previously noted, he contends that Kaupapa Māori positions researchers in such a way that self-determination is both operationalised and actualised. He advocates for the fundamental Māori concepts of whānaungatanga and taonga tuku iho to inform the research process in such a way that a metaphoric ‘whānau of interest’ research group (Bishop, R. Berryman, M. & Richardson, C., 2002; Bishop, 1999), guided and monitored by the taonga passed onto us by our ancestors, would better serve Māori interests. This development of an enhanced research relationship between researchers and participants where participants are ultimately in charge of the research process is suggested to facilitate and develop feelings of mutuality and reciprocity where there once was a large degree of animosity with non-Māori researchers (Bishop, 1999; p3). The strength of Bishop’s research mandate lies in his ability to capitalise on Māori knowledge and values to inform and re-structure research relationships which traditionally left Māori in a position of vulnerability by the practices of ‘slash and burn’ researchers. However a number of

questions must be raised concerning some of his assertions regarding Kaupapa Māori's use as a research framework.

Tillman (1998) has noted that Bishop's preoccupation with the Kaupapa Māori process being one where the whānau is in *complete* control denies a process of power and knowledge sharing between the participants and the researcher(s). Lopez (1998) similarly takes Bishop to task when it is suggested that he may be a chameleon of sorts who parades as one thing, that is, an advocate of the whānau being in complete control of the research process, but turns upon this ideal once it comes to publishing as he remains a privileged individual locked into the productivity mandates of the academic regime (p229; see also Carter 2003; pp39-40; Tyson, 2003; p23). Acknowledging the inherent benefits and privileges of being a Māori researcher seems under-played not only Bishop but by a number of his contemporaries as well.

The power effects of promoting and reifying the goals of the collective or the whānau-of-interest in research minimises the gaze of the masses upon the privileged researcher(s). A research approach which readily acknowledges the privileged position of the researcher ought not to be denied. The moral proposition of carrying out research in the name of the whānau while simultaneously a proclaimed member of the whānau of interest denies, as outlined by both Tillman and Lopez, the privileged status a researcher has in academic and research circles. A research approach which willingly acknowledges such conflicting insider/outsider potentialities within Māori educational research mandates, assures the pay-offs of research for the researchers are kept in check as credentials, promotions, publications, awards and positions of responsibility are not to be easily taken-for-granted. A more critically aware perspective of the researcher in Māori whānau-of-

interest research approaches assures lines of communication between participants and researchers are more open and subject to criticism by participants while simultaneously creating a space for more authentic exchanges of knowledge and sharing of power to take place.

A second point made by Bishop that needs critical attention is the notion of taonga tuku iho informing the research process. If suggesting taonga tuku iho as a mantra for guiding the research process implies utilising the knowledge and gifts from our rangatira and ancestors from our whakapapa lines, a sense of continuity with the past is retained with clear acknowledgement of the work that has gone on before us, to what effect and degree do the taonga of our ‘Other’ ancestors also inform the research process? As a beginning researcher do the views and knowledges of my Pākehā/English grandparents and ancestors hold a place within a Kaupapa Māori research framework, and if so, to what degree do they hold a position in light of taonga passed down from my Māori ancestors?

Lopez (1998) makes some connections to both of the above points when he problematises Bishop’s assumptions that there are distinctions between being an ‘insider’ and having access to ‘the Māori truth’ and an ‘outsider’ who does not have access to it. Lopez goes on to probe into the dualism presented by Bishop when he asks, ‘Who is an “outsider” and Who is an “insider” in Kaupapa Māori research?’ The winning blow however is landed in his queries about the place of people from mixed Pākehā/Māori backgrounds, are they ‘inside’ or outside’ the culture? (p228). The complexity of the terrain fails to be articulated by Bishop as Lopez in citing Spivak (1995 in Lopez, 1998) suggests that he subscribes to a logic that not only assumes that insiders can speak which is positive, but that they all speak in the same voice which needs critical attention (p228). Linda Smith

(1999) however provides a slightly different tangent upon which Kaupapa Māori research is conceptualised. She indicates some of the complex issues which are suggested to be supported by research derived from Kaupapa Māori theorising.

Linda Smith (1999) utilises a similar approach to Bishop when she utilises a binary dualism to communicate an understanding of indigenous-centred research methods through the concept of *decolonising methodologies*. Such a conception of research methodologies being either colonising or decolonising tends to make absent the more complicating aspects of epistemological borrowing which inevitably occur across borders. Yet, seemingly in contradiction to this binary Smith aims to divulge a sense of the complexity in her articulating of a Kaupapa Māori research mandate which asserts that Māori culture is complicated, internally diverse and contradictory. Such comments not only stand in contrast to modernist criticisms of Māori being unable to change or recreate themselves and still claim to be indigenous (Smith, L., 1999; p74), but it also contradicts the sharp binary of decolonising and colonising methodologies which she talks to in depth throughout her book.

Where Linda Smith's work differs from Bishop's is in his attendant focus on an absolute difference, suggesting that a Māori way of approaching research is distinctly different from more Western-oriented research. While similarly suggesting sharp Indigenous-Western distinctions in her work Smith has made some attempt at articulating a more complex view of Māori people. It is this view which interestingly impacts upon Linda Smith's Kaupapa Māori theorising being both similar and somewhat different from the work of Russell Bishop.

In articulating a Kaupapa Māori research approach Smith (1999) states that it supports a weaving between Māori and Western ways of knowing (pp190-191). Throughout her work she provides lengthy critiques of Western modes of operation such as Western notions of objectivity and positivism as processes of dehumanisation, critiques of the concept of the individual, Western philosophies, Western religions, Western capitalist modes of production, individual autonomy, self-interest and notions of liberalism. The irony of her initial comment, that Kaupapa Māori draws from both Māori and Western ways of knowing is somewhat lost in her failure to acknowledge how specific aspects of Western knowing are appraised and utilised in Kaupapa Māori research.¹¹

While Smith does not fully outline examples of how Western ways of knowing are woven amidst Māori ways of knowing she *does* acknowledge that Māori ways of knowing are not pure anymore (p174). Perhaps this is Smith's acknowledgement of Māori ways of knowing being implicated and constituted by aspects of Western ways of knowing in contemporary times? What Smith is seemingly alluding to is that there has been a degree of co-option, adaptation and re-ascription occurring within Te Ao Māori of Western ways of knowing to suit Māori interests, Māori aspirations and Māori goals. But does this unconscious deontologising of Western culture and Western ways of knowing not parrot the very nature and power of the Leviathan Kaupapa Māori theorising is attempting to dissuade and counter? The reality of a continual and on-going contestation between competing epistemologies and ontologies in research sees a conceptual blurring of boundaries between 'what is' and 'what isn't'. This blurring is often overshadowed by the

¹¹ Alex Barnes (2004), a Pākehā graduate of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori notes this irony when he states that while Kaupapa Māori is underpinned by notions of resistance to colonial and neo-colonial structures and dominant Western research practices, Kaupapa Māori research does not provide an 'easy categorical shift away from Western derived research methodologies' (p50). He suggests as Kaupapa Māori evolves it must acknowledge competing theoretical and practical considerations within its methodology.

moral heavy-weights of stand-point research who often negate the contradictions and complications within their own theorising. The question on the other side of the proverbial coin which is potentially being asked right now is, ‘What happens when the boundaries in research are blurred to such an extent that difference is no longer recognisable or in fact immaterial to the research being carried out?’ ‘Is the acknowledgement of a conceptual blurring of boundaries, existing between research methodologies, another unconscious act of colonization’s tendency to assimilate and dominate?’ The epistemological and philosophical position propounded throughout this research seeks to clarify such questions while simultaneously articulating a theoretical space which builds upon Mason Durie’s (2001, 2003) Māori-centred approach. It is to this newly emerging Māori research paradigm that we now turn.

Māori-centred research aims to locate Māori experiences, Māori values and Māori aspirations at the centre of any research methodology where Māori are concerned (Durie, M., 2002). In suggesting that Massey University’s research is Māori-centric, Mason Durie (2002) suggests that if the methodologies and rationales utilised are not linked to Māori realities, ‘they are not going to have much impact or be of much use to anyone’ (p2). It is clear that Durie is referring to the need for researchers to consider diverse Māori realities when articulating a research methodology. However it is unclear whether or not his initial impetus for Māori experiences, values and aspirations to be located at the *centre* of any research methodology, is suggesting an essentialised view of Māori values or a diverse view of values which the heterogenous Māori population exhibit and embrace, of which essentialised Māori values is a subset. Latter comments made by Durie suggests he is appealing to *both* when he states, that a Māori-centred research approach in no way

discounts Western methodologies, but it must take into ‘account values of the people you are researching’ (p2). His articulation of the necessity for Māori-centred, Māori-added and Māori-collaborative pathways to be employed signals a clear guideline for Māori educational research to embrace a multiplicity of avenues to ensure Māori educational advancement (Durie, M., 2003). Durie’s (2002) argument for Māori to move beyond rhetoric and push towards research of an empirical nature evidences his resolve to open up the space for a diversity of Māori-centred research methodologies to be employed.

Arohia Durie (2002) supports his assertions in part when she outlines the genesis of a Māori-centred research approach arising out of ‘a need for a research paradigm to capture a Māori reality, including lifestyle, patterns of thought, aspirations for the future and a determination to retain a Māori identity’ (p169). Yet again it initially seems unclear as to whether or not Arohia Durie is referring to notions of Māori thought derived solely from a more essentialised-oriented discourse or to thought derived from the diversity of worldviews and thoughts embraced by the Māori population of which essentialised Māori values would be a partial subset. As with Mason Durie, she seems to be referring to both however her frame of reference regarding Māori diversity is articulated somewhat differently. While Mason Durie frames internal Māori difference in a positive light and in need of being built and capitalised upon, Arohia Durie’s (2002) slant on the diversity of Māori thoughts held by the heterogenous Māori population is simply referred to as being due to the forces of ongoing and embedded colonisation. Her point of disjuncture centres on the construction of differences amongst the Māori population as being a result of ongoing colonisation derived from embedded colonial practices’ (p32). Such rhetoric suggests that Māori diversity is *imposed* by the colonial ‘Other’ upon an unconscious and critically

lacking Māori mass. Her consolation to such a situation is to take into account such colonial effects into any research which looks at Māori in education.

Jahnke and Taiapa (1999 in citing Durie, M., 1996) note that a major aim of Māori-centred research is to enhance positive Māori development through the advancement of Māori aims, goals and process. They assert as do Mason and Arohia Durie that a Māori-centred process of enquiry is one which locates Māori people as the focus of the research activity' (p43). Their work echoes an interest in capitalising on Māori diversity to inform research practices and protocols. Such a position is validated when they argue that there is a need for the emergence of distinct research frameworks favoured by Māori that emphasise a multiplicity of approaches to understanding Māori perspectives.

As the researcher it is the multiplicity element of the Māori-centred methodological approach which is of interest to me. Multiplicity creates a space for a diversity of approaches to be implicated within the role of creating knowledge to benefit Māori. Multiplicity opens up the research door to varying methods rather than solely relying on rhetoric to advance Māori education. Multiplicity initiates new relationships with varying academic and educational bodies for Māori advantage. Denying the voices of Māori multiplicity in the form of arguing that Māori difference is created out of the on-going impacts of colonisation does little to advance Māori educational interests and concerns. It holds Māori captive in the exact same vein that the traditionally dominant, research paradigm has as noted by numerous Māori researchers and academics.¹²

¹² Bhabha's notion of *enunciation* (in Young, 2004) bears similarities to the 'Ha' element of a Māori-centred methodological approach in that it aims to capitalise on the repertoire of conflictual positions that constitute the Māori subject. It aims to support heterogeneity rather than solely consider static or homogenous views of the Māori subject.

It is for this reason that a level of concern over a number of issues are raised regarding the potential for Māori to be framed homogenously; the potential for Māori to be compared to an idealised Māori identity; and the potential for research work by Māori being compared to an idealised Māori research framework, including Māori ethical and validity measures. Such issues compel me to utilise the inverted commas around the words ‘Māori’ and ‘Māori-centred’ in certain places throughout this chapter to specifically locate my work as research which ‘centres’ (in dynamic tension with both objective and subjective Western dispositions) itself around notions of positive ‘Māori’ difference ('Ha' element) distinguishing itself in part but not entirely from essentialised views ('Hi' element) of Māori values, world-views, aspirations, politics, economic and culture. While distinguishing my work as primarily revolving around the ‘Ha’ element, essentialist ‘Hi’ elements still inform in part the research carried out. It is from this muddied, yet dynamic research position that a muddled ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research methodology is articulated and advanced.

3.6 Articulating a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred Research Methodology

Muddled research affairs have been recently welcomed within Western social scientific realms, largely informed by the work of a number of bi-ethnic and ethnic minority scholars who have been advocating theories of paradigmatic confluence. Such positions articulate an increasing level of interest in how once seemingly irreconcilable discourses are now appearing to be more confluent (Howe, 2003).

Lincoln and Guba (2003) support this when they state that ‘various paradigms are beginning to “interbreed” such that two theorists previously thought to be in irreconcilable conflict may now appear, under a different theoretical rubric, to be informing one another’s arguments...Consequently, to argue that it is paradigms that are in contention is probably less useful than to probe where and how paradigms exhibit confluence and where and how they exhibit difference, controversies, and contradictions’ (p254). Such dynamism is reiterated throughout their anti-foundationalist position which analyses truth claims through a refusal to adopt any permanent or foundational standard.

This interbreeding of research paradigms is similarly articulated by the work of Gloria Ladson-Billings (2003). In utilising Anzaldua’s (1987 in Ladson-Billings, 2003) notions of borderlands and mestiza consciousness and King’s (1995 in Ladson-Billings, 2003) concept of alterity, Ladson-Billings coheres a theory of liminality which she argues has a perspective advantage as a result of the dialectical nature of the constructed otherness that prescribes the liminal status of people of colour which lies beyond the normative boundary of ‘Self-Other’ (King, 1995 cited in Ladson-Billings, 2003). King (1995) in support of this argues that this epistemic project is more than simply adding on multiple perspectives or “pivoting” the centre. Rather, ‘this liminal position or point of alterity attempts to transcend an ‘either/or’ epistemology’ (in Ladson-Billings, 2003; p407). It is with such thoughts in mind that a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodology has been articulated, attempting in part to transcend an either/or epistemological dualism while also attempting to provide a sense of balance and inclusiveness to Māori research paradigms.

Probably the most insightful views regarding paradigmatic confluence in educational research derive from the works of Gloria Anzaldua. In noting the need for

research to embrace a tolerance for ambiguity she articulates a vision of scholarship built upon the concept of mestiza consciousness. She argues that ‘scholars must shed the bonds of rigid paradigms and stand in new relationships to knowledge, the knower, and the known’ (1987 cited in Ladson-Billings, 2003; p423). Ladson-Billings (2003) shares Anzaldua’s vision of such forms of scholarship when she states that,

‘[*La mestiza*] has discovered that she can’t hold concepts or ideas in rigid boundaries. The borders and walls that are supposed to keep the undesirable ideas out are entrenched habits and patterns of behaviour; these habits and patterns are the enemy within. Rigidity means death. Only by remaining flexible is she able to stretch the psyche horizontally and vertically. *La mestiza* constantly has to shift out of habitual formations; from convergent thinking, analytical reasoning that tends to use rationality to move toward a single goal, to divergent thinking, characterized by movement away from set patterns and goals and toward a more whole perspective, one that includes rather than excludes. The new *mestiza* copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity’

(Anzaldua, 1987; p79 cited in Ladson-Billings, 2003; p422)

While Anzaldua’s notion of alterity is supported here, her notion that one must move from the bonds of rigidity are not wholly embraced. The ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodological approach advocates both stasis (‘Hi’ element) and flux (‘Ha’ element). A research position of alterity as espoused by Anzaldua *must* rely on the stasis of rigid boundaries to inform and challenge such work (so too the reverse situation of stasis needing to be informed and challenged by positions of flux and fluidity), so that both elements are in an inter-relationship of dynamic tension to inform methodology. There are multiple gradations located within such a dynamic, some more rigid than others, and some positioned at the border between ‘Māori’ and alternative paradigmatic views. It is timely

now to examine some of my current thoughts ‘in gestation’ regarding ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research approaches.

The ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodological approach being articulated and adopted here aims to provide a broad, conceptual space for a more essentialised Māori voice in research to be articulated (‘Hi’) alongside the more liminal voices at the borders of Māori and other ways of knowing (‘Ha’). The variety of gradations in between these two complementary forces allows for a multiplicity of research methods to be employed while centred (and ‘centred’ in dynamic tension with alternative ways of knowing) in some way with Te Ao Māori. Currently I am of the view that a necessity exists for a Māori-centred research approach to capitalise on two key and complementary aspects. They are;

Firstly the ‘*Hi*’ element: (derived from the concept of takatakihi, with connotations of inhaling with the aim of standing in a position of staunchness against a potential threat or enemy) The first is to validate, support and legitimate research which builds upon an essentialised view of mātauranga Māori and Māori knowledge in tune with the aspirations of Māori ancestors from our whakapapa lines. Such a position advocates for research which locates itself more centrally to traditional concepts such as whakapapa, whanaungatanga, taonga tuku iho, kanohi ki te kanohi, and mana. It might more readily include research work carried out in Te Reo Māori, it may be more inclined but not limited to a more collaborative approach to research and it might even expand and build upon traditional Māori research methodologies of the past to disseminate, formulate and structure research findings. The imagery of a warrior whose legs are ready to take on board the wero or challenge of an opposing group through the stamping of feet which liberates and activates one’s entire being in the act of protection, acts as a symbol of collective group preservation

in the face of philosophical challenge from an imposing and imminent threat from ‘outside’. Such a philosophical approach seeks to maintain the more static forces of the group’s essentialised epistemological and ontological perspectives.

Secondly the ‘*Ha*’ element: (derived from the notion of ‘breath’, with attached connotations of exhaling with the aim of bordering one’s breath with that/those of others whose ‘ha’ is different) The second modus operandi would be a less-essentialised, bricolaged Māori position which builds upon the diversity of Māori experiences and realities seeking to build research frameworks which consider the tensions and adaptations that occur at the borders between Māori and alternative ways of knowing. Such a position might draw from varying ancestral lines for guidance over the research process, it might also include producing material in Te Reo Māori, and it also may tend towards but not limited to more independent research work. It aims to build upon knowledges and values which straddle traditional and contemporary research methodologies from Māori, Western and other alternative spheres.

These two theoretical research ‘positions’ need not be seen as mutually exclusive or being in competition with one another but rather as complementary elements from which spring a variety of gradations and muddied positions between the dynamic forces of both the ‘*Hi*’ and the ‘*Ha*’. Both rely and depend upon one another to provide dynamic tension through the challenging of assumptions and claims to knowledge. The ‘*Hi*’ element depends on the ‘*Ha*’ to act as a counter-balance to its potentially over-essentialised position while the flux of the ‘*Ha*’ is also counterbalanced by the more static nature of the ‘*Hi*’. Māori research methodologies which more expressly capitulate at some level of depth, the stasis (‘*Hi*’) and flux (‘*Ha*’) both within and at the border of Te Ao Māori, Māori

knowledges, values and epistemologies seems to be a freer and more socially just model of Māori research. Over-arching principles of ‘Hi-Ha’ knowledge development, ‘Hi-Ha’ educational advancement, and ‘Hi-Ha’ research preferences do not tie all researchers up in an essentialised, culturalist bind; nor do they leave researchers to do their work without a care for Māori difference. Theorising the dynamism within and at the border of Te Ao Māori has a number of potential benefits for Māori educational research yet to be fully explored in detail. Issues of power and resistance are also considered within this evolving paradigm.

While the ‘Hi’ element of a ‘Hi-Ha’ methodological approach seeks to give space to monoglossic views regarding Pākehā domination over Māori in educational research, the ‘Ha’ element concurs a theory of more complex view of power relations. Drawing from a reading of Gramsci’s (1971) notion of hegemony where power is multi-faceted in which every discourse (whether Māori or Pākehā) is constituted by power effects seeking hegemonic possibility, the ‘Ha’ element of the ‘Hi-Ha’ methodological approach philosophically and politically embraced in this research, does not seek to suppress issues of power. It self-reflexively acknowledges its own hegemonic potentiality while seeking to assert a complex view of power relations between Māori and Pākehā in educational research. Readily acknowledging the power effects inherent within all methodologies, including its own discursivities is a key element of the ‘Hi-Ha’ methodological approach to research. In line with this, the ‘Ha’ aspect of this approach advances a more self-reflexive view of resistance.

Following Canagarajah (2002), resistance is embraced here as a ‘constructive and creative notion that theorises how the disempowered may reconstruct discourses and

structures for fairer representation' (p30). A 'Ha' approach to Māori research methodology is not a totally destructive practice of rejecting the established structure of dominant Western methodologies, which as Canagarajah (2002) states is a vengeful exercise of replacing it with another through an idealistic attempt to eradicate power in all its forms. The 'Ha' element of the 'Hi-Ha' approach seeks to give balance to such theorising through the reconstituting of a variety of discourses, structures and methodologies in progressively more 'inclusive, ethical and democratic terms' (p30). Such theorising capitalises on the diversity of contemporary Māori realities.

The 'Ha' element of the 'Hi-Ha' approach embraced here clearly utilises aspects of a Western-objectivist research approach in the content analytic procedure followed in terms of aggregating percentages, coding units in a fair and consistent manner and making use of independent coders to assist in minimising researcher bias. Critical theory is embraced in terms of the interpretative aspects of Chapter Six discussions and reviews of the literature. Aspects of Kaupapa Māori and Māori-centred research approaches are also evident in terms of research ethicality and reviews of the literature and methodologies. This work which is analysing how inter-relationships between Māori and Pākehā people (power and identity) and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological worldviews are articulated in academic discourse, builds upon a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred research methodology- yet this work coheres a more fluid movement around the 'Ha' element of this emerging paradigmatic view. Such a research position aims to clearly articulate where there may be instances of drawing from different research paradigms and varying epistemic positions for the benefit of Māori. It is timely now to articulate more clearly, the procedures followed in the examination of the four academic texts under analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHOD AND PROCEDURE

4.0 Introduction

In light of the preceding methodological review, this chapter outlines the key elements of the methods and procedures undertaken in the content analysis of four academic texts and how they articulate inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western ways of knowing. It begins with Section 4.1 which provides a review of some of the theoretical and epistemological issues surrounding the selected research method of content analysis with specific indications of how this research capitalises on variant aspects of this approach.

Section 4.2 begins by articulating some of the concerns over providing a cohesive picture of the procedures undertaken. It maintains that there is a need to connote more openly, some of the complexities and realities endured throughout the research process. The latter half of Section 4.2 discusses this concern in more depth and then provides an insight into the potential for researchers to utilise ‘objective dispositions’. The potential of using varying research components and philosophical positions is supported in the cohering of a ‘Hi-Ha’ methodological approach.

Section 4.2.1 outlines some of the steps involved in articulating research questions and selecting material, while 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 provide more specific details on the content analytic process followed in this research. Section 4.2.4 discusses issues of reliability, validity, bias while 4.2.5 provides a more in-depth insight into the depth of ethical conflicts encountered throughout the research process. In articulating a ‘Hi-Ha’ methodological

approach, a more liminal approach to ethical concerns is also embraced in this research. The politics of such concerns over the ethical status of this work are re-iterated here followed by an indication of a few limitations of this research.

4.1 Content Analysis

The analysis of the four texts proceeded by way of content analysis. Content analysis is an approach to research which examines written, visual or spoken texts (Strand & Weiss, 2005; Thomas & Treiber, 2005). As a research method it has been defined from a number of perspectives (Druckman, 2005). Traditionally it has been implicated by many as solely a quantitative, positivist approach (Berelson, 1952; Gunter, 2000 cited in Neuendorf, 2002; p11; Silverman, 1993 cited in Berg, 2001; p242). Such a position has conceptualised content analysis as a method requiring skills of scientific objectivity, leading to research based on reductive and quantified reasoning. Billig (1988) supports this in a critique of content analytical methodology by stating that rather than being involved in the act of interpreting words in documents and texts, researchers operating within this positivist content analytical perspective tend to focus their analyses on the counting of words or themes hence making such a method one of quantification (p206).

Bryman (2004) upholds this quantitative definition of content analysis when he argues that it is ‘an approach to the analysis of documents and texts that seeks to quantify content in terms of predetermined categories’ carried out ‘in a systematic and replicable manner’ (p183). Drawing from the works of Holsti (1969) and Berelson (1952), Bryman forcefully contends that content analysis is a rigidly quantitative research method which

aids in the construction of objective and systematically identified messages and themes based on the ‘quantitative description of the manifest content’ of texts (Berelson, 1952 cited in Bryman, 2004; p182). The notion of manifest content is a key feature of the more positivist-oriented content analytic approach and one utilised in this research.

The analysis of manifest features of texts (Berelson, 1952 in Bryman, 2004; Berelson, 1971; Berg, 2001)¹³ entails examining ‘those elements that are physically present and countable’ (Berg, 2001; p242) within texts. Manifest content is comparable to the *surface structure* present in the message (Berg, 2001; p242), those features that are explicitly evident in texts. Druckman (2005) supports this when he contends that the manifest approach involves the analysis of the more base features of the text/s under examination. Through the construction of units and themes drawn from the manifest content of the texts this descriptive purpose of content analysis involves the identification of particular features such as ‘what is being said’, ‘who is saying it’ and ‘to whom is it being said’. What is of note with the manifest approach is that discussions and conclusions revolve around what is actually, explicitly stated rather than what is communicated and received at the implicit level. Neuendorf (2002) readily supports this when she states that researchers working in this vein are careful to limit their conclusions to the content manifest in the study. Another key aspect of this more quantitative form of content analysis is its deductive, scientific approach.

It has been noted that Bryman (2004) contends that content analysis is ‘an approach to the analysis of documents and texts that seeks to quantify content in terms of predetermined categories’. Replicating the methods of the natural sciences, this deductive approach to analysing and sorting content units privileges the utilisation of predetermined

¹³ Also referred to as *descriptive content analysis* by Druckman (2005) and Neuendorf (2002).

categories from which one's research findings can be compared and contrasted against, with the possibility of formulating new frameworks, hypotheses or conjectures. Such an analysis of textual data is empirically based with categories constructed a priori to data sorting.¹⁴ The traditional quantitative, positivist approach to content analysis continues to be strong yet like many other research paradigms it has been subject to critique and reformation. Researchers who have critiqued the traditional approach have conceptualised and pushed for the use of content analytic methods with a more qualitative turn.

Berg (2001) argues that content analytic research does not necessarily have to follow a rigidly deductive, positivistic approach. He highlights that a controversy exists concerning the appropriate form of analysis that should be undertaken by content analytic researchers. Berg outlines this controversy firstly by comparing manifest content analysis to latent content analysis. He states that while manifest content analysis is about analysing explicit content in texts, latent content analysis involves the researcher propelling themselves towards 'an interpretive reading of the symbolism underlying the physical data' (p242) or content at the *deep structural* meaning level conveyed by the message (p242). Berg (2001) provides a couple of examples which typify the nature of latent content analysis. For example,

'...an entire speech may be assessed for how radical it was, or a novel could be considered in terms of how violent the entire text was.'

(p242)

Druckman (2005) notes that under the rubric of content analysis there is research which is carried out for the purpose of *description* while others for the purpose of *inference*

¹⁴ No a priori framework was constructed prior to the construction of content units for this study.

(p258). The notion of latent content analysis outlined by Berg (2001) has parallels with Druckman's (2005) idea of an inferential approach to content analysis. Here units and themes are built around the identification of particular latent features such as 'why something was said', 'how it was said' and 'with what effect'. As stated earlier, the uncovering of such latent content connotes 'interpreting meanings that lie beneath the surface' of the texts under examination (Holsti, 1969 in Bryman, 2005; p183). A second key feature of the qualitative turn in content analytic research employed in this study is the inductive approach to categorising and sorting data.

Inductive approaches to content analysis draw from the participants' words rather than overlaying them with predetermined, *a priori* categories. The voices of the research participants are paramount in an inductive approach where variables are chosen and measured after the messages have been observed (Neuendorf, 2002; p11). Content analysis from this qualitative, inductive perspective is therefore not staunchly located solely within a quantitative paradigm - rather it acts as a passport to listening to the words of the text, and understanding better the perspective(s) of the producer(s) of these words (Berg, 2001; p242).

While the quantitative and qualitative methods for carrying out content analysis have their differences, it seems that more recently some researchers are suggesting that there are new possibilities through a blending of the two perspectives. There have been calls for caution and calls for possibility from varying researchers on such a blending.

Despite his seemingly quantitative bend Bryman (2004) yields that content analysis is a 'highly flexible method' (p196). While he tends not to expand on this comment he remains somewhat cautious about utilising latent techniques in research when he states that

content analysis becomes ‘particularly controversial when it is used to seek out latent meaning and themes’ (p198). Berg (2001) on the other hand seems resolute on blending the two techniques throughout the research process whenever and wherever possible.

In outlining such a blending process Berg states that a researcher would give a content unit ‘the same attention from both methods’ (p243), providing that coding procedures for both methods are reasonably valid and reliable (Babbie, 1998 in Berg, 2001; p243). While it would make some sense to proceed in such a manner, the issue that Berg fails to take note of is that when blending occurs in this ‘equally’ attentive way, it will only work if there is synchronicity between the manifest units of content and the latent units of content. If a latent theme was being explored throughout a text which had units that differed from those constructed out of a manifest content analysis, how then would such blending proceed? Would there be dual ‘readings’ of the text under examination?

For the purposes of this research there is a push towards a more inclusive form of content analysis. While the manifest content analysis approach (the quantitative approach used to draw data from the texts) is utilised in this study which is more objective in nature, requiring skills of critical detachment and high levels of researcher control in constructing content units and sorting similar groups in such a way that such methods might be replicable by others, I also opted to utilise the more subjectivist, inductive approach which chooses to draw from the words of the textual authors themselves to determine, sort and organise categories rather than overlay it with an a priori framework. A number of traditionally objective dispositions are retained from the quantitative paradigm such as reliability, validity and bias while being in dynamic relationship to both subjectivist and Māori-centred rationalities. These will be discussed more in depth as the procedures and

methods employed are outlined further on in this chapter. It must be noted that while an analysis of the more latent content within the texts under examination do not form part of this research they would have, if time permitted opened up new dimensions and further rich data to add to the substance of this study. A more interpretative discussion takes place in Chapter Six based on the findings and results from the content analysis of the manifest features of the four texts under examination¹⁵.

The discussions that take place in Chapter Six will not only be grounded in the data inductively educed from the texts under analysis but the findings will also be compared and contrasted against the body of literature in Chapter Two which addresses issues surrounding the articulation of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews in educational academic discourse.

4.2 Procedure

While it would be a case of ease to note that my first ‘systematic’ step in proceeding to analyse the academic texts was to select four articles which talked to the central issues of my research questions followed by the application of a rigid methodological procedure, such claims would be nothing more than an idealised falsehood in the muddied research approach adopted here. As Billig (1988) states while researchers might lay claim to the ‘fact’ that the original texts may be the starting point for research, he argues that in another way the texts are *not* the starting point. He implores that the content analytic researcher will already have built up an understanding and knowledge of the topic

¹⁵ Ely, Vinz, Downing & Anzul (1997) note that interpretation means drawing from the patterns, themes and issues which have arisen from the data. These are then seen in relation to one another and against a larger theoretical framework. Such is the approach employed in this research.

before starting the search required for understanding particular texts (p207). This notion of a researcher ‘back-story’ contextualising the research undertaken complicates notions that research is a vacuous activity, devoid of the ‘self’ in any shape or form. I acknowledge this seemingly unimportant piece of information at the outset not for the purpose of being fickle or pedantic about my method and procedure but rather to give some recognition to two complementary beliefs that I have about the muddied ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research approach undertaken.

The first is that the research process is a particularly complex affair. The demands of the traditional, scientific researcher to portray a cohesive and ‘logical’ structure throughout the research process impacts upon the researcher in such a way that they may be inclined to provide a ‘misleading narrative of the thought that [actually goes] into the making of scientific discoveries’ (Medawar, 1990). Through giving space to and acknowledging the discrepancies that exist between different views on where my actual research process began and how it proceeded I’m attempting to deconstruct the ‘systematic’-ness of the procedure undertaken while at the same time advocating that a system, which may not seem overtly logical to all, was employed nonetheless (Davidson & Tolich, 1999). What is posited here is that knowledge in this instance was not gained through an essentialized following of a prescribed, lineal, pre-set model at all times, but more so through a complex and ‘muddled affair’ which throughout the entire process saw me gathering up ‘clues’ which nudged the search one way or another (Billig, 1998; p207).

In spaces throughout the method and procedure I have provided insights into the complexity of the procedural process. In the majority of spaces however I have chosen to retain the conventional method of outlining the more ‘essential’ procedure as a means of

compromise with the demands of conciseness stipulated by the academy. What I ask of the reader is to recognise that in places I have omitted some of the complexities that have occurred throughout the research process due to such requirements.

The second complementary belief about the research process, which may seem contradictory by some (but ought to be read as complementary) emphasised at this point is recognising that while researchers do not approach research endeavours as a blank slate without view they can throughout the research process, act in objective ways. To bracket oneself out of the research to eliminate *all* pre-judgements is according to Gadamer (cited in Schatzki, 1995) ‘mistaken, illusory and self-defeating’ (p139). Scott and Usher (1999) have similarly noted that researchers ought not to see themselves as ‘free-standing rational individuals’ but rather as ‘specific subjects of difference located in a representational economy’ (p23). Hammersley and Atkinson (1995; p19 cited in Taylor, 2001a) extend this point further by arguing that objective detachment in research is totally impossible. For this reason they argue that ‘the researcher’s influence must be taken into account and even utilised’ throughout the research process (p17).

The citing of works which claim that it is wholly impossible for knowledge to be objectively gained is not altogether supported through a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred methodological approach. The tangent upon which I claim the position of embracing objective dispositions that I do is one which does not wholly recognise the relativity of truth espoused in the volumes of literature ensconced within the post-modern paradigm, nor do I fully rely on the scientific, objectivist paradigm. It must also be re-iterated that I also do not fully rely on an essentialised ‘Hi’ Māori-centred approach in this research either. Rather throughout this work I have adopted a position which situates itself at the liminal

points between objectivist, subjectivist and Māori-centred paradigms acknowledging that while researchers do not approach research endeavours as a blank slate without view, objectivity *as a property of the researcher* can, through certain ways of acting and being, qualify a person as possessing certain objective traits which in effect leads one to act objectively (Schatzki, 1995; p139). I have phrased such researcher dispositions akin to ‘seeing the world as if you *were* God’, which implies that the researcher would assume *a proximal position of tentativeness*. This notion of possessing objective dispositions stands in contrast to a researcher claiming *objective rule* akin to ‘seeing the world as if you *are* God’, which implies that the researcher assumes *a position of dominance*. Such positions of dominant-objectivist research have been duly critiqued by large sectors of the academic community including Māori. The utilisation of ‘objective dispositions’ as opposed to ‘objective rule’ is seen as beneficial for Māori educational advancement as it opens the door for more statistically oriented, empirical work to be utilised through such a philosophical articulation.

Schatzki (1995) in drawing from the works of both Gadamer and Kuhn outlines a number of traits that mark an ‘objectively disposed’ researcher. Firstly he states that,

‘One cardinal mark of objectivity is striving to become conscious of the pre-judgements forming one’s understanding...The more a person strives to become aware of his or her pre-understandings, the more objective he or she is.’

(p139)

In tandem with this is the related mark of objectivity seemingly derived from Karl Popper’s notion of critical rationality (Perkinson, 1999) which argues that an objective researcher shows a ‘willingness to revise or abandon pre-judgments when they obstruct

understanding' (p139). What this trait asserts is that not only must a researcher be able to question and carry out a conversation or dialogue with the object(s) under analysis but more so be open to 'opposing viewpoints, arguments and judgments' (p141) with the effect of possibly 'learning something from the object under review' (p139).

Schatzki (1995) also delineates from a 'scientific' conception of objectivity as the term is commonly understood. In criticising the Enlightenment ideal of 'freedom from prejudice' he notes that the historicity of understanding, the notion that 'understanding is a development of tradition that occurs whenever a historically constituted individual interprets an object, text, person, or action...which is mediated by a past tradition of interpretation', problematises the scientific conception of objectivity which insists that '1) a person is objective when his or her knowledge-gathering apparatus functions correctly, and 2) this apparatus functions correctly when everything particular about the knower is bracketed and cognition merely mirrors the world' (p138).

Schatzki (1995) confers that for many 'objectivity' is viewed from this staunch Enlightenment perspective, equating it more or less with 'truth' and 'fact' while its opposite is constructed as 'falsity' or mere 'opinion' (p137)¹⁶. Objectivity in my view does not imply the possession of truth. Rather objectivity is a 'way of being', moulded into the everyday characteristics of a researcher as they grow and become increasingly aware of their own rationality¹⁷ (Schatzki, 1995; pp144-145). It is these two complementary beliefs which philosophically underpin the research procedures that follow. They are in summary

¹⁶ Contrary to some views, pitting objectivity against ethnic approaches to knowing is problematic. Hoy (1995) notes that attaining objectivity seems to imply overcoming ethnocentrism with the attendant labelling that objectivity is unequivocally 'good' and ethnic ways of knowing 'bad'. Hoy suggests there is a need for a greater criticality of such a simplistic binary approach to knowing.

¹⁷ Boon (1995) also connotes the term *ultraobjectivity* which contends a form of objectivity which is cross-culturally competent while self-reflexively aware of one's own position.

i) that the research process is a particularly complex affair and ii) recognising that while researchers do not approach research endeavours vacuously - as blank slates without view - they can throughout the research process, act in objective ways. Such beliefs about the place of objective dispositions in dynamic tension with both subjective and Māori-centred articulations are seen to be of prime benefit for research endeavouring to benefit Māori educational aspirations.

4.2.1 *Getting focused, articulating questions and selecting material to analyse*

Pinning down a kaupapa for my thesis was probably the most difficult task to get through. Over the past two years I have waxed and waned over varying possibilities for research, devising different research proposals to satisfy varying stakeholders' interests in my post-graduate study. I moved into and retracted from considering topics such as 'how educational achievement is constructed within mainstream schools from the views of Māori teachers' to 'Māori teachers' conceptualisations of power relations in mainstream schooling contexts' to carry out a 'critical discourse analysis of a series of education papers'. I seemed to be all over the place, this being confirmed when I was told by one of my supervisors that I needed to 'focus on one thing and stick to it'.¹⁸ Finally after much 'to-ing' and 'fro-ing' I settled (after a 4 week holiday in the UK), somewhat tentatively with the focus for this thesis '*Weaving 'Muka' and 'Iron'? : A Content Analysis of how Māori and Pākehā/Western Inter-Relations are Articulated in Academic Texts for Māori Educational Benefit*'.

¹⁸ Bouma (1996) notes that a more qualitatively oriented research endeavour is usually less focused at the outset.

The next step after this was to locate a set of academic texts which talked in some capacity to the issue I wished to explore. I had already located a number of texts from my previous literature searches around the varying topics I initially thought I would do so I was given the task of choosing from my selection of readings. A list of about twelve articles written by various New Zealand academics which focused on my topic of interest first surfaced. At this same time I was formulating my initial research questions. They were (and still are),

- i) ‘How are inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity, articulated in four academic texts for Māori educational benefit?
- ii) ‘How are inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies articulated in four academic texts for Māori educational benefit?

As the research questions were being formulated and the selection of texts was taking place, I finally decided upon four specific articles for analysis which talked about the issue of concern more voluminously than those I did not choose to analyse. Inside my head however I was still unsure as to *how* I was going to analyse them.

My final four articles for this analysis were Dr Elizabeth Rata’s (2004c) paper presented at the TEFANZ Conference at the Auckland College of Education titled, ‘*Ethnic Ideologies in New Zealand Education: What’s Wrong with Kaupapa Maori*’, Dr Elizabeth

McKinley's (2005) article in the International Journal of Science Education titled, '*Locating the global: culture, language and science education for indigenous students*', Professor Mason Durie's (2003) Hui Taumata Mātauranga Tuatoru Keynote Address titled, '*Māori Educational Advancement at the Interface between Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Whānui*', and Dr. Te Maire Tau's (2002) paper presented at the Popper Centennial Conference, Vienna titled, '*Open Societies and Tribal Groups*'. What is of note is that I was in attendance at the presentations of both Professor Durie's and Dr. Rata's papers while both Dr. McKinley and Dr. Tau after my own inquiry into their works for my own teaching and thesis interests, forwarded via e-mail a copy of their articles that I have utilised here for analysis. For each article there has been a connecting device where an academic exchange of sorts has occurred between myself, the authors and the ideas offered within.

In summary my criteria for selection were premised on whether the papers chosen talked in some length to the inter-relationship between Māori and Pākehā peoples and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological worldviews. It was important that the materials selected were able to be made into discrete content units for the purpose of the content analysis in light of the research questions articulated. It was also preferable that each of the articles were presented or published in the last five years. This was seen to be central to gauging a more contemporary insight into the nature of the discussions surrounding and impacting upon Māori people in education and the articulation of how Māori knowledge ought best be considered to promote Māori advancement. Each of the four texts fit these criteria.

Of the four texts selected for analysis, two of them seemed to orient themselves on initial readings, solely around Māori knowledge, values, aspirations and growth in education. To provide a sense of balance, the remaining two articles seemed to differ in tangent, offering perspectives on Māori knowledge, values and aspirations in education from more of a Western theoretical background. While it was initially seen to be important that the analysis of varying texts take into account such a diversity of views relating to the articulated research questions (i.e. not locating literature solely operating from a supposed Māori-oriented theoretical perspective), as can be seen in the Chapter Six discussions there were a number of themes indicating varying points of difference, contradiction and confluence between all four discourses. It is now, after completing the processes of analysis that while there are certainly differences in perspective on some issues pertaining to Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations in academic discourse, there are also points of confluence between all four authors previously seen as irreconcilable in their thinking.

The selection of four articles as opposed to any other number was seen to be a manageable load of data to work with as a beginning researcher. It not only allowed for greater ease of access to the data but also through this small number of articles, an extensive and prolonged engagement with the textual material occurred so that the complexity and dynamism of varying patterns and relationships of meanings were developed and better articulated by the researcher (Creswell, 1994; p12).

4.2.2 *The Content Analytic Process*

I began analysing the texts by creating ‘content units’.¹⁹ Content units are statement entities characterised as having a whole intent and meaning, in and of themselves (Niwa, 2005b). What this means when analysing a document in practical terms is that you’ll begin by reading the first sentence or two of a text and when you sense that a statement entity ‘means something’ in and of itself based on its manifest content you ask yourself, ‘What is this portion saying?’ Once you feel that what is being said makes sense in and of itself you create a border or boundary around that particular portion of the text. You write a paraphrase of that content unit which keeps the original intent and meaning of that identified content unit in tact. The example 4.2.2a below shows where a boundary line marks the beginning and the end of the sentence with a paraphrase written underneath. Before I talk about the writing of paraphrases it should be noted that statement entity boundaries may not necessarily be constituted by every single sentence contained in the text. The content units may be made up of varying sizes and lengths. It could be one sentence, a portion of a sentence, a collection of sentences or even more (Druckman, 2005; pp260-261). Here is an example from my research of a content unit boundary made up of one full sentence.

4.2.2a

Premised on the ethnic primordial ‘two worlds’ assumption, this view of Maori as the ongoing victims of structural socio-economic injustice pits Maori and non-Maori against each other.

Paraphrase: Socio-economic injustice
from two worlds mentality pits Māori
against non-Māori. R-073

¹⁹ Druckman (2005) calls them *codes* and Bryman (2004) *units of analysis*.

Here is another example of two content units constructed around one full sentence. You will note in 4.4.2b each portion of the sentence contains a whole intent and meaning, in and of itself able to be constructed into separate content units. These were used in a number of instances where the texts were thick and rich with ideas and needed to be analysed more closely and with more detail.

4.2.2b

Consequently it is important that the intersections between those two worlds are fully appreciated (D-044) so that the space can be negotiated wisely by students and by providers of educational services. (D-045)

Paraphrase: Two worlds intersections need appreciation. D-044

Paraphrase: Two worlds appreciation gives space for negotiation. D-045

The rationale behind the construction of content units that took up more than one sentence was that while such content was rich, the series of sentences identified were not overly thick or too complexly worded within the texts to warrant smaller units. The sentences which made up a single content unit talked to a similar point that were recapitulated in an adjoining paraphrase (see example 4.2.2c below).

4.2.2c

The recovery of our indigenous histories, knowledges, experiences and identity is inextricably linked to the recovery of our languages because languages are our view of the world. In order to understand the imperative of keeping indigenous languages, there is a need to move away from viewing language as a technical tool of communication and viewing language as encompassing our existence.

Paraphrase: Language recovery imperative for indigenous existence. M-094

Researchers working within the content analytic domain need the ability to paraphrase content units in one's own words. A paraphrase is a brief summary of what is being *visibly stated*, in other words, a paraphrase is a summary of what is *manifest* in the text (Druckman, 2005; Berg, 2001; Glassner & Loughlin, 1987 in Berg, 2001; Berelson, 1952 in Bryman, 2004). The key to a strong manifest content unit is to keep the whole intent and meaning from the original text in tact. That is, one's role is not to *add* or *read into* the text as one proceeds through the material. Such *reading in* at this point of the research would be the role of the interpretivist.²⁰ Our interest at this initial point and time is not to interpret what is being stated in the text under analysis; our sole interest is to paraphrase the 'objectively' (as seen in the space given for 'objective dispositions' as outlined in Section 4.2) manifest content of the text (Niwa, 2005b). The construction of strong content units and paraphrases are mediated by what constitutes a whole intent and meaning in and of themselves, based upon the manifest content of the texts. Whether one constructs content units or not around particular portions of a text is significantly dictated not only by the research questions one posits at the outset (Bryman, 2004), but also by whether content units can or ought to be made around particular chunks of the text in the first place.

There were a number of portions from throughout the texts which I have labelled '*Informational*' either due to the evidence of unimportant material which did not relate to the thesis focus or, as was the case in most instances they were titles, abstracts, headings, sub-headings and tables (i.e. one article had a series of tables throughout the text). Such features of the academic texts were omitted from being made into content units themselves.

²⁰ An interpretative approach is utilised in Chapter Six when the results and findings are discussed. Interpretation is seen to be needed in analysing any 'human-constructed formulation, written, spoken or gestured' (Finnegan, 1996; p147) but was not employed at this initial stage of content unit construction.

However the information contained within the tables and headings were often explicated in some detail throughout the article and *were* constructed into content units. In summary, the ‘what to count’ issue largely depended on my research questions, whether there was resonance between my research questions and the material of analysis and whether content units with strong and clear paraphrases of whole intent and meaning could be constructed with ease by the researcher.

The total number of content units created for analysis at the end of the first pre-sorting stage of coding of all four academic texts totalled 602 content units. The distribution between the four texts was as follows:

	McKinley	Rata	Durie	Tau	<i>n</i>
Content Units	188	141	158	115	602

Table 4.1 Pre-Sorted Distribution and Total Number of Content Units

4.2.3 Sorting the Data, Constructing Categories

Following the construction of the 602 content units and paraphrases, the units were then sorted into similar groupings, beginning the coding process. Groupings revolved around material with similar intent and meaning based upon each unit’s paraphrase. The 602 units were individually cut with their distinctive unit boundaries of whole intent and meaning kept in tact, placed into a box where they were mixed up by the researcher. The process of randomly selecting one content unit at a time and placing it face-up upon the sorting table waiting to find another content unit that similarly matched took much effort

and concentration. Upon the completion of the first round of sorting there were 391 similar groupings. Unable to work with the large diversity of data a second round of sorting was forthcoming.

The 391 similar groupings were each summarised in the form of a paraphrase, cut up and again placed into a box where they were mixed up by the researcher. Again, each of the 391 similar groupings was randomly selected one-by-one from the sorting box and compared and contrasted with following similar groupings. Upon the completion of the second round of sorting there were then 94 similar groupings. Still unable to work with the large diversity of data a third round of sorting began.

The third round of sorting the 94 similar groupings followed the same pattern as the previous two rounds. This time, upon the completion of the third round of sorting a total of 20 similar groupings were attained. At this stage a fourth round of sorting was forthcoming with procedures the same as the previous three rounds. Upon completion of this final round of sorting, 8 groupings (four major and four minor themes) were inductively drawn from the content analysis of the four academic texts under examination. Throughout the rounds of sorting, a number of uncategorised single content units were identified. These five uncategorised individual content units did not share similarities with other units and were not utilised in the final tallies. This brought the total content units finally categorised to 597.

	McKinley	Rata	Durie	Tau	<i>n</i>
Content Units	187	141	158	111	597

Table 4.2 Post-Sorting Distribution and Total Number of Content Units Utilised

4.2.4 Reliability, Validity and Bias

Reliability (coding accuracy) is a measure of the extent to which a test, or in this case, the construction of consistent content units and paraphrases, is free from measurement error or bias (Gall, Gall & Borg, 1999; p532). Gall, Gall and Borg (1999) state that, ‘researchers acknowledge the likelihood that their own errors and biases will affect the data that they collect. Therefore, they design research studies to minimise the influence of such factors’ (p12). For this study, the researcher sought the expertise of a panel of ‘experts’ to compare his pre-sorted content units and paraphrases with those of the panel. While not *all* the data were constructed into content units and paraphrases by the inter-coder reliability panel, selective samples were chosen from all four texts, with each of the three expert panellists having an unidentified page of raw data from each, totalling twelve pages of inter-coder reliability data altogether. Such an approach was utilised for the reason raised by Bryman (2004) that ‘coding must be consistent between coders’ (p195) for reliability of measurements utilised by the researcher to be met. The use of multiple observers and training them before hand in the system of constructing units and paraphrases on observational variables was employed by the researcher (Gall, Gall & Borg, 1999; p12).

A group of three fellow Masters’ degree students were approached to participate in the creation of content units and paraphrases to test researcher consistency in defining content units boundaries and reliable paraphrases based on specific sections of each of the four texts under analysis. A brief training exercise was given which outlined i) the aims and purposes of the research, ii) some of the research work that had already been carried out

(i.e. the selection of four articles, the construction of content units and the beginning of the sorting into similar groupings process) and iii) the nature of the task in which they were to carry out. It was noted that their role was one of assisting in the assessing of researcher consistency and reliability with the intent of minimising any effects of bias through their construction of content units and paraphrases (Niwa, 2005b). The panel were given definitions for both a content unit and paraphrase with an example provided on projector which outlined some of the key features of both. A brief insight into the method of content analysis was also provided prior to the creation of content units by the panel.

To ensure some level of semblance between the researcher's content units and those constructed by the expert panel, statistical procedures were utilised to gauge the level of agreement between parties. While the construction of content units and paraphrases between the researcher and panellists would rarely agree perfectly, a satisfactory level of agreement would be accepted as an indicator of the accuracy of the researcher's observations (Gall, Gall & Borg, 1999; pp12-13). In this case expert panellists were told that it was hoped, for the sake of reliability, validity and the minimising of bias that approximately 80% of their content units and paraphrases would need to match those of the researcher. The soundness of the researcher's ability to construct reliable content units and paraphrases and minimise potential bias, is seen to not only strengthen the rigour of the application of content analytic methods but also strengthen the validity (meaning of the coded categories) of the inferences made from the research study findings. Appendix 5 has a full statistical outline of the inter-coder reliability coefficient results with a final rate of 72%. While differences in rates between the researcher and individual coders (66%, 79%

and 69%) were evident, the overall rate of 72% was seen to be an appropriate percentage for the reliability levels of this research.

4.2.5 Ethics

While it would seem that ethical procedures involving the use of primary academic texts made widely available for public scrutiny would allay any fears of breaking ethical standards, a number of ethical concerns from both Western and Māori research paradigms have been considered. Strand and Weiss (2005) note that because non-reactive research such as the content analysis of academic texts does not involve human participants directly, it allows ‘researchers to avoid some of the ethical problems related to privacy and avoiding harm to participants’ (p162). However they note that such an unobtrusive approach to research needs to be mindful of the ‘potential consequences of their research findings’ (Strand and Weiss; p162). Such a concern is mirrored in Māori-centred research ethical standards.

Arohia Durie (2002a) has noted that ‘ethicality is about core values and respectful research, modified as need be to do no harm’ (p180). While differentiating a ready distinction between Māori ethicality, which is suggested to draw from collective concepts of good research, and traditional research ethicality, suggested to draw from individual concepts (p181), such an articulation of an absolute difference between the two ethical paradigms does play some part in *informing* the work of a ‘muddled’ researcher. However the potentiality for research work to be ‘locked out’ due to dual gate-keeping mechanisms which deny a position of alterity fails in and of itself to respect work which as Durie notes

above modifies as need be to do no harm. It is the work of a ‘Ha’ Māori-centred researcher to be *informed* by both traditional and Māori ethical research standards, not to be *dominated* and *controlled* to such a degree that the fulfilling of *all* ethics criteria of a particular paradigm are met.²¹

The three ethical principles of major concern and thoughtfully considered for this research were as follows:

Ethical Principles	Implications
Takatakahī Mana/ Mana Tangata/Dignity and Respect	Minimising the trampling on the standing and positions of the academics concerned
Conflicts of Interest	Fracturing ‘insider’-‘outsider’ binaries
Mana a ‘Iwi’/Outcome Awareness	Māori should benefit from the research

Table 4.3 ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-Centred Research and Ethicality

The Māori-centred ethical principle of Takatakahī mana/Mana Tangata parallels in many ways traditional research notions of affording dignity and respect to research participants. For this study, the positions and standings of the four academics whose material was under analysis recognised from the outset that while they are not participants as such; notions of mana and dignity were readily taken into account here. Respect for their varying tribal positions, family connections and work reputations are acknowledged also. However, such an articulation of the ethical principle of mana raises questions over

²¹ A note of caution is sounded for those whom embrace a position of ‘Ha’ alterity in their research methodology. Wynter (1992 cited in Ladson-Billings, 2003) states that the ‘system-conserving mainstream perspective of each order’, in the case of this research, the “dominant, Western educational research order” and the “established Māori educational research order”, ‘clash with the challenges made from the perspectives of alterity’. He states that such a clash occurs ‘for it is the task of established scholarship to rigorously maintain those prescriptions which are critical to the order’s existence’ (p408). With experiences of dispute and confrontation being forthcoming regarding the position of alterity taken up in this research, it suggests that such an articulation by Wynter holds some weight. One of the major issues grappled with throughout the entire research process was regarding questions over whether this work met mainstream and Māori ethical research benchmarks. A position of alterity (‘Ha’) validates the drawing from both sets of standards while having neither as their ultimate ‘Master’ (Minh-Ha, 1991).

whether or not I as a researcher can then engage critically with ideas posited and written by respected members of the academic community who hold some standing in Te Ao Māori? As a younger, rangatahi Māori who wishes to show respect for ‘his’ elders, is engaging in the critical analysis of a series of texts written by respected Māori academic leaders potentially interpreted by some as trampling on their mana? In recognising that not all the four academics whose material is under analysis are Māori, do such Māori-centred research ethical principles relate to them? Am I because of their ethnicity able to more ‘legitimately’ critically analyse the work of non-Māori, while somehow ‘dancing around’ ideas articulated by Māori academics? Such questions have been resolved from a position of alterity which suggest that as a researcher I show dignity and respect to variant connections each of the academics whose work is under analysis have, while simultaneously embracing a critical theory slant allowing any critical aspects arising from the research findings to be ‘put out on the table’ in a respectful manner.

The second ethical consideration of importance in this study is the notion of a conflict of interest. Arohia Durie (2002a) has noted that conflicts of interest can arise for ‘Māori as insiders to research in Māori contexts when the context is known well as are the connections and histories of prospective participants’ (pp182-183). In a Māori research context where notions of whakapapa, whanaungatanga and familial inter-connections abound, considering the insider-outsider/researcher-researched dilemma has also been an issue of concern in the analysis of four texts written by four academics. One of the articles analysed was that of a fellow academic staff member from the same University at which I am currently located. While situated on a different campus the use of his work was seen as a conflict of interest for me as an ‘ethnic insider’ researcher, whereas the potential to

analyse the academic work of a fellow colleague who was seen to be an ‘ethnic outsider’ was deemed to be more legitimate in minimising any conflict of interest. After much discussion and dialogue, no conflict of interest was seen to be evident as all four pieces of academic texts analysed in this research was made available for wide public perusal, analysis and critique.

The third and final ethical consideration of prime importance in this research is Mana a ‘Iwi’ or outcome awareness. A ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research approach attempts to centre the desire for Māori to benefit from the research. While it seems presumptuous that studies underpinned by a Māori research paradigm and accompanying ethical concerns would in some way be *more* explicitly beneficial to Māori than studies *not* underpinned by such approaches, a position of alterity notes that dynamic potential exists for research work to be liberating and/or dominating depending on how information is utilised, with what effect and for what purpose. While a researcher cannot control the multitude ways in which a published piece of research might be interpreted or utilised, the only level of control that the researcher does have complete command over is in providing assurance that the methodologies and procedures employed were carried out fairly and efficiently, ensuring that measures were put in place for the minimisation of bias and in communicating that issues of ethicality were thoughtfully considered and addressed throughout the research process.

This research aims to benefit Māori indirectly through a thorough analysis of four academic texts, highlighting theoretical and philosophical issues pertaining to education structured for them. While the primary audience for this work are other academics and fellow tertiary students, it is hoped that varying people will build upon select aspects of the

findings and discussions to assist Māori in more deeply engaging in critical matters pertaining to knowledge, power and educational provision. Māori as a heterogenous group, their aspirations and desires for educational advancement *are* central to the proposed research with the expressed hope of endeavouring to privilege Māori potentiality for growth and development across a broad spectrum of areas into which Māori educational advancement would be fostered.

4.2.6 Limitations

One of the two limitations that were of concern was the fact that only four pieces of academic texts were utilised for analysis. A larger selection would have provided further rich and descriptive data for the research. Considering the time constraints for completing a Masters degree the selection of four texts for analysis was deemed to be a suitable and manageable load.

A second limitation was evident upon analysing the findings of the content analysis. While an inductive approach was employed here in this instance with eight themes educed from the manifest content of the texts, approaching the categorising and sorting of data deductively with an *a priori* framework would have provided a more discourse analytic (Burman & Parker, 1993; de Beaugrande, 1999, 2004; Fairclough, 2001, 2003; Fairclough, Graham, Lemke & Wodak, 2004; Leudar, Marsland & Nekvapil, 2004; Luke, 1999; Mcnaughten, 1993; Taylor, S., 2001a, 2001b; Wetherell & Potter, 1988, 1992) or socio-

linguistic approach to analysing the rhetorical strategies utilized in the texts.²² Such an approach would have provided more scope and further rich data for analysis.

²² Bahktin's notions of monoglossia and heteroglossia as an a priori framework from which to analyse and code the four texts would have provided more specifically focused data regarding the constancy of use and the nuances of the application of such rhetorical strategies employed by the academics in articulating their positions on Māori and Pākehā power, identity and epistemological inter-relations in education.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Major and Minor Themes

As noted in Section 4.2.3 eight themes have been educed from the content analysis of the four academic texts. Four major themes constitute 79.40% ($n=478$) of the entire selection of single content units. They are as follows:

D1. Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing and tribal, mythic world-views is problematic as they fail to grasp the superiority of open, complex and universal ways of knowing which not only enable critical discussion and reflection but also allow for transformation and change.
D2. While a number of approaches and methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori there is a need for further negotiation over how the curriculum might be constituted. Careful consideration needs to be given to multifarious approaches rather than absolute ‘answers’ to Māori education.
D3. Māori are located at and influenced by the interface between Māori and Western/wider world knowledge systems and historical and contemporary realities.
D4. Sound relationships between Māori-Māori, Māori-Crown and Māori-wider world groups essential for a sustained Māori collective capacity.

Table 5.1a: Four Major Themes

Four minor themes constitute 19.77% or ($n=119$) of the single content units. They are:

D5. Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity.
D6. Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds where strong ethnic boundaries exist. Such divisions note the colonizing culture is the ‘Other’ and bearer of sin.
D7. Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector.

D8. Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement ‘gap’ between Māori and other students, Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors.

Table 5.1b: Four Minor Themes

The distribution of content units between the articles under analysis for the four major and four minor themes are stated in terms of the total number of content units (*n*), as a percentage total of all content units (*n%*), as a cumulative number of all content units (*<n*), and as a cumulative percentage total of all content units (*<n%*). This is then followed by a fractionised total of content units for the theme from each article (*f*), as a percentage total of all content units for the theme from each article (*f%*), as a fractionised cumulative number of all content units for each article (*<f*), and as a cumulative percentage of all content units from each piece of academic text (*<f%*). The distribution is as follows:

D1. Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing and tribal, mythic world-views is problematic as they fail to grasp the superiority of open, complex and universal ways of knowing which not only enable critical discussion and reflection but also allow for transformation and change.					
<i>n</i>	McKinley	Rata	Durie	Tau	
(<i>n</i>)	0	65	0	88	153
(<i>n%</i>)	(0.00%)	(10.80%)	(0.00%)	(14.62%)	(25.42%)
(<i><n</i>)	0	65	0	88	153
(<i><n%</i>)	(0.00%)	(10.80%)	(0.00%)	(14.62%)	(25.42%)
<i>f</i>	0/188	65/141	0/158	88/115	153/602
(<i>f%</i>)	(0.00%)	(46.10%)	(0.00%)	(76.52%)	
(<i><f</i>)	0/188	65/141	0/158	88/115	153/602
(<i><f%</i>)	(0.00%)	(46.10%)	(0.00%)	(76.52%)	

D1: Distribution Table

D2. While a number of approaches and methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori there is a need for further negotiation over how the curriculum might be constituted. Careful consideration needs to be given to multifarious approaches rather than absolute ‘answers’ to Māori education.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
n	124	0	37	1	162
(n%)	(20.60%)	(0.00%)	(6.15%)	(0.17%)	(26.91%)
(<n)	124	65	37	89	315
(<n%)	(20.60%)	(10.80%)	(6.15%)	(14.78%)	(52.33%)
f	124/188	0/141	37/158	1/115	162/602
(f%)	(65.96%)	(0.00%)	(23.42%)	(0.87%)	
(<f)	124/188	65/141	37/158	89/115	315/602
(<f%)	(65.96%)	(46.10%)	(23.42%)	(77.39%)	

D2: Distribution Table

D3. Māori are located at and influenced by the interface between Māori and Western/wider world knowledge systems and historical and contemporary realities.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
n	28	8	38	17	91
(n%)	(4.65%)	(1.33%)	(6.31%)	(2.82%)	(15.12%)
(<n)	152	73	75	106	406
(<n%)	(25.25%)	(12.13%)	(12.46%)	(17.61%)	(67.45%)
f	28/188	8/141	38/158	17/115	91/602
(f%)	(14.89%)	(5.67%)	(24.05%)	(14.78%)	
(<f)	152/188	73/141	75/158	106/115	406/602
(<f%)	(80.85%)	(51.77%)	(47.47%)	(92.17%)	

D3: Distribution Table

D4. Sound relationships between Māori-Māori, Māori-Crown and Māori-wider world groups essential for a sustained Māori collective capacity.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
n	9	0	62	1	72
(n%)	(1.50%)	(0.00%)	(10.30%)	(0.17%)	(11.96%)
(<n)	161	73	137	107	478
(<n%)	(26.74%)	(12.13%)	(22.76%)	(17.77%)	(79.40%)
f	9/188	0/141	62/158	1/115	72/602
(f%)	(4.79%)	(0.00%)	(39.24%)	(0.87%)	
(<f)	161/188	73/141	137/158	107/115	478/602
(<f%)	(85.64%)	(51.77%)	(86.71%)	(93.04%)	

D4: Distribution Table

D5. Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>n</i>	15	0	20	0	35
(<i>n</i> %)	(2.49%)	(0.00%)	(3.32%)	(0.00%)	(5.81%)
(< <i>n</i>)	176	73	157	107	513
(< <i>n</i> %)	(29.24%)	(12.13%)	(26.08%)	(17.77%)	(85.21%)
<i>f</i>	15/188	0/141	20/158	0/115	35/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(7.98%)	(0.00%)	(12.66%)	(0.00%)	
(< <i>f</i>)	176/188	73/141	157/158	107/115	513/602
(< <i>f</i> %)	(93.62%)	(51.77%)	(99.37%)	(93.04%)	

D5: Distribution Table

D6. Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds where strong ethnic boundaries exist. Such divisions note the colonizing culture is the ‘Other’ and bearer of sin.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>n</i>	3	27	0	4	34
(<i>n</i> %)	(0.50%)	(4.49%)	(0.00%)	(0.66%)	(5.65%)
(< <i>n</i>)	179	100	157	111	547
(< <i>n</i> %)	(29.73%)	(16.61%)	(26.08%)	(18.44%)	(90.86%)
<i>f</i>	3/188	27/141	0/158	4/115	34/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(7.53%)	(19.15%)	(0.00%)	(3.48%)	
(< <i>f</i>)	179/186	100/141	157/158	111/115	547/602
(< <i>f</i> %)	(96.24%)	(70.92%)	(99.37%)	(96.52%)	

D6: Distribution Table

D7. Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>n</i>	1	33	0	0	34
(<i>n</i> %)	(0.17%)	(5.48%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	(5.65%)
(< <i>n</i>)	180	133	157	111	581
(< <i>n</i> %)	(29.90%)	(22.09%)	(26.08%)	(18.44%)	(96.51%)
<i>f</i>	1/188	33/141	0/158	0/115	34/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(0.53%)	(23.40%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	
(< <i>f</i>)	180/188	133/141	157/158	111/115	581/602
(< <i>f</i> %)	(95.74%)	(94.33%)	(99.37%)	(96.52%)	

D7: Distribution Table

D8. Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement 'gap' between Māori and other students, Māori students' educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>n</i>	7	8	1	0	16
(<i>n</i> %)	(1.16%)	(1.33%)	(0.17%)	(0.00%)	(2.66%)
(< <i>n</i>)	187	141	158	111	597
(< <i>n</i> %)	(31.06%)	(23.42%)	(26.25%)	(18.44%)	(99.17%)
<i>f</i>	7/188	8/141	1/158	0/115	16/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(3.72%)	(5.67%)	(0.63%)	(0.00%)	
(< <i>f</i>)	187/188	141/141	158/158	111/115	597/602
(< <i>f</i> %)	(99.47%)	(100.00%)	(100.00%)	(96.52%)	

D8: Distribution Table

See Appendices 1-4 for a full outline of all the major and minor themes, their contributing variables and distribution rates for each theme and variable. The constitution of the remaining content units is also made available in tabular form. As noted earlier the remaining 0.83% (*n*=5) of single content units were seen not to apply to any of the eight themes educed from the data.

5.2 Analysis of Themes

The eight themes educed from the literature go some way in addressing the research questions outlined at the outset. It was initially thought that there were two sets of distinctive discourses apparent in the four articles selected. The content analysis has shown that while there is a definite marked degree of difference between the works of Tau and Rata in comparison to that of Durie and McKinley, there are also points of difference between both Tau and Rata and between Durie and McKinley. There are clear indications that the discourses of the four pieces of academic work have shown to exhibit both points

of convergence and divergence at varying instances in their articulation of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people, in terms of power and identity, and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews in education.

The following tables and supporting analyses have isolated the data from the above distributions pertaining to article weightings per theme. Included is the fractionised number of content units over the total number of content units from each article categorised under each of the eight themes (*f*), and a percentage total weighting of the distribution of all the constructed content units from each article per theme (*f%*). In bold are the significantly weighted themes identified for each article.

5.2.1 Major Theme D1

D1. Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing and tribal, mythic world-views is problematic as they fail to grasp the superiority of open, complex and universal ways of knowing which not only enable critical discussion and reflection but also allow for transformation and change.					
	<i>McKinley</i>	Rata	<i>Durie</i>	Tau	
<i>f</i>	0/188	65/141	0/158	88/115	153/602

D1a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D1

Both Tau and Rata articulate a high degree of focus on the superiority of open, complex and universal ways of knowing in comparison to Māori ways of knowing while both McKinley and Durie remain silent on the issue in the selected texts. Over three quarters of Tau's article (76.52%) and just under one half of Rata's article (46.10%) talks directly to the theme of problematising the re-establishment of traditional Māori pedagogies in education with an expressed view that more open and universal ways of

knowing ultimately allow Māori the ability to critically discuss, reflect, transform and change their current social, economic and material circumstances.

Slightly less than one half of Tau's content units (38/88) for this theme openly rubbish claims that traditional, mythic tribal worldviews and knowledge, and Māori epistemological systems are equal to notions of modern scientific rationality. His thesis, following the work of Karl Popper, proposes an open society which is unrestricted by past beliefs, bends itself towards the growth of knowledge through the rejection of beliefs which do not stand up to rational criticism in light of other views, and props itself upon the promotion of dissent rather than orthodoxy. These three open society characteristics encourage in Tau's view, exponential and widespread growth for Māori rather than reproduction and stagnation which is suggested to be the outcome of locating oneself within a closed society where traditional Māori knowledge and beliefs dominate.

In support of this Tau argues that traditional Māori knowledge, pedagogies and worldviews are closed and un-evolving as they tend to lack in explanatory power. His suggestion that indigenous scholars are childish when they involve themselves in a moral inquest when arguing that traditional Māori knowledge systems are open, complex and universal is strong as he suggests they lack a degree of intellectual inquiry. From Tau's view moral postulates do little to advance Māori education aspirations. A critical question to ask however is whether the task of 'intellectual inquiry' can be purely removed from the force of the 'moral inquest'? Isn't such an assumption that one's modern, scientific view of the world being superior to those of others in and of itself a moral postulate? Where does intellectual inquiry end and moral ascendancy take over? From a critical 'Māori-centred' perspective the two can never be so easily split.

There are two contentious aspects of this theme purported by Tau. First he strongly argues that colonialism rather than be seen solely as a negative experience for Māori, ought to be viewed more positively as it has enabled Māori to participate in critical discussion and reflection allowing iwi to transform, adapt and change (27/88). In noting how Ngai Tahu has evolved and changed and is more open than it was in the past, Tau notes that iwi Māori must work to retain their identity while also adapting and changing.

A second point of contention raised by Tau is his view that tribes have failed to emulate the progress of the democratic West and in so doing, lack the capacity to think and act like a nation. It is re-iterated that the re-establishment of traditional pedagogies and Māori ways of knowing locks Māori into a culturalist bind where what is thought and how one ought to behave is pre-ordained by a prescribed cultural code that one need never to stray from. Such a closed cultural idealist membrane is said to place a strong-hold on one's critical faculties as thought and behaviour are pre-set. The propensity for iwi to promote cultural orthodoxy rather than internal dissension is seen to be a rationalisation as to why tribes have failed to emulate the progress evident in the West.

Elizabeth Rata supports Tau in a number of ways. Slightly less than half of Rata's content units for this theme (30/65) openly critique the re-establishment of traditional pedagogies and Māori ways of knowing as she suggests like Tau that it reifies culture and locks Māori into a closed cultural idealist membrane which assumes that knowing is linked to ethnicity. The core of her critique centres on Kaupapa Māori theorising which she argues not only ignores rigorous self-criticism but proposes itself as the orthodox solution to Māori problems (28/65). She suggests that Kaupapa Māori has become the orthodox

approach for explaining Māori issues in teacher education, with claims that Kaupapa Māori approaches represent the voice of oppressed Māori.

Similar in tone to Tau's critique of indigenous scholars, Rata suggests that, rather than serving the interests of oppressed Māori, Kaupapa Māori instead serves the interests of the ethnic elite. From a critical 'Ha' Māori-centred perspective it again would be difficult to deny such a claim made by Rata as interests, both economic and political, readily accompany academic positions within capitalist institutions in which a number of Māori elite are located. However, the point Rata fails to unveil in her criticism of the ethnic elite is her own position of privilege and promotion of economic and political interests that are concomitantly being maintained by the discourse she propounds. I think Rata would be hard-pressed to find a member of the academy who would not be in a privileged position due to their work, research publications and theorising. There surely is always a degree of the 'self' in 'our' work for 'others' which ought not to be denied or downplayed.

5.2.2 *Major Theme D2*

D2. While a number of approaches and methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori there is a need for further negotiation over how the curriculum might be constituted. Careful consideration needs to be given to multifarious approaches rather than absolute 'answers' to Māori education.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>f</i>	<i>124/188</i>	<i>0/141</i>	<i>37/158</i>	<i>1/115</i>	<i>162/602</i>
(<i>f%</i>)	(<i>65.96%</i>)	(<i>0.00%</i>)	(<i>23.42%</i>)	(<i>0.87%</i>)	

D2a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D2

Both McKinley and Durie articulate a degree of focus on the need for multifarious approaches rather than absolute 'answers' to Māori educational issues. Approximately two

thirds of McKinley's discussion centres on noting that while a number of methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori in the past, there is a need for further development and greater flexibility in terms of coherently articulating Māori epistemologies and worldviews, utilising cultural broker teaching approaches and better understanding the relationship between Māori language and culture so that such understandings might contribute to improved education for Māori (65.96%). In talking to the nature of science education research and literature she states that there is an over-emphasis on curriculum development for indigenous students rather than studies of indigenous students in schools.

McKinley notes that the curriculum has often been used as a silencing tool for Māori and that currently debates and negotiations are taking place between the government and various Māori groups including Te Runanga Nui o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori to revise educational policies and practices to incorporate Māori language, culture and traditions. She notes that while there has been pressure for the Māori science curriculum to parallel the English documents, this is only a first step towards a modern Māori science curriculum.

An interesting point to note is that McKinley argues that multiculturalist-universalist debates exist in science education. While she states that in the past education provision was largely informed by universalist positions, such debates are presently dominated by multiculturalist approaches. She confers that while Māori language and culture have been supported through varying covenants and policy directives there is a need for wider support in regard to understanding and planning for education which considers the dialectical relationship between culture and language in Māori communities. Such a suggestion critiques sole use of a multiculturalist approach where Māori knowledge is often

dislocated or deontologised from the language in which it is contextualised and primarily understood. Her plea for wider support does not negate the work of multiculturalist approaches but rather she uses it as a springboard from which to broaden the approaches utilised in science education for Māori students. She seems firm in her resolve that there are no absolute answers to Māori educational issues and that a wide and broad approach is necessary.

Mason Durie re-affirms the need for multiple rather than absolute ‘answers’ for Māori education. Just under one quarter of his article (23.42%) emphasises the need for multiple relationships, multiple state policies and broad Māori aspirations to be carefully considered in the educational provision of Māori students. He insists that a number of answers to Māori education issues exist which need to be thought through systematically rather than seen as absolute answers. Durie seemingly questions absolute notions of Māori tino rangatiratanga as the sole catalyst for potential Māori educational advancement when he states that questions exist over whether Māori or the Crown would do a better job for which Māori goals can best be met. His view of sound relationships needing to exist between Māori groups, Māori and the Crown and Māori and wider world groups is clearly articulated in his aspiration for a sustained Māori collective capacity discussed in more detail in section 5.2.4.

Tau makes one comment in light of notions of absolutism. He states that Western intellectuals who propose Western society as the end-point for which Māori are to aspire to is nothing more than immaturity. Such a position slightly differs from Rata who more strongly articulates the absolute need to utilise Western notions of universalism and rationality to inform educational structures as seen in *Theme D1*. While McKinley, Durie

and Tau make some comment against absolute answers, Rata is more intentional in her absolute desire for Western ideals to be predominant in educational services structured for Māori.

5.2.3 Major Theme D3

D3. Māori are located at and influenced by the interface between Māori and Western/wider world knowledge systems and historical and contemporary realities.					
	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>f</i>	28/188	8/141	38/158	17/115	91/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(14.89%)	(5.67%)	(24.05%)	(14.78%)	

D3a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D3

This was the only theme in which all four texts shared some degree of convergence. However the tangents on which the theme was discussed varied between the texts. All four mentioned the importance of the historical and/or contemporary realities in which Māori are currently located. Durie notes that the nature of the intersections and relationships between the Māori world and the wider world needs to be fully appreciated as Māori have the unique experience of being influenced by both, with the influence of the Māori world being the common denominator in all instances. He notes that for some learners the Māori world will be more influential while for others te ao whanui and associated worldviews and behaviours would predominate. He states that ‘while the ratio may vary, there will be influence from both te ao Māori and te ao whanui’ (p4). He contends that forces of tension and potential exist at the interface between the Māori world and the wider world and such forces which give shape to the interface need to be understood so that principles may be created to address them.

McKinley focuses heavily on the varying forces at the interface outlined by Durie in her article when she discusses the competing of worldviews and its impact on educational provision in science education for indigenous students. She notes that while differing worldviews are becoming more generally accepted in education, debate exists between Māori/indigenous knowledge systems and Western knowledge systems and worldviews. Some of the gradations are noted in her review of the literature. She argues that a number of indigenous writers are against notions of inclusion as it is viewed that western modern science would dominate indigenous knowledge. Notions of unequal power relations are seen to be incontestable when only indigenous knowledge that ‘fits’ western modern science is included. In opposition to the point raised by some indigenous scholars that modern science would dominate indigenous knowledge, McKinley argues that Māori scholars reject the notion that western modern science is a threat to indigenous cultures. She also notes that some indigenous researchers argue that indigenous knowledge and western science can be taught alongside one another to expand and develop dual understandings. In noting the diversity of views around the meeting of divergent worldviews and its impact on educational provision, her position is one which readily recognises the diversity of Māori realities and highlights the need to implement educational services, policies and provisions centred on such diversity.

Te Maire Tau’s article, while not explicitly related to education highlights the impact of colonisation on tribal systems and Māori social organisation practices. He notes that at the point of colonisation tribes had to adapt, as tribal foundations and tribal knowledge systems were destabilised through the corrosive effect of modernity and imperialism. But rather than capitalise on traditional knowledge systems, Tau argues that

beliefs of the past ought not to determine modern societal functioning. Whereas McKinley and Durie acknowledge the need for a diversity of realities to determine modern society, Tau articulates an impetus to bypass the necessity for any aspect of traditional Māori knowledge to impact upon social structures. His view is that the reality Māori face is one in which democracy, free markets and modernity are the dominating organising principles of the world. This position seems to stand in contradiction to his earlier point made in *D2* that the posturing of Western society as the end-point by Western intellectuals is immature.

Dr. Rata emphasises the point that the majority of Māori are influenced in contemporary times by fluid ethnic identity. She argues that because of such fluidity, the mandate of Kaupapa Māori symbolically misrepresents the realities of contemporary Māori lives. Her solution however is not to consider the incorporation of traditional Māori knowledge and views in education *unless* it fits in with a notion of democracy which she fails to define in this work. Rather she calls for the abandonment of neotraditionalist ideologies, a label she ascribes to Kaupapa Māori theorising, in preference for a scientifically open and universalistic approach to social development for Māori. She infers that because the majority of Māori have not opted into Kaupapa Māori schools that as a whole, Māori largely reject the in-roads made by such movements. While Durie and McKinley might read this situation as Māori diversity having choices about where and how their tamariki ought to be educated, Rata interprets it as a clear mandate to remove all forms of Kaupapa Māori education.

5.2.4 Major Theme D4

D4. Sound relationships between Māori-Māori, Māori-Crown and Māori-wider world groups essential for a sustained Māori collective capacity.				
	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>
<i>f</i>	9/188	0/141	62/158	1/115
(<i>f%</i>)	(4.79%)	(0.00%)	(39.24%)	(0.87%)

D4a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Major Theme D4

Close to forty percent of Mason Durie's article focuses on the need for sound relationships to exist both between Māori groups and between Māori groups in connection with other collectivities (39.24%). He argues that while Māori have attempted to organise themselves for self-determination for over 150 years, a mechanism is needed for a sustained collective Māori capacity for long term planning and policy above sectoral and tribal aspirations. He calls for the uniting of all tribes under the rubric of a Māori Education Authority which exists not only to articulate Māori aspirations but to provide a harmonisation of relationships between Māori groups while simultaneously considering constitutional arrangements for Māori in New Zealand. He does not see a potential Māori Education Authority as closing itself off from wider society, operating within a cultural instrumentalist framework. Rather he sees such a mechanism as providing a space where negotiation between the Māori world and wider world is acknowledged, recognising the legitimacy and validity of each.

While Durie notes initial concerns regarding sole State control over Māori as being limiting and restrictive, he seems pleased with the progress made with Māori-Crown relations. He highlights the benefits of Hui Taumata in strengthening sound working relations between Māori and the Crown, suggesting that it is a practical demonstration of

the Treaty of Waitangi which provides for the exchanging of views, respecting of differences and confirmation of power sharing arrangements. Durie however is somewhat at odds with the state of Māori-Māori relations. His urging for a Māori Education Authority perhaps is an attempt to strengthen inter-tribal relations for the benefit of our tamariki, focusing on component Māori similarities rather than on the over-emphasising of Māori differences.

McKinley makes similar comments as Durie on the potentially restrictive and limiting manner in which governments have/might have sole control over Māori/indigenous peoples and education provisions in which Māori/indigenous children are located. She also provides examples of how collaboration between Māori collectivities and science research groups are in operation with success for all parties involved. Such collaboration is just one example of a number of ways in which Māori groups might develop varying inter-relations with different groups. Tau similarly highlights an incident where Ngai Tahu has extended both their relationships and tribal knowledge through collaborative ventures with a selection of tertiary institutions.

5.2.5 *Minor Theme D5*

D5. Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>f</i>	15/188	0/141	20/158	0/115	35/602
(%)	(7.98%)	(0.00%)	(12.66%)	(0.00%)	

D5a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D5

In the first of the minor themes, Durie dissuades any criticisms of Māori development building upon Māori knowledge, values and rights as ethnic privilege as often portrayed by the media. He asserts that such criticisms are out of step with Māori political rights to their own identity, culture and systems of organisation and representation. His stress on the media's tendency towards failing to address such fundamental issues is countered through his articulation of Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture and worldviews allowing for a sense of continuity with the past.

McKinley supports Durie's statements when suggesting that indigenous survival is about maintaining and recovering indigenous worldviews, languages, cultures and environments. She readily notes Māori and indigenous worldviews being linked to ecology and interconnectedness.

5.2.6 *Minor Theme D6*

D6. Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds where strong ethnic boundaries exist. Such divisions note the colonizing culture is the 'Other' and bearer of sin.					
<i>f</i>	3/188	27/141	0/158	4/115	34/602
(<i>f%</i>)	(1.60%)	(19.15%)	(0.00%)	(3.48%)	

D6a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D6

Slightly less than one fifth of Rata's article focuses on critiquing Māori scholars who posit the existence of two distinctive worlds where strong ethnic boundaries exist. She maintains that strong divisions are exacerbated by Kaupapa Māori theorising through the use of a 'them' and 'us' binary discourse, through the creating of illusory power relations between Pākehā and Māori and through the sole construction of non-Māori researchers as

building their academic careers on the backs of Māori. Through appeals to ethnic identity fluidity, as outlined in 5.2.3, she re-iterates that distinctive ethnic boundaries do not exist.

Tau comments on the sharp distinctions constructed by indigenous scholars who target colonisers or the West as the bearers of sin and evil upon indigenous peoples. McKinley similarly notes that literature exists which suggests that for many indigenous peoples the colonising culture is the ‘other’ to such an extent that Kaupapa Māori schools are said to enable Māori children while non-Kaupapa Māori schools are believed not to. All three seem to discount absolutist thinking in regards to educational provision for Māori children, despite earlier claims from both Rata and Tau that Māori must bypass the use of traditional Māori knowledge and embrace a theory of critical rationality for future growth and development.

5.2.7 *Minor Theme D7*

D7. Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector.

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	
<i>f</i>	1/188	33/141	0/158	0/115	34/602
(<i>f</i> %)	(0.53%)	(23.40%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	

D7a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D7

Just under one quarter of Rata’s content units are based on ‘informational’ aspects of Kaupapa Māori theorising (23.40%). She makes numerous statements about specific characteristics of Kaupapa Māori theory, such as Kaupapa Māori is influential in the education sector, Kaupapa Māori suggests a unique Māori worldview and Kaupapa Māori

is related to identity politics and ‘post’ positions. It would have been interesting to have carried out a more latent content analysis of this theme as what is ‘stated’ at the implicit level by Rata suggests that the comments she makes are appealing to the negative attachments of such characteristics inferred by the phrasing and structuring of her discourse. McKinley makes one comment on Kaupapa Māori, stating that it is based on socio-political change for Māori through language and culture access.

5.2.8 Minor Theme D8

D8. Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement ‘gap’ between Māori and other students, Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors.					
<i>f</i>	McKinley	Rata	Durie	Tau	
(<i>f</i> %)	7/188 (3.72%)	8/141 (5.67%)	1/158 (0.63%)	0/115 (0.00%)	16/602

D8a: Distribution and Weighting of Content Units of Minor Theme D8

The final minor theme highlights a contradiction between McKinley and Rata. McKinley maintains that Māori students’ educational achievement is significantly lower in comparison to other groups while Rata suggests that Māori students’ educational achievement is relatively stable and closing in comparison to other groups. Despite such differences McKinley, Rata and Durie all concede that Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a complex range of factors rather than isolated causes. An interesting note made by McKinley is that the utilisation of learning styles with diverse students does not assure or guarantee achievement. The import of learning styles into

teacher education to cater to student population diversity is indicative of the impact of multicultural theorising in addressing issues of educational achievement in schools.

5.3 Summary of Themes

Eight themes, four major and four minor, were educed from the four texts under examination. As stated at the outset there are clear indications that the discourses of the four pieces of academic work have shown to exhibit both points of convergence and divergence at varying instances in their articulation of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people in terms of power and identity and Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews in education.

There seems to be a divergence of opinion on how best to cater for Māori needs and aspirations in education. Both Durie and McKinley evidence a clear move away from notions of absolutist solutions to Māori issues in education. They posit the necessity for Māori diversity to be acknowledged in educational structures, policies and practices. While both Tau and Rata directly critique the re-establishment of traditional Māori pedagogies and worldviews in education with an expressed view that more open, scientific and universal ways of knowing ultimately allow Māori the ability to critically transform and change their current social, economic and material circumstances, Tau differs in part to Rata's position as he questions the arrogance of both Māori scholars and Western intellectuals who position their views of the world as the superior end-point.

Ironically Rata herself theorises against forms of absolutist thinking in regard to ethnic identity. In positing that numerous Māori embrace a form of ethnic fluidity she

carries out an outright attack on Kaupapa Māori theorising for its propensity to construct distinctive ethnic boundaries in educational discourse almost to the point of demonising Pākehā researchers and educationalists who are seen to continue in their colonising mandate of Māori.

All four texts exhibited a degree of convergence to Theme D3 where the importance of the historical and/or contemporary realities in which Māori have been and are currently located within was articulated. Durie noted that the nature of the intersections and relationships between the Māori world and the wider world needs to be fully appreciated and understood so that principles may be created to address them for Māori educational advancement.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

6.0 Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to bring together the significance of the research findings and compare and contrast them with the review of the literature. It examines some of the ‘big ideas’ presented from such a comparison in an inherently interpretative manner. It not only aims to examine how power, identity and epistemological inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā/Western views are articulated in a selection of academic texts, but it also endeavours to consider the specific political, social and cultural purposes and effects such articulations might have.

Section 6.1 discusses, through the use of a critical ‘Ha’ Māori-centred approach, the utilisation of binaries and dualisms to inform notions of difference which impact upon the constructions of inter-relations between Pākehā and Māori peoples and Pākehā/Western and Māori epistemological boundaries. Discussions around the use of monoglossic binaries with an insight into the political and philosophical intentions of the four academics whose works have been examined are considered here. Points about the contradictions of deontology, the politics and philosophy of egalitarian discourse, the potential homogenising of Māori as a unitary collectivity and the emphasis of realist rationalities over spiritual or ‘irrational’ rationalities are all inter-twined within the discussions that take place. Each discussion draws in links from the review of the literature and other textual sources to give potency to the dialogue and critique that takes place.

It is from this that in Section 6.2 the necessity for a ‘Ha’ Māori-centred philosophical approach to Māori advancement is highlighted. Drawing in perspectives which build upon notions of hybridity, mimicry (Bhabha, 1984)²³ and more recent theorisations on the politics of representation, a critically evolving approach to knowledge is propounded with impacts upon education, research and methodology directing itself towards theorising Māori notions of difference with a much broader scope than that offered by a number of academics, as seen in the review of literature and findings of the research, who emphatically focus on expounding mutually exclusive binaries and dualisms between such groups as subordinate Māori and dominant Pākehā or open, democratic egalitarians and ethnic ideologues. Concerns over the use of a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach are also noted with the hope that what is articulated is challenged, built upon and further critiqued.

The thesis concludes with Section 6.3 which re-asserts that there is an inherent need for academics and theorists who comment on Māori educational issues to review and rethink the use of binaries and dualisms in their work while simultaneously re-considering their relationships with knowledge. The mandate for a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research methodology is re-iterated as a potential model for academics working in the realm of Māori education, whether in policy, research or teaching to build upon and challenge.

²³ Bhabha advances mimicry as a form of resistance and intervention. In Young (2004) it is noted that Bhabha extends Foucault’s notion that the colonial subject is also an object of surveillance through the notion of mimicry which by way of ‘acting White’ but ‘not quite’ one can bring to the fore the ambivalent nature of colonial discourse. Bhabha suggests that such ambivalence invokes agency and space for transformation which in effect critiques instrumentalist relations of power and one-dimensional views of identity. Bhabha (1984) notes that the ‘menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority’ (p129).

6.1 Articulating Power, Identity and Epistemological Inter-relations

The initial section of this discussion chapter focuses on how the four academic texts in the content analysis articulated power and identity inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and epistemological inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western worldviews. All four were shown to exhibit use of a binary or monoglossic dualism between a distinctive Māori person, worldview, epistemology or reality in relation to a Western person, worldview, epistemology or reality in some capacity. Such articulations varied in intensity and use with different philosophical and political positions evident in all four discourses. Ironically (perhaps not so ironic for some), the desire to complicate the Māori and Pākehā/Western monoglossic binary was also articulated by all four academics. Again, while there was variance in the intensity and use of such complicated and heteroglossic articulations between discourses, there were clear indications that each academic articulated aspects of the complexities of the Māori-Pākehā/Western binary or dualism based on varying philosophical, theoretical and political purposes and effects. It is imperative to now discuss each of the articles under scrutiny.

6.1.1 Discussion of McKinley Article

Upon analysing the article by Elizabeth McKinley, it is clear that she has both utilised and simultaneously complicated a monoglossic binary approach to articulating Māori issues in education. Her initial review of the literature surrounding the education of Māori/indigenous students in science classrooms explores the relationship between

indigenous knowledges, or native science, and Western scientific knowledge. She states in outlining the differences between the two different worldviews that,

'Indigenous peoples' relationship to their ecologies, where there is respect and appreciation of the inherent values in everything, is a worldview that is not held by all. In a worldview that treats knowledge as being able to be 'uncoupled' from its location and the person suggests knowledge can be treated as a commodity to be shared, or bought and sold. Such diverse views of knowledge form the basis of the debate in the literature that follows and sees the literature divided into two camps often labelled as 'universalist' (includes Western modern science or WMS) and 'pluralist' or 'multiculturalist' (includes indigenous knowledge or IK).'

(McKinley, 2005; p228)

McKinley notes that a large number of academics locate themselves within one of two distinctive, and seemingly mutually exclusive camps when theorising the nature and attendant characteristics of knowledge. She notes that indigenous peoples hold a holistic and ecological worldview while universalists are seen to view knowledge in a more sectoral and 'uncoupled' manner. She builds upon this binary when noting that different peoples gather knowledge, relate to and interpret the world differently. Such distinctions are said to be manifest in the different cultures and languages that exist.

It is clear throughout the article that McKinley claims her space as an indigenous researcher. She states in arguing for the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems that 'the recovery of our indigenous histories, knowledges, experiences and identity is inextricably linked to the recovery of our languages because languages are our view of the world' (p232). Her triple use of the collective, possessive word '*our*' suggests that she strongly locates herself within an indigenous research perspective, aiming to provide an

impetus for the reformation and revising of science curricula and science teaching strategies to more effectively meet the aspirations of indigenous communities while concomitantly pushing for the simultaneous utilisation of both indigenous language and culture together in science education so that indigenous knowledge is not subordinated and relegated to isolated and fragmented cultural titbits for consumption within a modern science classroom. In her assuming of an indigenous position, McKinley while acknowledging the existence of distinctive Māori/indigenous and Western worldviews with their unique languages, cultures and perspectives, she largely articulates a position which straddles both a monoglossic dualism and a more complicated and complex heteroglossic articulation of Māori/indigenous and Pākehā/Western inter-relations in education.

Her desire to utilise and complicate the Māori-Western knowledge binary is made clear when she highlights literature which asserts that science teachers ought to be cultural brokers enabling non-Western students to construct both Western and traditional meanings for use in their environments (Aikenhead, 1996 in McKinley, 2005; p231). Here McKinley acknowledges a Western/non-Western dualism to articulate the existence of distinctive groups, yet she does not wish to isolate the groups into closed circuits whereby Western students learn solely Western knowledge and non-Western students solely learn non-Western forms of knowing. This complex, heteroglossic articulation is then countered by a return to a monoglossic articulation when she discusses issues of deontology when she states that there is a need for mainstream science education ‘to move away from viewing language as a technical tool of communication and viewing language as encompassing our existence’ (p232). Here she argues that mainstream teaching contexts tend to isolate

indigenous cultural knowledge at the expense of the language. McKinley claims that such cultural knowledge is deontologised. She states that,

'The teaching of contexts in school programmes, including where language is used to only name objects, does nothing for the revitalization of language and continues to separate culture and language. This technical and utilitarian approach to indigenous knowledge, that is the use of cultural contexts in science classrooms in another language, is where 'language and culture are alienated, remaining in a nondialectical relationship' (Aoki 2005a: 237). The learner will only penetrate the other culture with the interest of subordinating the knowledge into the scheme of his or her own thought processes or language if necessary (for examination purposes). The cultural knowledge has been drawn out at the expense of the language and, as a result, the contexts are required to carry an extraordinary symbolic load for the culture. The trap for teaching and learning science is that this approach means the culture is deontologized — it becomes an object, an artefact'.

(McKinley, 2005; p233)

It is here that a number of observations have been made and need to be critically discussed. In this excerpt, McKinley acknowledges the political implications of Māori knowledge subordination in science education when it is subsumed by curriculum developments and texts that make sole use of contexts and words as they 'will only ever represent indigenous peoples as 'fixed' in some past' (Ninnes, 2001 in McKinley, 2005; p232). In a study led by Dr. McKinley (2004a in McKinley, 2005; p232) it was found that science teachers in English medium schools utilised 'Māori contexts' where units of work such as the preparing of hangi, creating kowhaiwhai and taniko patterns and learning the Māori names of native plants and the planets and constellations were largely gleaned from textbooks and departmental resource box sources (pp232-233). McKinley's view that Māori cultural knowledge in science classrooms of English medium schools is deontologised when alienated from Māori language is a position held firmly by a number

of academics (Darder, 1991; p113; Jackson, M., 1998; Johnston, 2003; Smith, G.H., 1997, 2000, 2002; Smith, L.T., 1999). The colonial abuse of Māori language, culture and peoples has not been one easily forgotten by many of our forebears and contemporary Māori educational discourse clearly articulates a propensity towards challenging such Pākehā dominance in its perceived varying forms and guises.

The problem however which McKinley fails to acknowledge in this article is, if we are to argue that the deontology of Māori knowledge by isolating selected aspects of Māori culture for science education classrooms in English medium schools is a real threat and also maintain that distinctive knowledge boundaries exist between Māori/indigenous forms of knowing and Western modern science then it must also be acknowledged that the potentiality for contemporary Māori medium science classrooms to deontologise selected aspects of a Western way of knowing in Te Reo Māori is equally just as valid. A firm view of distinctive knowledge boundaries assumes a position of epistemological authenticity in comparison to an inauthentic epistemological position with regard to Māori knowledge, with authenticity being represented by the teaching of Māori scientific concepts in Te Reo and the inauthentic resembling the ‘Māori contexts’ approach noted by McKinley above. Such a strongly articulated binary, while politically astute in conveying a critical view of power relations between Māori/indigenous and Pākehā/Western people, lacks an understanding of Gramsci’s (1971; see also Entwistle, 1979; Forgacs & Nowell-Smith, 1985; Giroux, 2001) notion of hegemony where all subjects and discourses, whether Māori or Pākehā, are constituted by dynamic and complex power effects. The failure to acknowledge the complexities of hegemonic forces in regards to the deontology of aspects of Māori epistemology is itself a strategic manoeuvre in articulating a space where one’s

political and educational aspirations are expressed and built upon. Does a monoglossic binary articulation provide a full picture of the complex inter-relationships between Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies? It is asserted here that while there is a need for such monoglossic binary discussions to take place, they are often made at the absence of more complex, heteroglossic articulations. Such a strongly articulated binary conceptualises issues of deontology in a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ manner.

McKinley’s articulation of deontology condones a more rigid view of epistemic boundaries between different groups and collectivities. The ambivalence inherent in assuming such a view that Māori knowledge is deontologised when subsumed by the dominant ‘Other,’ suggests that indigenous people must also be aware of the power effects at play if adopting the epistemological ‘Other’ into their own framework. There is a tendency for many of my contemporaries to over-emphasise an overt view of knowledge which readily articulates the necessity of Western epistemological social and cultural practices to be open to Māori while negating the same situation in reverse. Such a rigid view of distinctive epistemic boundaries would need greater critical consideration before pointing the finger at the so-called deontologists. The task of looking internally at one’s ‘own’ ontological and epistemological perspective(s), as highlighted in the self-reflexive aspects of Gramsci’s (1977 in Entwistle, 1979) theorising of hegemony and asking whether the ‘Other’ is absent, present or simultaneously absent and present would highlight a degree of ambivalence, uncertainty and blurring of epistemic boundaries often negated in some academic discourses.

If we are to take McKinley’s argument of deontology serious then space would need to be made in offering a more authentic Western scientific learning experience by

presenting aspects of science education in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Wharekura in the English language so that the replication of dominating and deontologised teaching practices is minimised. While this may be a short term solution to the situation of remedying an historically politically imbalanced education system, surely the more long term solution is one which involves a long awaited re-think of Māori approaches to knowledge in contemporary, modern times. Such a timely stock-take of how Māori relate to and with knowledge, in its broadest sense, in varying spaces including education has been lacking in wide critical discussion and engagement. Acknowledging the validity and legitimacy of a more liminal Māori-centred view to knowledge in tandem with a more essentialised approach opens up the space for the presence of the ‘Other’ to be considered, which will ultimately adapt and give shape to a reviewed Māori epistemological perspective. This is what a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach to knowledge is attempting to do, opening up a space for theorising on Māori inter-relations with the ‘Other’ to be considered in a more positive light for the purposes of Māori advancement.

The work of Dr. Elizabeth Rata has challenged a number of Māori views of knowledge which have not been fully welcomed by sectors of the Māori community. While her view is one which seeks to dethrone all notions of a Māori epistemological stance, it does provide some insight and response to Māori inter-relationships with knowledge.

6.1.2 *Discussion of Rata Article*

The title of Rata’s (2004c) article ‘*Ethnic ideologies in New Zealand education: What’s wrong with Kaupapa Maori?*’ begins with the expression of a binary. The

juxtaposition of ‘ethnic ideologies’ with ‘New Zealand education’ infers that the two are mutually exclusive. This is reinforced by the latter half of her title and further explicated in her work which outlines her view that a number of things are wrong with Kaupapa Māori and it ought not to be part of any aspect of the New Zealand education framework.

It is clear from the outset that Rata’s work trades voluminously on the strategic use of monoglossic binaries to express her view that Kaupapa Māori is closed, epistemologically flawed and reifies culture locking Māori into an idealised, culturalist membrane where knowing is linked to one’s ethnicity. While not utilising the Western and Māori/indigenous dualism reminiscent in the work of McKinley, (due to Rata’s (2004) assertion that ‘the assumption that two distinctive ethnic populations are socially extant is fundamentally flawed’ (p6) – and an ethnic fluidity reality belies the existence of two distinctive ethnic Māori and Pākehā populations), Rata coheres an open/closed dualism which suggests that open thinking is superior while negating Kaupapa Māori as a form of closed thinking which is inhibitive and inferior. Below is a table with examples of how Rata utilises the monoglossic binary approach for both communicatory effect and for what is inherently a political mandate for an egalitarian form of democracy in education for Māori.

<i>Open Thinking</i>	<i>Closed Thinking</i>
Open thinking promotes democracy	Kaupapa Māori is anti-democratic
Scientific and objective critical rationality open and superior	Ethnic and subjective ways of knowing closed and inferior
Open theorising transformative, emancipatory and liberating	Kaupapa Māori theorising closed, inhibitive and oppressive

Table 6.1a: Examples of Elizabeth Rata’s binary theorising

The irony of Rata's criticisms being structured around such an open and closed binary is that she concomitantly criticises and complicates the use of binaries utilised by Kaupapa Māori advocates in *their* theorising. Is Rata contradicting her stand against binary theorising in doing so? What seems clear is that while she appraises the use of binaries in discourse to propound and assert her own political position, she renounces the use of binaries by groups who counter her views, suggesting that the 'them' and 'us' discourse which Kaupapa Māori advocates are said to employ, pits Māori against non-Māori in an inevitable showdown. She unconsciously replicates a similar tool as her so called opponents when she herself pits 'open, democratic thinkers' against 'ethnic ideologues' in an inevitable showdown.

It is also noted that Rata attempts to complicate binary understandings articulated by Kaupapa Māori theorists. Rata disavows the assertion made by Kaupapa Māori advocates that two distinctive ethnic populations exist in New Zealand, Māori and non-Māori. She complicates this binary by articulating that high rates of intermarriage implicate numerous Māori with an ethnic fluidity rather than an ethnic immutability. She also complicates the monoglossic articulations utilised by Kaupapa Māori theorists in their suggesting that unequal power relations exist between Pākehā and Māori people. In citing the work of Graham Smith (2003; p3 in Rata, 2003; p7) who states that Māori educational disadvantage has been both produced and reproduced by the context of unequal power relations between 'dominant Pākehā' and 'subordinated Māori' social relations, Rata suggests that such distinctive articulations between Māori and Pākehā misrepresent the division as an ongoing colonial imbalance where Māori are solely constructed as victims at the hands of non-Māori. Such a view of non-Māori dominance over Māori subordination,

while not explicitly detailed in length in this article, is complicated in a general sense by Rata, suggesting that such simplistic deductions are in need of a more complicated reading. However the core of her critique of Kaupapa Māori binaries is the challenge she poses against any notion of a distinctively unique Māori epistemology, confronting assertions made by Kaupapa Māori advocates that Western ways of knowing are ethnic ways of knowing and a Māori epistemology can claim to be just as rational as Western modern science.

Rata infers that a universal and open way of knowing is the superior form of knowing countering in essence any notion of the existence and widespread benefit of an ethnic or racialised epistemological stand-point. In her view there are ways of knowing that are more authentic, pure and open and there are other more subjectively oriented ways of knowing which fulfil a *muthos* or social cementing function which are tainted by phrases such as '*I know because I am*'. Such knowledge from this view is said not to be tested or put to critical scrutiny as aspects of cultural knowing are believed to have been held onto since time immemorial. This sense of inflexibility seen to be characteristic of Kaupapa Māori theorising by Rata serves as a critical signpost for Māori to more adequately reflect on our relationships with knowledge in varying quarters and contexts. The sole theorising of rigid knowledge boundaries may actually counter the emancipatory aims Kaupapa Māori set out to achieve through the psychological distancing of those Māori who do not embrace a Kaupapa Māori oriented identity and position. Those who adopt a more consciously liminal or bordered approach to both knowledge and their identity are oftentimes seen to lack pride in their own culture if they speak English in a 'non-Māori' way, choose to go against the grain of a Māori-centric or iwi-centric logic when approaching tasks or question

Māori teachers in their role as guides and professionals. The psychological distancing that can follow the staunch bordering of identity and knowledge boundaries by overly politicised agents can work to do a disservice to the very people they are attempting to free and emancipate.

As outlined in the previous section when discussing McKinley's work, if sharp distinctions exist between different types of knowledges to such a degree that deontology is feared, we place ourselves in the precarious position of either condoning a view of discernible relativities where individuals are located within a closed culturalist relationship with knowledge or more likely so situate ourselves within a sphere of false consciousness which denies the borrowings and overlaps that inevitably occur at the borders of differing epistemologies, worldviews and ways of knowing. What Rata's theorising affords us all, in spite of its numerous inconsistencies and contradictions and notwithstanding the cries of racism levelled at her work by a number of academics, is the underlying call for Māori to reconsider their relationships with knowledge in contemporary, modern times. Questions raised from a Māori-centred perspective are akin to 'Do we accommodate scientific, empirical research within the sphere of mātauranga Māori?' 'Are Māori responsible for deontology when utilising knowledge from 'Other' spheres?' 'To what extent can Māori adapt, change or omit aspects of knowing which seem to have been immutably held onto by our ancestors?' While a Māori-centred perspective posits questions directed at Māori relationships with knowledge, it also acts as a springboard to challenge Rata regarding her own views of open knowledge as solely liberating and freeing while also probing into some of the complexities negated by Rata in the predominant use of monoglossic binaries in her work.

What follows is a re-orienting of Rata's binaries from a critical 'Ha' Māori-centred position. Such a reading of Rata's use of binaries to communicate her theoretical, philosophical and epistemological position would not only acknowledge the existence of distinctive boundaries between open thinking and Kaupapa Māori theorising but it would also give a multitude of space for the political and social nuances of such distinctions to be overlain with border-crossings, complexities and confusions.

<i>'Open Thinking'</i>	<i>'Māori-Centred'</i>	<i>'Kaupapa Māori'</i>
Potentially Democratic/ Anti-democratic	<i>Both 'Open thinking' and 'Kaupapa Māori' theorising are potentially democratic and/or anti-democratic in varying educational spaces and contexts</i>	Potentially Democratic/ Anti-democratic
Potentially Open/ Closed	<i>Both scientific, objective critical rationality and ethnic, subjective ways of knowing are potentially open and/or closed in varying instances</i>	Potentially Open/ Closed
Potentially Transformative/ Closed Emancipatory/ Inhibitive Liberating/ Oppressive	<i>Both 'Open thinking' and 'Kaupapa Māori' theorising have the potential to be transformative and/or closed, emancipatory and/or inhibitive and liberating and/or oppressive</i>	Potentially Transformative/ Closed Emancipatory/ Inhibitive Liberating/ Oppressive

Table 6.1b: A Critical 'Ha' Māori-Centred Re-orienting of Rata's Binaries

Rather than state that the concept of open thinking raised by Rata is wholly democratic and liberating and Kaupapa Māori theorising wholly anti-democratic, closed and inhibitive, a 'Ha' Māori-centred reading of her work would assert that open thinking and Kaupapa Māori theorising are both potentially democratic and anti-democratic, open and closed, and liberating and oppressive dependent of course upon the space, time and context in which such forms of knowing are proffered. The potentiality to theorise the complexities of knowledge boundary inter-relationships while also recognising their more

static characteristics occurs at both the individual micro-level and the more collective macro-level. The simplicity of solely utilising binaries and dualities to inform one's theorising in education is dismissed from a 'Māori-centred' position which readily acknowledges both the static and fluid nature of all forms of knowing. The theoretical and philosophical approach of Professor Mason Durie more readily acknowledges this inherently complex inter-relationship occurring at epistemological and ontological boundaries and it is to a critical analysis of his work that we now turn to.

6.1.3 *Discussion of Durie Article*

The title of Mason Durie's (2003) article '*Māori Educational Advancement at the Interface between Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Whānui*' readily acknowledges the existence of a monoglossic binary. While 'Te Ao Māori' and 'Te Ao Whānui' are conceptualised here as distinctive entities, Durie's use of a binary differs from Rata's predominant tendency to pit one against the other. Rather than becoming embroiled in a battle of academic lambasting through the tool of polarisation, his use of the word 'interface' opens up a space for dialogue, challenge, and interchange between the 'two paradigms' while simultaneously retaining, maintaining and legitimating their distinctive identities and internal complexities and contradictions inherently characteristic of each. Similar to McKinley, Durie clearly straddles both a monoglossic binary and a more complicated and heteroglossic articulation of Māori and wider world inter-relations in education.

Again, similar to both McKinley and Rata, Durie does not articulate an inter-relationship between Māori and Pākehā people or Māori and Pākehā views specifically.

Instead he notes a number of inter-relationships that need to be more carefully considered within and between the realms of Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Whānui if Māori education is to be advanced. As noted in Chapter Five, close to forty percent of Durie's article focused on the need for sound relationships to exist between Māori and Māori groups, Māori and non-Māori people, Māori and Crown entities and Māori and other wider world collectivities with the hiatus being the formulation of a possible Māori Education Authority. Such a mechanism is seen to not only provide a space where negotiation between groups located within the array of inter-relationships are acknowledged, recognised and legitimated but it would also provide a centralised site for Māori education aspirations, in their most broadest and diversified sense, to be articulated. He states,

‘The point is that in order to articulate wider Māori aspirations, and to give them credence, in the same way the Government does with high level macro policies of the state, a collective Māori voice would be an advantage. It is of course not a matter for the Crown to decide, but it is something that Māori will predictably continue to debate, not simply around the possibility of a Māori education authority but on a broader front around a Māori capacity for formulating longer term social, cultural and economic goals.’

(Durie, M., 2003; p17)

Durie throughout his article talks very specifically on the Māori-Crown inter-relationship. While the literature review revealed a propensity for some academics to articulate the relationship between the two groups as *Māori* and the *Pākehā-State* ascribing an ethnic descriptor to the Crown (Smith, G., 2000), Durie does not opt into articulating the two parties in such a way. He instead acknowledges that the Hui Taumata forum provides a space for the practical demonstration of the Treaty of Waitangi to take place where an

exchanging of views, respecting of differences and confirmation of power sharing arrangements are made. However, as will be discussed further on in this section, Durie does talk about distinctive Māori and non-Māori groups existing.

In articulating inter-relations between Māori ways of knowing and other knowledge systems, Durie seems a lot stancher in his position on articulating an absolute difference in knowledge systems at the outset but then resigns himself to the fact that Māori people are located and influenced by a number of realities at the interface between Māori and wider worldviews. From this Māori/non-Māori dualistic perspective, Durie notes that there is a high level of public intolerance for Māori views and beliefs as they are often seen to impede progress. Here he acknowledges the existence of a distinctive Māori knowledge system in comparison to what can only be inferred to as a more Western, scientific rationalism pervading wider New Zealand society. He also makes sharp distinctions between the worldviews of Māori and non-Māori people. The examples he cites in relation to this are Māori beliefs of taniwha and the registration by Māori of waahi tapu.

In regards to Māori beliefs of a taniwha at Meremere where a multi-million dollar expressway was to be constructed and another at Ngawha where a prison was to be built, Durie (2003) notes that ‘in public eyes Māori beliefs were largely interpreted as superstitious barriers to progress and in defiance of logic, science, and economic common sense’ (p9). In regards to Kopukairoa in Tauranga being registered as a waahi tapu, Durie states that the non-Māori owners were incensed ‘belittling Māori beliefs in the process and questioning the economic costs of spiritual ideas about land and the environment’. He goes on to say that, ‘clearly they had little tolerance for Māori world views and ecological

balance and saw it as evidence of Māori disinterest in positive development' (Durie, 2003; p9).

Does Durie suggest in utilising the Māori/non-Māori binary that *all* Māori hold beliefs in taniwha and waahi tapu? On the other side of the coin it is just as pertinent to ask whether or not he is suggesting that *all* non-Māori then hold Western scientific and economic rationalist views about the world? What this conundrum highlights is that there is a necessity to utilise linguistic boundary markers such as 'Māori' and 'non-Māori' to make sense of the world in which we live at a more essentialised level. But such an essentialised understanding through the use of binaries needs to be seen not only as a component part of the more complex, confusing and at times contradictory inter-relationships that ultimately exist between peoples, worldviews and epistemologies, but it also has the potential to be read as an homogenising and controlling device utilized by a Māori elite who are seeking to assume a position of authority on all matters pertaining to Māori. The sole use of essentialised binaries in academic discourse affecting Māori may actually serve the interests of some while putting out to the periphery the interests of those Māori who adopt a more bordered and liminal approach to knowing. Durie does well to consider such complexities in his theorising of the interface for Māori educational advancement.

Durie complicates the aforementioned binary by noting that while there are many similarities between Māori people in comparison to other New Zealanders he states that the unique factor which is the essential difference between the distinctive two groups is 'that Māori live at the interface between te ao Māori (the Māori world) and the wider global society (te ao whānui)' (p9). He extends this further by stating that 'the factor that is uniquely relevant to Māori, is the way in which Māori world views and the world views of

wider society, impact on each other' (p9). There are two important points to be discussed in relation to this point.

Firstly, the latter comment made by Durie maintains that Māori are implicated and impacted by the interface between Māori world and wider world views. While these two binaries are potentially homogenising in their intent to communicate Durie's political purpose of advancing Māori aspirations in education, he does well to placate concerns over this initial emphasis on the essentialised binary when articulating that Māori are influenced by a number of realities at the interface between the Māori world and wider world views.

He states that,

'Across the range of educational options, some learners will be more influenced by one world than the other. Children at Kohanga Reo for example will be more exposed to te ao Māori than students studying physics at a university or Māori who are learning automotive engineering in a private training establishment. However, in those cases, and all others involving Māori learners, while the ratio may vary, there will be influence from both te ao Māori and te ao whānui. As a consequence, educational policy, or teaching practice, or assessment of students, or key performance indicators for staff, must be able to demonstrate that the reality of the wider educational system is able to match the reality in which children and students live. Consequently it is important that the intersections between those two worlds are fully appreciated so that the space can be negotiated wisely by students and by providers of educational services.'

(Durie, M., 2003; pp5-6)

While Durie does not in this article discuss the intersections between the two worlds in any real depth, he does provide some significant sign-posts for others to be guided by and build upon. His concerns for taking into account the multiple realities in which Māori learners are situated opens up a whole gamut of opportunities for Māori, whether they speak Te Reo at a fluent, intermediary or basic level, whether they come from high, middle,

or low socio-economic backgrounds, whether they are located in private, public, state, religious, kura kaupapa or home schools, whether they come from ‘full-Māori’, ‘mixed Māori’, or a ‘Māori ancestral’ background - Durie’s theorising allows for the recognition of a wide spectrum of Māori diversity while simultaneously legitimating and re-affirming essentialised aspects of a Māori worldview. His call for providers to more adequately reflect the varying nuances of the intersections between te ao Māori and te ao whānui in educational structures and programmes for Māori students is well considered.

The second point to discuss is in regard to Durie’s claim that the interface between te ao Māori and te ao whānui is a unique experience for Māori. The increasing Māori presence in the psyche of wider New Zealand society and in part, the wider world means te ao Māori is no longer accessible solely by those who are Māori. Just as the wider world is accessible to Māori, so too is te ao Māori accessible to non-Māori, Pākehā, Russians, Samoans and numerous other individuals married to or in relationship with Māori people, non-Māori learners situated in Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Whare Wānanga, even those learners from varying backgrounds who are located in tertiary institutions where components of te ao Māori, whether it is language learning, cultural safety courses, waka ama, te reo kori or waiata Māori, non-Māori in New Zealand and presumably less so those around the world, are influenced in varying degrees by both te ao Māori and the wider world. Of course, the binary articulated by Durie might not be one in which they subscribe to, but a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred epistemological perspective of overlapping spheres and blurred boundaries takes into account the theoretical and philosophical presence of the ‘Other’ in its discourse. It is for this reason that Durie’s view, that the essential difference between Māori and non-Māori is the unique situation of Māori living at the interface

between te ao Māori and te ao whānui is countered and negated here with the adoption of a more complex view of the circumstances supported.

It is clear from this discussion that Mason Durie straddles the use of articulating essentialised binaries in tandem with more complicated heteroglossic articulations of the intersections that over-lap between knowledge and people-group boundaries. While he seems to communicate a strong view that there are distinctive people groups (Māori and non-Māori), he does complicate the influence of worldviews on the lives of Māori learners. This differs markedly from Rata's articulation which suggests that there are no distinctive ethnic groups in New Zealand, yet there are only open and closed ways of knowing and thinking, of which open thinking is superior.

What seems increasingly clear is that inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people and Māori and Pākehā worldviews in educational discourse are articulated by academics for the purpose of effectively communicating their point of view which ultimately impacts upon the meeting of their political, social and economic goals. The emerging pattern from the three articles already discussed is that at times throughout an academic's piece of work, binaries and distinctive boundaries between people groups and worldviews are strongly utilised while in other instances a more complex and complicated view is expressed. The final article for discussion by Dr. Te Maire Tau further iterates this emerging pattern.

6.1.4 Discussion of Tau Article

Dr. Te Maire Tau's paper titled '*Open Societies and Tribal Groups*' is comparative in nature. It seeks to critique Māori tribal structures while articulating the necessity for embracing Karl Popper's notion of an open society. It is interesting to note that throughout his work like Rata's he utilises monoglossic binaries to communicate the benefit of one epistemological approach above that of another. But where he differs from Rata is in the manner in which he critiques not only the position of his own iwi, but he criticizes his own philosophical contemporary Karl Popper. Such an approach to knowledge is more closely reminiscent of Popper's theorizing than that expounded by Rata, who maintains a 'them' and 'us' discourse in her work through polarisation tactics while Tau exhibits an innate ability to provide critique at multiple and contradictory levels both towards those against and in support of his own philosophical and theoretical bend, noting that at times those whom he supports he might not agree with and those whom he doesn't agree with at times he might see particular aspects of their theorising in more positive lights. This thread of no-one being absent from critique is clearly evident throughout Tau's work.

The bulk of Tau's article centres on the critiquing of Māori epistemological systems and traditional tribal ways of knowing suggesting that they are problematic as they fail to grasp the superiority of open, complex and critical ways of knowing. In arguing that indigenous scholars tend to invoke moral postulates rather than intellectual inquiries he sustains the position that a Māori way of knowing is inferior to a Western way of knowing. But rather than suggest that a Western epistemological approach is the definitive approach to knowing he complicates the situation by stating that,

'...since the 1960s indigenous communities have been told a thousand times over that their poverty and low socio-economic status is due to the sins of the colonizer rather than examining the errors within their own world view. Consequently, indigenous scholars are placed in the position where they deny the idea of progression, opting for the view that their traditional knowledge systems were sophisticated and universal and that tribal communities were highly complex and thriving. Such comparisons are childish and are reactions to equally immature claims made by western intellectuals that western civilization is the end point.'

(Tau, 2002; p3)

It is clear that instead of opting into a barrage of oppositional rhetoric utilized by some of his many contemporaries, Tau is bent on advancing Māori people through the critiquing of traditional tribal worldviews. Such a critique posits the characteristics of an open society to advance Māori socially, educationally, and economically.

He notes that while tribal groups have attempted to understand Western ways of knowing, they have made numerous failed responses to grasp the superiority of colonial knowledge. What this failure of understanding by indigenous scholars has meant is that they inevitably draw back into arguments of colonisation being the core of indigenous peoples' woes. It must be made clear that Tau's position is one which does not deny the politics of power on the life chances of Māori people, but rather it is a stance which desires to open up for critical discussion, the contemporary re-establishment of traditional Māori ways of knowledge while concomitantly being aware of the historical and contemporary forces of power in which Māori people are implicated.

His significant involvement with his own Ngai Tahu iwi clearly suggests that there is a need for modifying the way in which tribes specifically and Māori generally work,

think and act. In stating that Ngai Tahu has shifted from being a tribal entity to a tribal corporate, he posits that they are compelled ‘to engage with a world that exists in different forms beyond its cultural membrane. This means knowledge must stand for more than cultural particulars’ (Tau, 2002; p5). Here it is clear that Tau insists that if tribes are to function effectively, they must re-theorise their views, relationships and practices with knowledge rather than relying on the re-affirmation of cultural practices said to be held onto since time immemorial. Such practices are suggested to neither grow nor advance knowledge and understanding for Māori. His criticism of the notion of whakapapa is a case and point in support of this.

In citing the work of Popper whose idea of progression means ‘rejecting beliefs that no longer withstand criticism for theories that do’ (p3), Tau states Māori were ‘caught out’ as they were required to interpret everything new according to a whakapapa framework. The attempt to graft in Pākehā people and understand the new beliefs, practices and goods that they were being continually exposed to showed up the inherent inflexibility of a Māori worldview. As Tau (2001a) has stated in an earlier article, such discrepancies exhibited that beliefs which were held together by whakapapa ‘functioned to maintain the solidarity of the kin group rather than the pursuit of certain and true knowledge’ (p136). In his earlier article he states that the Ngai Tahu tradition of fire stemming from the fingernails of Mahuika is maintained through whakapapa which explains the origins of such a natural phenomenon. He critiques the assumptions of his own iwi’s myth of the origin of fire when he states,

‘The myth tells us that fire could be found in certain trees because Maui placed the ember from Mahuika’s fingernails within. If Pākehā brought with them matches to create fire, Māori needed to explain the origins of

phosphorus and identify the person who discovered this substance and made it applicable to domestic activities. And even if a myth was created, it would ignore the fact that matches were invented by persons unknown and unaccounted for by way of whakapapa. More importantly, it would also ignore the reality that one needs a theory of combustion to explain fire...Whakapapa, the principle that held knowledge together, collapsed under its own inflexibility.'

(Tau, 2001a; p145)

Such a failure to adapt traditional knowledge systems to accommodate and explain the new in Tau's view evolved far too slowly, giving impetus to the imperial power to colonise Māori. A view of whakapapa lacking in credibility is not the only point of contention Tau raises. He also asks that Maori view colonisation more positively through the epistemological advances it offers rather than solely constructing it as an experience of incomparable loss and evil.

Much of the literature which articulated inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā people in New Zealand focused on defining an absolute difference between the two groups with an inherent focus on the role of Pākehā in colonising Māori through education, legislative acts and innumerable injustices of land loss and confiscation. While Tau in no way denies the colonial history akin to that outlined in Sections 2.1a and 2.1b of this thesis, he asks that Māori approach colonisation with a more balanced perspective in suggesting that it has enabled Māori to stand outside themselves and critically reflect on their life circumstances allowing them to transform, adapt and change. My own reference to Māori people in the use of the third person '*them*' is a prime example of how an individual can stand outside themselves in a more objectively distant manner. In utilising '*them*' to partially refer to the '*self*' an oppositional stance cohering an absolute difference between

‘them’ and ‘us’ is dissuaded from being utilised. Instead a position which embraces philosophically and epistemologically a particular nuance of the interface realities outlined by Mason Durie is readily acknowledged in my use of the English language unable to be replicated in Te Reo. Such a critically informed ‘Māori-centred’ position locates itself at the border of ‘Māori’ and ‘Western’ ways of knowing in a more consciously inter-subjective manner. Tau maintains that an inability to stand outside one’s own world of closed thinking ensures stagnation, a lack of growth of knowledge and development, and in my own eyes, a form of dehumanisation that often goes silently unnoticed.

Te Maire Tau’s articulations of Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations in his academic discourse is similar to the other three discourses in that they all employ the use of monoglossic binaries and attempt in some shape or form to complicate the binaries utilised. A critique of knowledge inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemological positions as relayed by Tau from a critical Māori-centred perspective does not place sectoral constraints on his work as his thinking corresponds with issues in the education realm. The ability for his theorising to cross-over into the sphere of education seems logical when regarding the nature of his discussions, the level of historical particularity he provides and the criticality of his work commands respect for thoughtfully considering the epistemological challenges facing Māori in a forever changing world.

6.1 Working With and Beyond the Binary: Critically Representing Inter-Relating Power, Identity and Knowledge Boundaries in Educational Discourse

'...it is not enough to stand on the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. This would... "lock one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed" making "all reaction limited by, and dependent on, what it is reacting against".'

(Anzaldua, 1987 in Pillow, 2003; p192).

The review of the literature began by analysing the literature which discussed power and epistemic inter-relations in academic discourse between Māori and Pākehā. An examination of mission and native schooling's propensity to assimilate Māori into Pākehā rationalities were seen to be continued in the advent of state schooling designed by dominant Pākehā for Māori. Māori 'speaking back' to Pākehā dominance revealed a body of literature which capitalised on articulating monoglossic binaries between Māori and Pākehā people in regards to power and identity and Māori and Pākehā/Western epistemologies. More recent discourses such as Kaupapa Māori have asserted the necessity for transformative, indigenous education movements to re-affirm pride in all aspects of being Māori, ranging from affirming a positive Māori identity to the re-invigorating of a distinctive Māori way of knowing. The predominance of such academics to over-emphasise a binary understanding of power relations in education and articulate a knowledge/power relationship being maintained by Pākehā stakeholders over Māori was shown in the literature to have only begun to be more critically examined.

The content analysis of how four academic texts articulated Māori and Pākehā inter-relations in education evidenced that they all utilised a monoglossic binary approach with varying degrees of impetus to understand, express and communicate their philosophical and political positions on Māori educational issues. What was noticeable from the findings was that all four academics attempted, again in varying capacities to complicate a dualistic view of inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā groups and/or epistemologies.

While it has been relayed in the literature that both Graham Smith and Russell Bishop alongside many of their contemporaries denote a strong binary understanding of Māori and Pākehā inter-relations, the content analysis also revealed that Elizabeth Rata, seen to stand in opposition to Kaupapa Māori advocates, likewise heavily utilised the exact same tool to advance her political perspective. Billig (1988) in attempting to understand and explain how ideology is expressed in scholarship, notes that it is not difficult to find parallels between the ideological systems of explanation proposed by some far left and far right wing groups (p202). He notes that both groups trade on a conspiracy theory of sorts which serves to not only rally ‘their’ masses into political action through a method of refuting and discounting ‘the opposition’ but it also acts as a distracting technique which serves to deny the common intellectual heritage from which the two polar groups are seen to derive. The article written by Tau was seen to also utilise the binary approach strongly but where he differed from Smith, Bishop and Rata was in the position of tentativeness he so readily adopted, not exempting any form of knowing from critique include those of his own philosophical and theoretical contemporaries.

The texts of McKinley and Durie while utilising a monoglossic binary understanding in part to communicate their perspectives on issues pertaining to Māori, both went into more complex detail than that offered by Smith, Bishop and Rata in regard to complicating a dualistic and polarised understanding of such concerns. The central finding of this research in regard to how inter-relations between Māori and Pākehā in regards to power, identity and epistemology are articulated has been the obvious lack in conceptualizing the blurred and mottled spaces in the ‘in between’ in a more comprehensive and critical manner. Anzaldua’s words noted at the beginning of this section highlights the problem of over-utilising binaries and declarative statements to communicate one’s perspective, advancing the need for a theory of ‘borderlands’ (Anzaldua, 1987 in Ladson-Billings, 2003), a ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994 in Somerville and Perkins, 2003) or as Bahktin (1986 in White, 2005) states a theory of heteroglossia. The conceptualizing of a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach to knowledge, power, identity, education and research is my attempt to advance such a position.

6.2.1 Working With and Beyond the Binary: Theorising Ambivalence

A number of overseas academics are theorising positions of ambivalence in their academic work. Iris Young (1990) in talking to an emerging scholarly pattern notes that it is commonplace for academics to utilise binary oppositions to inform their thinking and theorising in education. The boundary line between ‘what is’ and ‘what isn’t’ is clearly marked out in such discourses when focused for political, social and economic purposes (Spoonley, 1993; p38-39). However, Young notes that despite the seeming unification of

groups for such purposes ‘none of the social movements asserting group specificity is in fact a unity. All have group differences within them’ (p162). Young (1990) furthers this point by arguing that the categorical opposition of groups essentialises them, repressing the differences within groups. In this way the definition of difference as exclusion and opposition actually denies difference’ (p170). Tillman (1998) has similarly noted that in our efforts as non-majority groups to counter and resist the oppression of dominant groups, following the theorising of Gramsci (1971) ‘there is always the possibility that we may create other types of hegemonic discourses and practices’ (p224).

Identifying himself as a ‘halfie’, Gerard Lopez holds a position of tensionality towards standpoint theories. He notes that on one hand he appreciates the ‘transgressive potential of the standpoint that pushes the boundaries of our taken-for-granted assumptions...However, on the other hand, such a position tends to homogenize a population in favour of essentialist/totalizing narratives- bypassing the creative tensions in representation in favour of a (post) colonial elitism that ignores the “radical textual practices of difference” (Spivak, 1995; p27 in Lopez, 1998; p227). Lopez maintains that in any cultural context individuals are multiply situated and positioned. Such a view of individuals being multiply positioned is supported by a number of other academics.

Anzaldua’s (1987 cited in Ladson-Billings, 2003 & Lopez, 1998) conception of a *mestiza consciousness* has already been outlined in the methodology chapter. It maintains that the borders and walls that are supposed to keep the ‘undesirables out’ are actually the orthodox enemy from within, containing the human psyche within rigid identity and epistemological boundaries. Her notion of ‘walking the borderlands’ theorises the

ambivalence ethnic academics and individuals experience when engaging with their two epistemological worlds, neither of which is their ultimate home.

Contributing to this body of work is Trinh Minh-Ha (1991) who articulates the tensions of being an Insider/Outsider with no place to call 'home'. She states,

'The moment the insider steps out from the inside, she is no longer a mere insider (and vice versa). She necessarily looks in from the outside while also looking out from the inside. Like the outsider, she steps back and records what never occurs to her the insider as being worth or in need of recording. But unlike the outsider, she also resorts to non-explicative, non-totalizing strategies that suspend meaning and resist closure...She refuses to reduce herself to an Other, and her reflections to a mere outsider's objective reasoning or insider's subjective feeling...She knows she is different while at the same time being Him. Not quite the same, not quite the Other, she stands in that undetermined threshold place where she constantly drifts in and out. Undercutting the inside/outside opposition, her intervention is necessarily that of both a deceptive insider and a deceptive outsider. She is this Inappropriate Other/Same who moves about with always at least two/four gestures: that of affirming "I am like you" while persisting in her difference; and that of reminding "I am different" while unsettling every definition of otherness arrived at.'

(Minh-Ha, 1991; p74)

The section from which this excerpt is derived from Minh-Ha's work entitled *No Master Territories*, expounds a view which seeks to articulate the shifting terms and moments of cultural representations in discourse with implications for one's ethnic identity/ies and relationships to/with epistemological boundaries

Homi Bhabha coheres a similar theory of ambivalence in his notion of the 'third space' which conceptualises the zone of cultural contact as 'the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between space- that carries the burden of the meaning of culture'

(1994 in Somerville and Perkins, 2003; p256). It is within this third space that the politics of polarity are eluded and new positions and possibilities are visualised and enabled. Such a view parallels the mandate of a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred philosophical and theoretical approach which seeks to balance a more rigid monoglossic binary position with the legitimisation and validating of a more liminal, Māori position.

Bahktin’s (1986 in White, 2005) notion of heteroglossic negotiation coheres with many of the above theories of ambivalence. Maintaining a heteroglossic approach to knowledge and communicating such knowledge involves a person, academic or otherwise in recognising the debatable nature of a particular position displaying a willingness to negotiate with those who hold an alternative view. Such a position of ambivalence is often interpreted to be one filled with doubt and uncertainty as terms such as ‘maybe’ or ‘perhaps’ are utilized throughout portions of their discourse as they negotiate to learn from alternative positions. White (2005) affirms this when he expounds Bahktin’s position that a theory of heteroglossia is one which codes a speaker’s individual *attitude* towards knowledge as one which operates to reflect a process of interaction or negotiation between alternative socio-semiotic positions (p2). He contends that a position of heteroglossia is one which is open to endlessly deferred meanings and knowledge creation rather than assuming a questioning position which seeks to prod at alternative epistemological views for the purpose of forestalling or fending off negotiations from such alternative spaces (p4). The heteroglossic moment in a piece of academic discourse is open to tentative discursive potentialities rather than the monoglossic approach which underpins a definitive approach to knowledge through the use of declarative linguistic codes. The monoglossic moment is seen to be evident in the work of Smith, Bishop and Rata in greater force than the works of

Durie and McKinley, yet monoglossic moments were clearly evident in their texts. Tau seems more monoglossic in orientation yet there were a number of heteroglossic moments evident in his work as well.

The strength of Bakhtin's (1986 in White, 2005) theorising of heteroglossia and monoglossia and Lopez's (1998) position of tensionality towards standpoint theories is not only in the way in which it addresses conceptions of the 'third space' or the 'borders' to more adequately represent the variances and heterogeneity which exists in the 'in between', it also gives some credence and space for the more monoglossically oriented discursivities to speak and have legitimisation. It is this dualistic yet dynamically complex tensionality which a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach to knowledge, research, methodology and education seeks to capitalise on. It is noted that while a binary approach to understanding Māori issues in education has afforded much to certain sectors of the Māori population, the desire to move beyond the binary (while simultaneously drawing from the more monoglossic view of knowledge evident in the binary) towards a theory of ambivalence is necessary if we are to cohere a multiplicity of effective and broad ranging strategies for Māori educational advancement.

6.2.2 Concerns Over Theorising a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred Approach

Although Sections 3.5 and 3.6 outline some of the 'at the moment' (adopting a heteroglossic 'meaning in the making' tensionality towards my theorising) elements of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred methodology, there are still certain aspects that require further scholarly retort and inquiry. While I have chosen not to expand on my 'in the working'

thoughts, this section aims to provide a brief overview of some the concerns I have about how particular elements of a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach might be utilised or have been articulated in this thesis for the purpose of heteroglossic dialogue with the readers of this work. The declarative moment, often readily presented in a piece of post-graduate work is stalled here as I discuss my own ambivalences toward a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach.

The first aspect of ambivalence for discussion is whether or not a position of alterity is supported by the heavyweights of more ‘grounded’ and ‘centred’ theorising. The trepidation towards more overtly carving an ambivalent space in my research theorising has been one wrought with both fear and excitement. As a foot into such ambivalent research waters I presented a paper for the Te Uru Māraurau Whakaareare Seminar Series titled, ‘*Experimenting with Inter-corporeality: A Dialogue with Criticisms of Kaupapa Māori Theory*’ (Niwa, 2005b). It was here that I began to explore the potentiality for utilising a dialogical communicative format, inviting the audience to respond inter-corporeally with my articulation of a position marked by questioning, ambivalence and doubt (Gottschalk, 1998; p214) in regard to criticisms of Kaupapa Māori theorising. At the outset of the presentation I noted that the most pressing concern for me as I was reading up on the issue to be discussed was, ‘How do I present a piece of work which states, ‘I don’t know?’ or ‘I’m not sure?’ Being asked to present presumes some leverage of authority on a particular subject matter and the ensuing dilemma that I faced with regard to presenting an ‘authoritative text’ propelled me to delve into some of the literature which attempted to challenge the declarative tone of the bulk of educational research literature which I had encountered in my studies.

My creation of an imaginary dialogue drawing in voices from varying epistemological and political positions in regard to Kaupapa Māori theorising and its attendant characteristics symbolically represented the ambivalence and doubt I had encountered throughout my reading in preparation for my presentation. With one breath I was criticising Kaupapa Māori's tendency to over-emphasize a binary understanding of Māori educational issues, while with another breath I was appraising its articulation of a difference outside the 'norm' in the form of Kaupapa Māori schools. Clearly I was in 'two minds' regarding my view of Kaupapa Māori. Such a position of temporality and ambivalence is not readily appreciated in some more staunch academic circles. The concern over the potential for my theorising to be read as 'whakahīhi' and 'wishy-washy' is again paralleled in my articulation of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach here.

A second concern I have had about my utilizing a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach to contextualize my work is that I haven't specifically drawn from one reputable methodological or epistemological source to validate my theorising. The eclectic nature of my approach again may be read by some to be presumptuous and whakahīhi. Related to this is a third concern I have in regard to my use of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach to re-orient the binaries utilised by some academics. In Section 6.1.2 I re-oriented Elizabeth Rata's binary theorising from a 'Ha' Māori-centred perspective outlining a more ambivalent view of what she was propounding. As a point of response to Rata's 'opposition' I have done the same with the binary discourse present in the work of Graham Smith, re-iterating that both Rata and Smith utilise similar rhetorical tools to advance their positions. Table 6.2a provides a few examples of how he articulates Māori and Pākehā inter-relations in his theorising.

<i>Pākehā</i>	<i>Māori</i>
Pākehā people Dominant/Colonisers/Powerful	Māori people Dominated/Colonised/Powerless
Dominant Pākehā/Western Educational Research Paradigms debilitating	Kaupapa Māori Resistance Research Paradigms freeing
Dominant theorising oppressive, limiting and subjugating	Kaupapa Māori theorising transformative, liberating and emancipatory

Table 6.2a: Examples of Graham Smith's binary theorising

The 'Ha' aspect of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach offers a re-orienting of Smith's work opening it up to a dialogically, heteroglossic reading as seen below in Table 6.2b.

'Pākehā'	'Hi-Ha' Māori-Centred	'Māori'
Dominant/ Dominated Coloniser/ Colonised Powerful/ Powerless	Both Pākehā and Māori people are potentially dominant and/or dominated, coloniser and/or colonised, powerful and/or powerless in varying educational contexts and spaces	Dominant/ Dominated Coloniser/ Colonised Powerful/ Powerless
Debilitating/ Freeing	Both Dominant Pākehā/Western and Kaupapa Māori educational research paradigms are potentially debilitating and/or freeing in varying educational contexts and spaces	Debilitating/ Freeing
Oppressive/ Transformative Limiting/ Liberating Subjugating/ Emancipatory	Both Dominant Pākehā/Western and Kaupapa Māori theorising are potentially oppressive and/or transformative, limiting and/or liberating and subjugating and/or emancipatory in varying educational contexts and spaces	Oppressive/ Transformative Limiting/ Liberating Subjugating/ Emancipatory

Table 6.2b: A Critical 'Ha' Māori-Centred Re-orienting of Smith's Binaries

In offering a position of alterity and complexity the 'Ha' aspect of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach acts as a theory of negotiation. Rather than be seen as a threat to the 'established orders' it aims to work with and beyond the binaries dominant in educational research affecting Māori. The 'Hi' aspects of a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach would read

Smith's work differently and perhaps they would more specifically challenge the views and discussions that I have posited throughout this thesis. As a theoretical thesis which philosophically engages with issues of power, epistemology, theory and identity for Māori educational benefit, the points posited are an attempt to connect with fellow Māori educationalists welcoming their critical, intellectual debates and dialogues in regard to my work. The crux of this concern revolves around the lack of depth in which I have articulated this 'new' paradigm for Māori education and research.

A fourth concern over a 'Hi-Ha' Māori-centred approach is the use of particular words in its title. I debated over whether or not to include the words *Māori* and *centred* into the title as *Māori* promotes a potentially declarative and homogenous Māori unity, while *centred* is often interpreted as endorsing an authentic and essentialised Māori centre from which knowledge and understanding for Māori people derive. The addition of 'Hi-Ha' to the front of the term Māori-centred throughout this thesis (and in parts I have placed inverted commas around the term 'Māori-centred') acts as a symbolic reminder that Māori are not a totalised homogeneity. The concern over whether such work denies the actions of various Māori activists and educational resistance theorists who articulate a collective difference from the 'dominant norm' is negated here in part- but still lacking in analytical depth. My mandate for promoting a more complex and nuanced inter-relationship between Māori and Pākehā/Western peoples and epistemologies has somehow turned my attention away from more substantially theorising the place of the 'Hi' elements of this approach to knowledge. While in one sense I see that a large body of work mentioned in the review of the literature capitalises on such 'Hi' elements, I hope somebody else takes this challenge up in their theorising and scholarly work to more explicitly articulate this.

In line with all the concerns raised is my fifth and final point that a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach to knowledge, representation, identity, education and research methodology is not spelled out at any great depth in this work. I have provided sign-posts to steer myself or others into new directions for further exploration, but a weakness of my articulation is in the lack of closure that I offer in regard to propounding a more definitive ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred approach. Part of me wishes that there was space and time to allow more coverage and depth of this emerging paradigm to be more fully considered. Another part of me sees my work as an opportunity for others to build upon, challenge, modify and change. The propensity for the conducting and writing up of educational research to be more declarative in orientation has inculcated me with an air of ambivalence as I search to negotiate representations, shift epistemological boundaries and question the politics of making absent the complex.

6.3 Conclusion

What this thesis has noted in attempting to address the research questions regarding how Māori and Pākehā power, identity and epistemological inter-relations are articulated in a selection of academic texts, is that when articulating Māori and Pākehā/Western inter-relations there is a tendency for some to emphasise the use of monoglossic binaries to convey their view. While providing a point of ‘speaking back’ to Pākehā dominance in educational practices and policies designed for Māori, such theorising has tended at times to negate internal differences assumed by the diverse Māori population while also negating the complex nature of power and how efforts at producing a counter-hegemonic discourse

might in and of itself produce its own form of hegemony through moral and intellectual persuasion (Gramsci, 1977 in Entwistle, 1979).

An emerging body of literature is beginning to address such binaries in educational discourse by drawing from theoretical circles which articulate more bricolaged and blurred boundaries between seemingly irreconcilable power, identity and epistemological positions and worldviews. This thesis urges academics and theorists who comment on Māori educational issues to review and re-think the use of binaries to advance Māori educational causes. The potentiality for broad and multifarious approaches to Māori educational advancement to be embraced would go hand-in-hand with a critical examination of binaries.

This thesis has also urged Māori researchers and educationalists to not only reconsider their relationships with knowledge, questioning the worth of solely articulating distinctive boundaries between Māori and Pākehā/Western people and epistemological worldviews but to also reconsider how notions of resistance have negated their inherent self-reflexive and medial nature. Resistance theorising, which largely capitalises on the use of monoglossic articulations to advance Māori political and social goals, has benefited numerous Māori in education with the advancement of Kaupapa Māori theory, Kohanga Reo, Whare Wānanga and Kura Kaupapa Māori. The reality though is that this is not the ‘arrival’ place that all Māori wish to aspire to. While a small body of research is beginning to more readily articulate the diversities and differences experienced by the wider Māori population, it is re-iterated here that theories which mark and box Māori as if some homogenous collectivity, have the potential to reinscribe the ideological domination they are seeking to resist. While noting that monoglossic articulations have benefited some

Māori this does not provide a ‘full picture’ for all. A ‘Hi-Ha’ approach to conceptualising both the essentialised ‘Hi’ aspects and the more bricolaged ‘Ha’ aspects of Māori society is my attempt at theorising a ‘fuller picture’.

The mandate for a ‘Hi-Ha’ Māori-centred research methodology and approach to knowing has been made re-iterating its potential for use as a working model for academics working and theorising in the realm of Māori education. The ‘Hi’ Māori-centred approach, while not definitively outlined yet concomitantly critiqued and philosophically supported throughout this thesis, is in need of a ‘Ha’ perspective to provide a more balanced view on issues pertaining to Māori in education. The promotion of a more liminal Māori-centred perspective offers a point of dialogue for others to challenge, critique, build upon and work with in their endeavours to bring benefit to Māori in education.

Appendix 1: Full Outline of all Major and Minor Themes, Contributing Variables and Distribution Rates

D1. Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing and tribal, mythic world-views is problematic as they fail to grasp the superiority of open, complex and universal ways of knowing which not only enable critical discussion and reflection but also allow for transformation and change.				
<i>McKinley (0)</i>	<i>Rata (65)</i>	<i>Durie (0)</i>	<i>Tau (88)</i>	<i>Total (153)</i>
C10. Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing, mythic tribal worldviews and ascribing an ahistorical primordial timelessness to the ages past not only reifies culture and locks Māori into a close cultural idealist membrane but it is epistemologically flawed as such moves assumes the knowing is linked to ethnicity (35)	C13. Traditional mythic tribal worldviews are a way of the past and claims that tribal knowledge or Māori epistemological systems are complex, universal and to be equated with modern scientific rationality are childish (45)	C14. Imperialism/ Colonialism ought to be viewed more positively as it enables critical discussion and reflection allowing tribes to transform, adapt and change and in effect become more open (27)	C19. While Māori and tribal groups attempted to understand Western man, they made numerous failed responses to grasp colonial knowledge and colonial superiority. Tribal groups have failed to emulate the progress of the Democratic West and lack capacity to think/act like a nation (18)	C20. Kaupapa Māori lacks critical scrutiny as it proposes itself as the orthodox solution to Māori problems while simultaneously serving ethnic elites. This form of theorizing is anti-democratic and deeply flawed (28)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (30)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (5)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (7)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (38)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (27)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (18)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (28)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

C10.

Re-establishing traditional pedagogies, Māori ways of knowing, mythic tribal worldviews and ascribing an ahistorical primordial timelessness to the ages past not only reifies culture and locks Māori into a close cultural idealist membrane but it is epistemologically flawed as such moves assumes the knowing is linked to ethnicity (35)

B45. Kaupapa Māori knowing is closed, epistemologically flawed, reifies culture, assumes knowing to be linked to ethnicity, it ignores self-criticism and is in need of critical scrutiny (20)	B38. Critical perspective lacks in a closed cultural idealist membrane (5)	B30. In the past and continuing today, Māori and other indigenous and ethnic elites push for re-establishing traditional pedagogies and mythic, tribal worldviews (3)	B85. Criticisms of Treaty of Waitangi as ahistorical (1)	B84. Ethnic primordialism not limited to New Zealand (2)	B53. Ethnically based social policy is problematic (4)
<i>McKinley (0) Rata (20) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (1) Durie (0) Tau (4)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (2) Durie (0) Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (1) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (2) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (4) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>

C13.

Traditional mythic tribal worldviews are a way of the past and claims that tribal knowledge or Māori epistemological systems are complex, universal and to be equated with modern scientific rationality are childish (45)

B31. Traditional, mythic tribal worldviews are a way of the past (3)	B81. While critics of Western scientifically objective knowledge see it as an ethnic way of knowing which is no higher than any other form of knowledge, it is objective and emancipatory (3)	B40. Indigenous scholars and communities criticised for their claims that their knowledge systems are open (9)	B19. Closed societies equate their beliefs with modern scientific rationality (2)	B39. Popper proposes an ‘open society’ to enable progression and opposes closed societies and tribal realization (22)	B33. Māori knowledge, pedagogy and worldviews are seen to be closed and unevolving (6)
<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (3)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (3) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (1) Durie (0) Tau (8)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (2) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (22)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (1) Durie (0) Tau (5)</i>

C14.

Imperialism/ Colonialism ought to be viewed more positively as it enables critical discussion and reflection allowing tribes to transform, adapt and change and in effect become more open (27)

B32. Imperialism/ Colonialism ought to be viewed positively as it enables critical discussion and reflection which allows for tribal transformation (7)	B34. Ngai Tahu has evolved, changed and is more open than it was in the past (18)	B80. Tribes must retain their identity while also adapting and changing (2)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (7)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (18)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (2)</i>

C19.

While Māori and tribal groups attempted to understand Western man, they made numerous failed responses to grasp colonial knowledge and colonial superiority. Tribal groups have failed to emulate the progress of the Democratic West and lack capacity to think/act like a nation (18)

B10. Māori attempted to understand Western man (2)	B9. Māori made numerous failed responses to colonial knowledge and colonizers (11)	B6. Tribal groups have no capacity to act like a nation nor emulate the progress of the democratic West (3)	B66. Moral reactionary comparisons fail to explain the West's progress (2)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (2)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (11)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (3)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (2)</i>

C20.

Kaupapa Māori lacks critical scrutiny as it proposes itself as the orthodox solution to Māori problems while simultaneously serving ethnic elites. This form of theorizing is anti-democratic and deeply flawed (28)

B44.

Kaupapa Māori has many flaws which need critical scrutiny(28)

McKinley (0)

Rata (28)

Durie (0)

Tau (0)

D2. While a number of approaches and methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori there is a need for further negotiation over how the curriculum might be constituted. Careful consideration needs to be given to multifarious approaches rather than absolute ‘answers’ to Māori education.				
McKinley (124)	Rata (0)	Durie (37)	Tau (1)	Total (162)
<p>C1. While a number of approaches and methods have been utilised to improve education for Māori students, these are just first steps. There is a need for further development and greater flexibility in terms of coherently articulating Māori epistemologies and worldviews, utilizing ‘cultural broker’ teaching approaches, better understanding the relationship between language and culture and understanding Māori communities and how they might contribute to Māori education (67)</p>	<p>C2. The curriculum has often been seen as a silencing tool for Māori but negotiation and debates are currently taking place in regard to the place of Te Reo and Māori knowledge and worldviews in the curriculum (28)</p>	<p>C17. While Māori language and culture have been supported through varying covenants with New Zealand wide benefits, wider support is needed especially in regard to understanding and planning for education which considers the dialectical relationship between culture and language in Māori communities (15)</p>	<p>C5. Universalist/Multiculturalist/Ethnicity debates exist which give form to the structure of social and educational policies and practices (11)</p>	<p>C4. Multiple relationships, multiple state policies, broad Māori aspirations and a multiple number of ‘answers’ need to be carefully considered rather than seen as absolute answers. Such multiplicity will bring benefits for Māori education (41)</p>

<i>McKinley</i> (65)	<i>McKinley</i> (24)	<i>McKinley</i> (15)	<i>McKinley</i> (11)	<i>McKinley</i> (9)
<i>Rata</i> (0)	<i>Rata</i> (0)	<i>Rata</i> (0)	<i>Rata</i> (0)	<i>Rata</i> (0)
<i>Durie</i> (2)	<i>Durie</i> (4)	<i>Durie</i> (0)	<i>Durie</i> (0)	<i>Durie</i> (31)
<i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>Tau</i> (1)

C1.

While a number of approaches and methods have been utilized to improve education for Māori students, these are just first steps. There is a need for further development and greater flexibility in terms of coherently articulating Māori epistemologies and worldviews, utilizing ‘cultural broker’ teaching approaches, better understanding the relationship between language and culture and understanding Māori communities and how they might contribute to Māori education (67)

B3. Many institutions including schools lack flexibility to reform such institutions to meet or incorporate Māori worldviews (3)	B28. A number of methods have been used to improve science education for indigenous students as an education crisis is occurring. There are further challenges (9)	B49. Science education with Māori knowledge and/or for Māori students needs further development (14)	B27. Science education research and literature focuses too heavily on curriculum development rather than on issues such as studies of indigenous students in schools, their knowledge and language, and indigenous communities' involvement in education and the impact of colonisation (15)	B29. Science teachers ought to be cultural brokers enabling non-Western students to construct Western and traditional meanings for use in their environments (6)	B69. Utilising both indigenous language and indigenous culture together in science education sustains indigenous knowledge. Utilising them separately will subordinate indigenous knowledge (11)	B11. How indigenous language and culture is used in education is important (4)	B12. The majority of teachers have few positive resources with regard to students from indigenous or culturally different backgrounds (5)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

<i>McKinley</i> (1) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (2) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (9) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (14) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (15) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (6) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (11) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (4) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)	<i>McKinley</i> (5) <i>Rata</i> (0) <i>Durie</i> (0) <i>Tau</i> (0)
--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

C2.

The curriculum has often been seen as a silencing tool for Māori but negotiation and debates are currently taking place in regard to the place of Te Reo and Māori knowledge and worldviews in the curriculum (28)

B2. School curricula often resistant to reform as curricula used as a silencing tool for local peoples (2)	B4. While a science curriculum in Te Reo is developed, Māori exercise of self- determination in respect to the curriculum in Te Reo is still to be resolved (3)	B25. Debate exists over the place of indigenous worldviews in curricula (7)	B73. Te Runanga o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori negotiating with government essential (2)	B71. Revising educational policy and curricula to incorporate indigenous languages, culture and traditions vital (3)	B48. Some authors believe inclusion of indigenous knowledge into science curriculum possible (2)	B24. While there has been pressure for the Māori science curriculum to parallel the English documents it is a first step towards a modern Māori curriculum (5)	B46. Educational policies and services for Māori are being negotiated at the Māori and wider world interface (4)
McKinley (2) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (3) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (7) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (2) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (3) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (2) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (5) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)	McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (4) Tau (0)

C4.

Multiple relationships, multiple state policies, broad Māori aspirations and a multiple number of ‘answers’ need to be carefully considered rather than seen as absolute answers. Such multiplicity will bring benefits for Māori education (41)

B14. Multiple co-operative relationships, multiple state policies (i.e. economic and social) and broad Māori aspirations shape Māori education (8)	B50. A number of answers to Māori education issues exist which need to be carefully considered rather than seen as absolute answers (20)	B5. Learning Te Reo and science simultaneously has dual benefits (3)	B16. Māori language development is supported by government in varying ways including education initiatives (2)	B83. Western intellectuals who pose Western society as end-point immature (1)	B63. Questions exist over whether Māori or the Crown would do a better job for which Māori goals can best be met (7)
<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (6)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (18)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (7)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

C5.

Universalist/ Multiculturalist/Ethnicity debates exist which give form to the structure of social and educational policies and practices (11)

B22. Multiculturalist/Universalist debates exist in science education and are dominated by multiculturalist approaches (3)	B37. Universalist positions have a particular view of the world which informs education (8)
<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (8)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

C17.

While Māori language and culture have been supported through varying covenants with New Zealand wide benefits, wider support is needed especially in regard to understanding and planning for education which considers the dialectical relationship between culture and language in Māori communities (15)

B1. Different peoples gather knowledge, relate to and interpret the world differently. These differences are manifest in their culture and languages (4)	B70. The dialectical relationship between culture and language must occur to understand a worldview (4)	B64. Language revitalization has support from varying places but needs wider support (3)	B13. Many legislated acts, policies and covenants recognize indigenous rights to keep their languages and culture but they do not 'save' them (2)	B15. Māori language and culture revitalization has been beneficial to revitalizing New Zealand (2)
<i>McKinley (4)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (4)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

D3. Māori are located at and influenced by the interface between Māori and Western/wider world knowledge systems and historical and contemporary realities.

<i>McKinley (28)</i>	<i>Rata (8)</i>	<i>Durie (38)</i>	<i>Tau (17)</i>	<i>Total (91)</i>
C12. While differing worldviews are becoming more generally accepted debate exists at the interface between Māori knowledge systems and Western/Other knowledge systems and worldviews. Issues of inter-relationships and challenges regarding the degree of adaptation between Māori and Western/Other systems of knowing need to be addressed (50)			C15. Māori are influenced by a number of historical and contemporary realities at the interface between the Māori world and the wider world (41)	
<i>McKinley (26)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (10)</i> <i>Tau (14)</i>			<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (8)</i> <i>Durie (28)</i> <i>Tau (3)</i>	

C12.

While differing worldviews are becoming more generally accepted debate exists at the interface between Māori knowledge systems and Western/Other knowledge systems and worldviews. Issues of inter-relationships and challenges regarding the degree of adaptation between Māori and Western/Other systems of knowing need to be addressed (50)

B23. While differing worldviews are becoming more generally accepted debate exists between Universalist/Multiculturalist/Indigenous positions (10)	B36. 'Local' indigenous knowledges, languages and worldviews are challenged when meeting the 'global' (7)	B26. Debate exists surrounding the relationship between indigenous knowledge and Western modern scientific knowledge (8)	B47. The interface between scientific theory and Māori knowledge needs to be addressed (2)	B35. Imperialism/Colonialism destabilized tribal systems of social organisation forcing adaption (8)	B8. Relationships between Māori knowledge and other knowledge systems needs thorough analysis as high levels of public intolerance for Māori views evident (8)	B7. Western culture emphasizes the isolated individual (1)	B54. Shakespeare and Bible determined the past but do not determine modern societal functioning (3)	B18. Popper's ideas are somewhat distant and frustrating for groups seeking a way out of a static worldview (3)
<i>McKinley (10) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (6) Rata (0) Durie (1) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (8) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1) Rata (0) Durie (1) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (8)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (8) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (3)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (3)</i>

C15.

Māori are influenced by a number of historical and contemporary realities at the interface between the Māori world and the wider world (41)

B51. Māori influenced by a number of realities at the interface between Māori world and wider world views (25)	B67. While tension and potential exists at the interface between the Māori world and the wider world the forces that give shape to the interface are to be understood so that principles may be created to address them (9)	B88. Indigenous people are minorities in their own countries (1)	B82. Ngai Tahu invaded by imperial power (1)	B79. The majority of Māori students are educated in mainstream schools (3)	B87. Māori student numbers increasing in schools but Māori medium education numbers decreasing (2)
<i>McKinley (0) Rata (4) Durie (19) Tau (2)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (9) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (0) Durie (0) Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0) Rata (3) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1) Rata (1) Durie (0) Tau (0)</i>

D4. Sound relationships between Māori-Māori, Māori-Crown and Māori-wider world groups essential for a sustained Māori collective capacity.				
<i>McKinley (9)</i>	<i>Rata (0)</i>	<i>Durie (62)</i>	<i>Tau (1)</i>	<i>Total (72)</i>
C6. Sole government control over Māori/indigenous peoples will/has demonstrate/d a lack of commitment in supporting Māori/indigenous languages and ways of knowing in education. This sole control of government is restrictive and limiting (10)	C7. While Māori have attempted to organize themselves for self-determination for over 150 years, a mechanism is needed for a sustained Māori collective capacity for long term planning and policy above sectoral and tribal aspirations (29)	C8. Māori relations with the Crown are strengthened with Hui Taumata, Māori representation on government bodies and the reconciling of Māori worldviews with national goals (24)	C9. Sound relationships and collaboration between Māori groups and between Māori and wider world groups essential (9)	
<i>McKinley (6)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (4)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (29)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (24)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (5)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>	

<p style="text-align: center;">C6.</p> <p>Sole government control over Māori/indigenous peoples will/has demonstrate/d a lack of commitment in supporting Māori/indigenous languages and ways of knowing in education. This sole control of government is restrictive and limiting (10)</p>	
B59. State control over Māori limiting (5)	B72. Governments lack commitment in supporting indigenous languages and ways of knowing (5)
<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (4)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (5)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

<p style="text-align: center;">C7.</p> <p>While Māori have attempted to organize themselves for self-determination for over 150 years, a mechanism is needed for a sustained Māori collective capacity for long term planning and policy above sectoral and tribal aspirations (29)</p>		
B58. Māori have attempted to organize themselves for self-determination for over 150 years (10)	B62. Mechanism for sustained Māori collective capacity for long term planning and policy above sectoral and tribal aspirations to be considered (17)	B75. Hui Taumata provides a model for collective Māori aspirations an action (2)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (10)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (17)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (2)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

C8.

Māori relations with the Crown are strengthened with Hui Taumata, Māori representation on government bodies and the reconciling of Māori worldviews with national goals (24)

B57. Māori had/have representation on government bodies (10)	B76. Hui Taumata strengthens sound relations between Māori and the Crown (11)	B65. Reports launched in 2002/2003 reconcile Māori worldviews with national goals (3)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (10)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (11)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (3)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

C9.

Sound relationships and collaboration between Māori groups and Māori and wider world groups essential (7)

B17. Collaboration between Māori groups and science research groups in operation (3)	B74. Hui Taumata illuminates the interface between Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Whanui (2)	B21. Sound relationships within Te Ao Māori and at the interface between Te Ao Māori/tribal groups and the wider world essential (4)
<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (2)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (3)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>

D5. Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity.

<i>McKinley (15)</i>	<i>Rata (0)</i>	<i>Durie (20)</i>	<i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>Total (35)</i>
↓				
C11. Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity (33)				
<i>McKinley (15)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (20)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>				

C11.

Development which draws from Māori knowledge, values, rights and identity is not ethnic privilege but derived from Māori rights to recover and maintain their own culture, worldviews and systems of organisation allowing for a sense of continuity (35)

B68. Calls for abolition of Māori parliamentary seats based on view of ethnic privilege portrayed by media were out of step with Māori political rights, identity and representation (7)	B20. Development which draws heavily from Māori knowledge and values allows for a sense of continuity (10)	B56. Indigenous Peoples' have rights to their own culture and systems of organization (6)	B55. Māori/Indigenous worldviews linked to ecology, language and interconnectedness (7)	B78. Indigenous survival about maintaining and recovering indigenous worldviews, language, culture and environments (5)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (7)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (7)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (6)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (7)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (5)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

D6. Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds where strong ethnic boundaries exist. Such divisions note the colonizing culture is the ‘Other’ and bearers of sin

<i>McKinley (3)</i>	<i>Rata (27)</i>	<i>Durie (0)</i>	<i>Tau (4)</i>	<i>Total (34)</i>
---------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------

↓
C18.

Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds (i.e. through Kaupapa Māori) where the colonizing culture is the ‘Other’ and bearers of sin (34)

<i>McKinley (3)</i>
<i>Rata (27)</i>
<i>Durie (0)</i>
<i>Tau (4)</i>

C18.

Māori scholars posit the existence of two distinctive worlds (i.e. through Kaupapa Māori) where the colonizing culture is the ‘Other’ and bearers of sin (34)

B91. Munz rejects Smith’s colonizing and decolonizing methodologies distinctions (1)	B41. The sins and ‘Otherisation’ of the West/Coloniser targeted by indigenous peoples (5)	B92. Kaupapa Māori creates strong ethnic divisions and strong ethnic boundaries through creating illusory power relations between (26)	B93. Literature suggests Kaupapa Māori schools enable Māori while non-Kaupapa Māori do not (1)	B94. Some indigenous researchers suggest indigenous life only fully learnt from traditional pedagogies (1)
<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (1)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (4)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (26)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

D7. Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector.

<i>McKinley (1)</i>	<i>Rata (33)</i>	<i>Durie (0)</i>	<i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>Total (34)</i>
---------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------

↓

C16.

Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector (34)

<i>McKinley (1)</i>
<i>Rata (33)</i>
<i>Durie (0)</i>
<i>Tau (0)</i>

C16.

Re-established traditional Māori knowledge is characterised by attempts to transform unequal power relations, it suggests a unique Māori worldview, is related to identity politics and ‘post positions’ and is based on language and culture access for socio-political change. It is influential in the education sector (34)

B42. Kaupapa Māori has a number of characteristics (20)	B43. Kaupapa Māori influential in education sector (11)	B77. Tradition and the use of neotraditional knowledge is used by tribes for political and economic reallocation and enhanced political and economic positioning (3)
<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (19)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (11)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (3)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

D8. Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement ‘gap’ between Māori and other students, Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors.

<i>McKinley (7)</i>	<i>Rata (8)</i>	<i>Durie (1)</i>	<i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>Total (16)</i>
---------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------

↓

C3.

Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement ‘gap’ between Māori and other students, Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors (16)

<i>McKinley (7)</i>
<i>Rata (8)</i>
<i>Durie (1)</i>
<i>Tau (0)</i>

C3.

Despite differences in view on the nature of the achievement ‘gap’ between Māori and other students, Māori students’ educational performance is to be attributed to a number of factors (16)

B60. Students’ educational performance seen to be attributed to a number of reasons (6)	B52. Māori/Indigenous students’ education performance to be attributed to a number of factors (6)	B61. Different views exist on the nature of the gap between Māori students and other groups in terms of educational achievement (4)
<i>McKinley (3)</i> <i>Rata (3)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (3)</i> <i>Durie (1)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (2)</i> <i>Rata (2)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>

Appendix 2: Number and Distribution of Unsorted Content Units

Unsorted Content Units (5)				
<i>McKinley (1)</i>	<i>Rata (0)</i>	<i>Durie (0)</i>	<i>Tau (4)</i>	<i>Total (5)</i>
B90. NZ teachers in low socio-economic communities set high standards (1)	B95. All knowledge sources are sources of interpretation (1)	B86. Author's knowledge of Popper's philosophy not from educational institutes (1)	B89. Tribes not religious (1)	B96. Ngai Tahu membership based on ancestor (1)
<i>McKinley (1)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (0)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>	<i>McKinley (0)</i> <i>Rata (0)</i> <i>Durie (0)</i> <i>Tau (1)</i>

Appendix 3: Number of Content Units Per Theme

	<i>McKinley</i>	<i>Rata</i>	<i>Durie</i>	<i>Tau</i>	<i>n</i>
D1	0	65	0	88	153
D2	124	0	37	1	162
D3	28	8	38	17	91
D4	9	0	62	1	72
D5	15	0	20	0	35
D6	3	27	0	4	34
D7	1	33	0	0	34
D8	7	8	1	0	16
	187	141	158	111	597

Appendix 4: Number of Total Content Units Constructed

	McKinley	Rata	Durie	Tau	n
D1	0	65	0	88	153
D2	124	0	37	1	162
D3	28	8	38	17	91
D4	9	0	62	1	72
D5	15	0	20	0	35
D6	3	27	0	4	34
D7	1	33	0	0	34
D8	7	8	1	0	16
	187	141	158	111	597
Unsorted	1	0	0	4	5
	188	141	158	115	602

Appendix 5: Inter-coder Reliability Coefficients Results

Inter-coder reliability coefficients are concerned with the assessment of agreement between researcher and coders. This is useful for measures such as the coding of manifest content units in texts as each pair of coded measures constructed by both the researcher and the coders, is either a hit or a miss (Neuendorf, 2002). The manner in which such simple agreement is calculated here is through Holsti's method of *percentage agreement* (in Neuendorf, 2002; p149). His formula of $PA_o = \frac{2A}{n_a + n_b}$ enables the researcher to gauge the proportion agreement observed (PA_o), by noting the number of agreements between the researcher and the coder (A) and the total number of units coded by both the researcher (n_a) and the coder (n_b). The proportion agreement observed percentage is presented between the points of .00 (no agreement) to 1.00 (perfect agreement). The total percent agreement observed between the researcher and the three coders is noted at the bottom of each table with the symbol $(T)PA_o$. What follows are a set of five tables. The first four outline the level of inter-coder agreement regarding the construction of content units (CU) and paraphrases (PP) for each article while the fifth table summarises the three coders' level of agreement in comparison to the researcher's content units and paraphrases with an overall inter-coder reliability rate of 0.72 achieved.

	Coder 1		Coder 2		Coder 3		Total	
	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP
<i>A</i>	6	7	5	5	5	6	16	18
<i>n_a</i>	10	10	5	5	8	8	23	23
<i>n_b</i>	8	8	5	5	7	7	20	20
<i>PA_o</i>	.67	.78	1.00	1.00	.67	.80	.74	.84
<i>(T)PA_o</i>	0.79							

Table 4.4a: McKinley Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table

	Coder 1		Coder 2		Coder 3		Total	
	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP
A	3	6	6	9	4	7	13	22
n_a	7	7	12	12	8	8	27	27
n_b	6	6	9	9	7	7	22	22
PA_o	.46	.92	.57	.86	.53	.93	.53	.86
(T)PA _o	0.71							

Table 4.4b: Rata Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table

	Coder 1		Coder 2		Coder 3		Total	
	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP
A	5	6	4	5	5	7	14	18
n_a	8	8	7	7	9	9	24	24
n_b	8	8	8	8	7	7	23	23
PA_o	.63	.75	.53	.67	.63	.88	.60	.77
(T)PA _o	0.68							

Table 4.4c: Durie Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table

	Coder 1		Coder 2		Coder 3		Total	
	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP
A	2	6	10	8	3	6	15	20
n_a	9	9	10	10	10	10	29	29
n_b	6	6	10	10	6	6	22	22
PA_o	.27	.80	1.00	.80	.38	.75	.59	.78
(T)PA _o	0.69							

Table 4.4d: Tau Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table

	Coder 1		Coder 2		Coder 3		Total	
	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP	CU	PP
A	16	25	25	27	17	26	58	78
n_a	34	34	34	34	35	35	103	103
n_b	28	28	32	32	27	27	87	87
PA_o	.52	.81	.76	.82	.55	.84	.61	.82
(T)PA _o	0.66							
	0.79		0.69		0.72			

Table 4.4e: Overall Inter-Coder Reliability Co-efficient Table

References

- Adamson, W.L. (1980). *Hegemony & Revolution. A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Almeida, D. (1997). The Hidden Half: A History of Native American Women's Education. *Harvard Education Review*, Vol.76(4), 757-771.
- Alway, J. (1995). *Critical Theory & Political Possibilities*. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age. Second Edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Atkinson, E. (2003). The postmodern prism: fracturing certainty in education practice. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (eds.). *Educational Research in Practice*. London, New York: Continuum, p35-50.
- Barnes, A. (2004). Social Justice Theory & Practice: Pākehā, Kaupapa Māori and Educational Leadership. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*, Vol.19, 47-62.
- Barnhardt, R. (2000). Teaching/ Learning Across Cultures: Strategies for Success. In R. Neil (ed.). *Voice of the Drum: Indigenous Education and Culture*. Brandon, Manitoba: Kingfisher Publications, pp167-176.
- Battiste, M. (2000). Chapter 15. In *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver, University of British Columbia, pp192-208.
- Battiste, M. & Henderson, J.Y. (2001). *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge & Heritage. A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon, Purich Publishing.
- Belsey, C. (2002). *Critical Practice (2nd Edition)*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Berelson, B. (1971). *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. New York: Hafner Publishing.
- Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences – Fourth Edition*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2003). *The Cultural Self-Review: Providing culturally effective, inclusive, education for Māori learners*. Wellington: NZCER.
- Bhabha, H. (1984). Of Mimicry & Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *October*, 28, pp125-133. Retrieved 30/9/2004 from <http://www.jstor.org/>

- Billig, M. (1988). Chapter 14: Methodology and Scholarship in Understanding Ideological Explanation. In C. Antaki (ed.). *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Sage Publications, pp199-215.
- Bishop, R. (1996). Addressing Issues of Self-Determination & Legitimation in Kaupapa Māori Research. In B. Webber (ed.). *He Paepae Korero. Research Perspectives in Māori Education*. Wellington: NZCER, pp143-160.
- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: a Māori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol.2(2), 199-219.
- Bishop, R. (1999). Kaupapa Māori Research: An Indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson (ed.). *Māori & Psychology: Research and Practice*. Department of Psychology, University of Waikato, pp1-6.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M. & Richardson, C. (2002). Te Toi Huarewa: Effective Teaching and Learning in Total Immersion Māori Language Settings. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, Vol.26(1), 44-61.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S. & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: The Experiences of Year 9 & 10 Māori Students in Mainstream Classrooms*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Bocock, R. (1986). *Hegemony*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Boon, J.A. (1995). Chapter 10: Ultraobjectivity, Cross-Culturally: Interpretive Anthropology and the Arts of Reading. In W. Natter, T.R. Schatzki & J.P. Jones (eds.). *Objectivity and Its Other*. New York: Guilford Press, pp179-205.
- Bouma, G.D. (1996). *The Research Process (3rd Edition)*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, pp169-187.
- Bryman, A. (2004). Social Science Research Methods. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burman, E. & Parker, I. (1993). Chapter 1: Introduction- Discourse Analysis: The Turn to the Text. In E. Burman & I. Parker (eds.). *Discourse Analytic Research. Repertoires & Readings of Texts in Action*. London: Routledge, pp1-13.
- Bunge, M. (1998). *Social Science Under Debate: A Philosophical Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Callewaert, S. (1999). Philosophy of Education, Frankfurt Critical Theory & the Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (eds.). *Critical Theories in Education, Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge, pp117-144.

- Canagarajah, A.S. (2002). *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Carter, M. (2003). Chapter 2: Telling Tales Out of School: ‘What’s the Fate of a Black Story in a White World of White Stories?’ In G. Lopez & L. Parker (eds.). *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, pp29-48.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1997). *Research Methods in Education. Fourth Edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design. Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publications.
- Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the Classroom: A Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Davidson, C. & Tolich, M. (1999). Starting and restarting the research. *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding*. Auckland: Pearson Education.
- de Beaugrande, R. (1999). Discourse studies and the ideology of ‘liberalism’. *Discourse Studies*. Vol.1(3), 259-295.
- de Beaugrande, R. (2004). Critical Discourse Analysis From the Perspective of Ecologism. *Critical Discourse Studies*. Vol.1(1), 113-145.
- Dei, G. & Calliste, A. (2000). *Power, Knowledge & Anti-Racism Education*. Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Druckman, D. (2005) *Doing Research. Methods of Inquiry for Conflict Analysis*. California, Sage Publications.
- Durie, A.E. (1992). *Whaia Te Ara Tika: Research Methodologies and Māori*. Paper presented at a Māori Research Seminar, Massey University, July.
- Durie, A.E. (2002a). *Te Rērenga o te Rā: Autonomy and Identity: Māori Educational Aspirations*. PhD Thesis. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Durie, A.E. (2002b). *Whakamua Whakamuri: Māori Research*. Keynote address presented at NZARE Conference, Massey University, December 7th.
- Durie, A.E. (2005). *181.332/182.332 Māori Issues in Education Study Guide*. Palmerston North: Department of Māori and Multicultural Education.
- Durie, M.H. with Black, T.E., Christensen, I.S., Durie, A.E., Taiapa, J., Potaka, U.K. & Fitzgerald, E.D. (1995). Te Hoe Nuku Roa Framework: A Māori Identity Measure. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*. Vol.104(4), 461-470.

- Durie, M.H. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga. The Politics of Māori Self-Determination.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M.H. (2001). Chapter 13: A Framework for Considering Māori Educational Advancement. In M.H. Durie (ed.). (2003). *Ngā Kāhui Pou: Launching Māori Futures.* Wellington: Huia Publishers, pp197-211.
- Durie, M.H. (2002). A national leader in Māori-centred research. In *Massey: The magazine for alumni and friends of Massey University.* Retrieved 19/5/2003 from http://masseynews.massey.ac.nz/magazine/2002-Nov/stories/durie_research.html
- Durie, M. H. (2003). *Māori Educational Advancement At the Interface Between Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Whānui.* Paper presented at Hui Taumata Mātauranga Tuatoru, Turangi/Taupo, 9th March.
- Entwistle, H. (1979). *Antonio Gramsci. Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ely, M., Vinz, R., Downing, M. & Anzul, M. (1997). *On Writing Qualitative Research: Living by Words.* London: Falmer Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Chapter Six: The Discourse of New Labour: Critical Discourse Analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S.J. Yates (eds.). *Discourse as Data. A Guide for Analysis.* London: Sage Publications, pp229-266.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London/New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., Graham, P., Lemke, J. & Wodak, R. (2004). Introduction. *Critical Discourse Studies.* Vol.1(1), 1-7.
- Fendler, L. (1999). Making Trouble: Prediction, Agency and Critical Intellectuals. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (eds.). *Critical Theories in Education, Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics.* London: Routledge, pp169-188.
- Forgacs, D. & Nowell-Smith, G. (1985). *Antonio Gramsci- Selections from Cultural Writings.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Finnegan, R. (1996). Using Documents. In Sapford, R. & Jupp, V. (eds.). *Data Collection and Analysis.* London: Sage in Association with The Open University, pp138-151.
- Foucault, M. (1976). Two Lectures. In Gordon, C. (ed.) *Michel Foucault- Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault.* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Gall, J. Gall, M. & Borg, W. (1999). *Applying Educational Research- A Practical Guide: Fourth Edition*. New York: Longman.
- Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical Theory and Education*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory & Resistance in Education: Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Wesport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gore, J. (1998). On the limits to Empowerment Through Critical & Feminist Pedagogies. In D. Carlson & M. Apple (eds.). *Power/Knowledge/Pedagogy. The Meaning of Democratic Education in Unsettling Times*. Colorado: Westview Press, pp271-288.
- Gottschalk, S. (1998). Postmodern Sensibilities and Ethnographic Possibilities. In A. Banks & S.P. Banks (eds.). *Fiction & Social Research: By Ice or Fire*. California: AltaMira Press/Sage Publications, pp205-233.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Edited and Translated by Q. Hoare & G.N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Greenland, H. (1984). Ethnicity as Ideology: The Critique of Pakeha Society. In P. Spoonley, et al. (eds.). *Tauwi: Racism & Ethnicity in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Griffiths, M. (1998). Fact and values: Power/knowledge. In *Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence*. Buckingham: Open University Press, pp44-64.
- Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile Bodies. Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hemara, W. (2000). *Māori Pedagogies: A View from the Literature*. New Zealand Council of Educational Research: Wellington.
- Henderson, J.Y. (2000). Challenges of Respecting Indigenous World Views in Eurocentric Education. In R. Neil (ed.). *Voice of the Drum: Indigenous Education and Culture*. Brandon, Manitoba: Kingfisher Publications, pp59-80.
- Henry, E. (1999). Kaupapa Māori. Locating Indigenous Ontology, Epistemology, and Methodology in the Academy. A speech based on a paper by E. Henry & H. Pene. In V. Tapine (ed.). *A Report on the Proceedings of the Wananga. Building Research Capacity Within Māori Communities*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Herbert, J. (2002). *It's a long road that has no ending*. Inaugural Professorial Lecture, Chair of Indigenous Australian Studies, James Cook University, 2 July.

- Hickling-Hudson, A. & Ahlquist, R. (2003). Creating the Curriculum in the Schooling of Indigenous Children in Australia and the United States: From Eurocentricism to Culturally Powerful Pedagogies. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.47(1), 64-89.
- Howe, K.R. (2003). *Closing Methodological Divides- Toward Democratic Educational Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hoy, D.H. (1995). Chapter Seven: Significant Others: Objectivity and Ethnocentrism. In W. Natter, T.R. Schatzki & J.P. Jones (eds.). *Objectivity And Its Other*. New York: Guilford Press, pp113-136.
- Iseke-Barnes, J. (2003). Living and Writing Indigenous Spiritual Resistance. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. Vol.24(3), 211-238.
- Jackson, M. (1998). *Research and the Colonisation of Māori Knowledge*. Paper presented at Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research Development Conference, April.
- Jackson, M.D. (2003). Literacy, Communications and Social Change. In I.H. Kawharu (ed.). *Conflict and Compromise. Essays on the Māori Since Colonisation*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, pp27-54.
- Jahnke, H. & Taiapa, J. (1999). Māori Research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (eds.). *Social Research in NZ: Many Paths to Understanding*. Auckland: Pearson Education, pp39-50.
- Johnston, P. (1994). Examining a State Relationship: 'Legitimation' and Te Kohanga Reo. In Pihama, L. (ed.) *Te Pua*, Vol.3(2), 22-28.
- Johnston, P. (1998). *He Ao Rereke: Education Policy and Māori Under-Achievement: Mechanisms of Power and Difference*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Johnston, P. (2003). Research in a bicultural context: the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (eds.). *Educational Research in Practice*. London, New York: Continuum, pp98-110.
- Johnston, P. & Pratt, J. (2003). Culture, race and discourse. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (eds.). *Educational Research in Practice*. London, New York: Continuum, pp152-163.
- Katene, N. (1992). *Kohanga Reo: Let's Celebrate*. He Parekereke Occasional Publication Series. Wellington: Victoria University.
- Kawagley, O. (1995a). *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway for Ecology & Spirit*. Illinois: Waveland Press.

- Kawagley, O. (1995b). *Alaska Native Education Research Requires That we Reach into the Profound Silence of Self to Know*. Paper presented at the Circumpolar Science Conference, Anchorage Alaska.
- Kawharu, I.H. (2003). *Conflict and Compromise. Essays on the Māori Since Colonisation*. Auckland: Reed Publishing.
- Kenrick, P. (2001). *He Tirohanga mo te Oritetanga: Analysis of Closing the Gaps*. Project presented in partial fulfilment for MEd. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Chapter 9: Racialized Discourses and Ethnic Epistemologies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues. Second Edition*. California: Sage Publications, pp398-432.
- Lakomski, G. (1999). Chapter 16: Critical Theory and Education. In J.P. Keeves & G. Lakomski (eds.). *Issues in Educational Research*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp174-183.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V. & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: ‘us’, ‘them’ and ‘doing violence’ in political discourse. *Discourse and Society*. Vol.15, (2/3), 243-266.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (2003). Chapter 6: Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues. Second Edition*. California, Sage Publications, pp253-291.
- López. G. (1998). Reflections on epistemology and standpoint theories: a response to “a Māori approach to creating knowledge”. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol.2(2), 225-231.
- Luke, A. (1999). Chapter 15: Critical Discourse Analysis. In J.P. Keeves & G. Lakomski (eds.). *Issues in Educational Research*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp161-173.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Macnaughten, P. (1993). Discourses of nature: argumentation and power. In E. Burman & I. Parker (eds.). *Discourse Analytic Research. Repertoires & Readings of Texts in Action*. London: Routledge, pp52-72.
- Marrow, R.A. & Brown, D.D. (1994). Critical Theory & Methodology. *Contemporary Social Theory*, Vol. 2. California: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, J. (1999). The Mode of Information & Education: Insights on Critical Theory and Michel Foucault. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (eds.). *Critical Theories in Education, Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge, pp145-167.

- Martin, K. (2001). *Ways of Knowing, Ways of Being & Ways of Doing: Developing a theoretical framework & methods for Indigenous re-search & Indigenist research*. Retrieved 13/7/04 from <http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/rsrch/conf2001/PAPERS/MARTIN.pdf>.
- McKinley, E. (2005). Locating the global: culture, language and science education for indigenous students. *International Journal of Science Education*, Vol.27(2), 227-241.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture*. London: Routledge.
- McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (1996). Ina te Mahi he Rangatira. Māori Women as Rangatira in Marae Kitchens. In B. Webber (ed.). *He Paepae Korero. Research Perspectives in Māori Education*. Wellington: NZCER, pp19-34.
- Mead, L. (1996). *Ngā Aho o te Kakahu Matauranga: The Multiple Layers of Struggle by Māori in Education*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Medawar, P. (1990). Is the scientific paper a fraud? *The Threat and the Glory: Reflection on Science and Scientists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minh-Ha, T.T. (1991). *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Nash, R. (1999). Realism in the Sociology of Education: 'explaining' social differences in attainment. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol.20(1), 107-125.
- Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Niwa, T.H. (2005a). Experimenting with Inter-corporeality: A Dialogue with Criticisms of Kaupapa Māori Theory. Paper presented at the Whakaareare Seminar Series, Te Uru Māraurau, Massey University, 14th September.
- Niwa, T.H. (2005b). *Constructing Content Units for Educational Research: An Expert Panel Task*. Palmerston North: Massey University, 19th September.
- Oliga, J.C. (1996). *Power, Ideology and Control*. New York: Plenum Press.
- O'Regan, H. (1999). If it's Good Enough for You, It's Good Enough for Me: The Hypocrisy of Assimilation and Cultural Colonisation. In J.N. Brown & P.M. Sant (eds.). *Indigeneity: Construction and Re/Presentation*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, pp193-207.
- Parker, I. (1988). Chapter 13: Deconstructing accounts. In C. Antaki (ed.). *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Sage Publications, pp184-198.

- Perkinson, H.J. (1999). Foreword. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (eds.). *Educational Research in Practice*. London, New York: Continuum, ppvii-viii.
- Phillips, D.C. & Burbules, N.C. (2000). *Postpositivism and Educational Research*. Maryland: Powman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F. & Walker, S. (2000). Creating Methodological Space: A Literature Review of Kaupapa Māori Research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. Vol.26(1), 30-43.
- Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M. & Lee, J. (2004). *A Literature Review of Kaupapa Māori and Māori Education Pedagogy*. Auckland: The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
- Pillow, W.S. (2003). Chapter 8: *Race-based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods in Epistemological Shifts*. In G. Lopez & L. Parker (eds.). *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, pp182-202.
- Popkewitz, T.S. & Fendler, L. (1999). *Critical Theories in Education, Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Popper, K. (1962). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Popper, K. (1989). *Conjectures and Refutations. The Growth of Scientific Knowledge (Fifth Edition)*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Popper, K. (1992). *Unended Quest. An Intellectual Autobiography (Second Edition)*. London: Routledge.
- Powick, K. (2002). *Māori Research Ethics: A Literature Review of the Ethical Issues & Implications of Kaupapa Māori Research and Research Involving Māori for Researchers, Supervisors and Ethics Committees*. Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, University of Waikato.
- Puketapu, B. (1993). *He Mata Ngaro: Māori Leadership in Educational Administration*. Unpublished MEdAdmin Thesis, Massey University.
- Rata, E. (1996a). "Goodness and power": The Sociology of Guilt'. *New Zealand Sociology*, 11(2), 223-274.
- Rata, E. (1996b). Whanau Revival and Retribalisation. *Sites*, No.32 (Autumn), 1-22.
- Rata, E. (2002). *Democratic Principles in Teaching and Learning. A Kantian Approach*. Monograph/ Research Report Series from the Auckland College of Education.

- Rata, E. (2004a). *Māori and Non-Māori: Which Way Forward?* Auckland College of Education Seminar Series, 23 March.
- Rata, E. (2004b). Neotribal Capitalism and Public Policy. *Political Science*, Vol.56(1), 55-64.
- Rata, E. (2004c). *Ethnic Ideologies in New Zealand Education: What's Wrong with Kaupapa Maori.* Paper presented at the Teacher Education Forum of Aotearoa New Zealand Conference (TEFANZ), Auckland College of Education, 5th-7th July.
- Rata, E. (2004d). *Neotribalism or Democracy? You Choose.* Paper presented at the Aotearoa Tertiary Equity Committee Conference (ATEC), Auckland, 3rd September.
- Rata, E. (2004e). *Under-Achievement in Maori Education: Why Kaupapa Maori Can't Help.* Paper presented at the Politics of Early Childhood Symposium, Auckland, 21st-22nd September.
- Rata, E. (2005a). *The Rise and Rise of the Neotribal Elite.* Address to the Summer Sounds Symposium, Marlborough Sounds, 11-13 February.
- Rata, E. (2005b). *The Subversion of Democracy in New Zealand Education.* Address to the New Zealand Secondary Principals' Conference, Wellington, 19 May.
- Rigney, L. I. (1997). Internationalisation of an Indigenous Anti-Colonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and its Principles. *Journal for Native American Studies*, Vol.14(2), 109-125.
- Salamini, L. (1981). *The Sociology of Political Praxis. An Introduction to Gramsci's Theory.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Schatzki, T.R. (1995) Chapter 8: Objectivity & Rationality. In W. Natter, T.R. Schatzki & J.P. Jones (eds.). *Objectivity And Its Other.* New York: Guilford Press, pp137-160.
- Scott, D. (1999). Introduction. In D. Scott (ed.). *Values and Educational Research.* London: Institute of Education, University of London, pp1-6.
- Scott, D. (2000). *Realism and Educational Research. New Perspectives and Possibilities.* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Scott, D. & Usher, R. (1999). *Researching Education: Data, Methods and Theory in Educational Enquiry.* London: Cassell.
- Shipman, M. (1997). *The limitations of social research (4th Edition).* London: Longman.
- Simon, J. (1986). *Ideology in the Schooling of Maori Children.* Palmerston North: Delta.

- Simon, J. (1990). *The Place of Schooling in Maori-Pakeha Relations*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Simon, J. (1994). Historical Perspectives on Schooling. In, E. Coxon, K. Jenkins & L. Massey (eds.). *The Politics of Learning and Teaching in Aotearoa*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, pp37-81.
- Simon, J. (1998). *Ngā Kura Māori. The Native Schools System 1867-1969*. Auckland: Auckalnd University Press.
- Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1999). Chapter 6: Reflexivity. Social Justice and Educational Research. In D. Scott (ed.). *Values and Educational Research*. London: University of London, pp93-110.
- Smart, B. (1995). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, C. (1998). *Straying Beyond the Boundaries of Belief: Māori Epistemologies Inside the Curriculum*. Paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society, Australasia, University of Auckland, November.
- Smith, G.H. (1988). *Kaupapa Maori Schooling: Implications for Educational Policy Making*. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Smith, G.H. (1991). *Reform and Maori Educational Crisis: A Grand Illusion*. Monograph No.3. Auckland: Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland
- Smith, G.H. (1992). Kura Kaupapa Māori: Contesting & Reclaiming Education in Aotearoa. In D.H. Poonwassie & D. Ray (eds.). *Tomorrow Can Be Better*. Ontario: Garland Press, pp89-108.
- Smith, G.H. (1995). WHANAU (Extended Family) Structures as an Innovation Intervention into Maori Educational and Schooling Crises. Paper presented for The Association for Baha'i Studies, Australia.
- Smith, G.H. (1997). *The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Smith, G.H. (2000). Māori Education. Revolution and Transformative Action. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. Vol.24(1), pp57-72.
- Smith, G. H. (2002). *Kaupapa Māori Theory: Transformative Praxis and New Formations of Colonisation*. Paper presented at Cultural Sites, Cultural Theory, Cultural Policy Conference: The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research. Wellington, January 23rd-26th.

- Smith, G.H. (2003). *Kaupapa Māori Theory: Theorizing Indigenous Transformation of Education & Schooling*. Paper presented at 'Kaupapa Māori Symposium' NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Auckland, December.
- Smith, L.T. (1994). Kura Kaupapa Māori and the implications for curriculum. In Hatton, E. (ed). *Understanding Teaching: Curriculum and the Social Contexts of Schooling*. Sydney: Harcourt Brace, pp345-348.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research & Indigenous Peoples*. London/ New York/ Dunedin: Zed Books & Oxford University Press.
- Somerville, M. & Perkins, T. (2003). Border Work in the Contact Zone: Thinking Indigenous/non-Indigenous Collaboration Spatially. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. Vol.24(3), 253-266.
- Spoonley, P. (1993). *Racism & Ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart-Harawira, M. (2003). *New Formations of Empire and Indigenous Education Strategies as a Transformative Response*. Seminar presentation at the Global Citizenship Project, School of Education, University of Glasgow, April 15th.
- Tait, E. (1995). *Mana Tu. Senior Maori Students Discuss Success at Secondary School*. Unpublished MEd Thesis. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Tau, T. (2001a). The Death of Knowledge: Ghosts on the Plains. *The New Zealand Journal of History*. Vol.35(2), 131-152.
- Tau, T. (2001b). Mātauranga Māori as an Epistemology. In A. Sharp & P. McHugh (eds.). *Histories, Power & Loss*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Tau, T. (2002). *Open Societies and Tribal Groups*. Paper presented at the Popper Centennial Conference, Vienna.
- Taylor, S. (2001a). Chapter One- Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S.J. Yates (eds.). *Discourse as Data. A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, pp5-48.
- Taylor, S. (2001b). Chapter Eight- Evaluating & Applying Discourse Analytic Research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S.J. Yates (eds.). *Discourse as Data. A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, pp311-330.
- Te Ahu (n.d.a). *Placing Indigenous Values at the Heart of Education*. Retrieved 3/10/2003 from <http://www.gaje.net.au/indigi.htm>
- Te Ahu (n.d.b). *The Evolution of Contemporary Maori Protest*. Retrieved 3/10/2003 from <http://maorinews.com/writings/papers/other/protest.html>

- Te Ariki, C. Spoonley, P. & Tomoana, N. (1992). *Te Whakapakari te Mana Tangata: The Politics and Process of Research for Māori*. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Thomas, M.E. & Treiber, L.A. (2005). Chapter 6: Nonreactive Research. Content Analysis, Accretion Measures, and Using Existing Statistics. In K. Strand & G.L. Weiss (eds.). *Experiencing Social Research: A Reader*. Boston: Pearson Education, pp161-179.
- Tillman, L. (1998). Culturally specific research practices: a response to Bishop. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol.2(2), 221-224.
- Torres, C.A. (1998). *Education, Power and Personal Biography. Dialogues with Critical Educators*. New York: Routledge.
- Torres, C.A. (2003). Chapter 12: Education, Power, and the State: Successes and Failures of Latin American Education in the Twentieth Century. In C.A. Torres & A. Antikainen (eds.). *The International Handbook on the Sociology of Education: An International Assessment of New Research and Theory*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp256-284.
- Tripp, D. (1992). Critical theory and educational research. *Issues in Educational Research*, Vol.2(1), 13-23.
- Tyson, C. (2003). Chapter 1: Research, Race, and an Epistemology of Emancipation. In G. Lopez & L. Parker (eds.). *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, pp19-28.
- Waitere-Ang, H. (1999). *Te Kete, The Briefcase, Te Tuara: The Balancing Act- Māori Women in the Primary Sector*. Unpublished MEdAdmin Thesis. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Waitere-Ang, H. & Johnston, P.M. (1999). *If all Inclusion in Research Means is the Addition of Researchers That Look Different, Have You Really Included Me At All?* Paper presented at the 1999 AARE, NZARE, Conference, Melbourne.
- Walker, R. (1991). *Liberating Māori From Educational Subjection*. Monograph, No.6. Research Unit for Māori Education, University of Auckland.
- Walker, R. (1996a). Contestation of Power & Knowledge in the Politics of Culture. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, Vol.1(2), pp1-7.
- Walker, R. (1996b). *Ngā Pepa a Rangimui*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1988). Chapter 12: Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative frameworks. In C. Antaki (ed.). *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Sage Publications, pp168-183.

White, P. (2005). Engagement- a Bakhtinian perspective. In *An Introductory Tour Through Appraisal Theory*. Retrieved 23/03/05 from
<http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalOutline/Unframed/AppraisalOutline.htm>

Young, I. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Young, R. (1990). *A Critical Theory of Education- Habermas and Our Children's Future*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Young, R. (2004). *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West. Second Edition*. London & New York: Routledge.