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Abstract

Previous studies on racism in the field of critical social psychology have focused on perpetrator talk and text, perpetrator personality and cognition, and in-group psychology. Research examining targets’ perspectives and responses to racism and race theory is rare. The current study redresses a little of this imbalance by exploring the accounts of indigenous Māori of Aotearoa New Zealand and their partners. The researcher, a Pākehā (B.A. Māori studies), used long standing Māori contacts to establish trust, and also sought approval from a Māori Cultural adviser, the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, and a local marae (Takapuwahia) before beginning the project. Interviews were conducted with 24 participants aged 30-74, 19 of whom were Māori (10 women, 9 men) and five of whom were Pākehā women partners. Participants were asked three open ended questions. Had they had experiences of racism, and if so, could they describe them? Why did they think the racism occurred? Was there a solution? The epistemology chosen to underpin the analyses was social constructionism, which allowed the inclusion of political and social contexts and power issues, and also acknowledged the power of language to not merely reflect reality, but actively construct it. A data driven inductive approach was employed to bring to light the uniqueness of the participants’ perceptions. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) informed by social constructionism, was used in the first paper Resisting racism, to outline three themes: difficulties in expressing resistance due to power imbalance or stereotyping, non-vocalised resistance, and vocalised resistance, which was the most stressful and successful response. In Accounting for racism, a micro-level analysis of participants’ talk draws on the discourse analytic tradition of Potter and Wetherell (1987) to highlight four main discourses: Ignorance of racism and Māori people, media promotion of negative stereotypes, an innate Pākehā sense of superiority, and institutionalised racism. Thematic analysis is used again in Reducing racism to define four main themes: Structural racism with attention to the workplace and the justice system, education’s role in anti-racism practices, increased interaction, and becoming inclusively ‘Kiwi’ while practising mutual respect. This research contributes key insights from the targets’ perspective, and addresses a gap in current research which is focussed almost exclusively on perpetrator theory. In addition, this study holds significance for psychologists, educationalists,
researchers and policy makers as it brings fresh understanding on racism against Māori and how to best reduce it in Aotearoa New Zealand.
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My journey

I grew up unaware of my privilege as a Pākehā Kiwi, and totally unaware that Māori might be marginalised. Culture wasn’t something I thought I had; the fact that New Zealand as a whole was English in orientation was something I took for granted. I remember in Secondary School years beginning to sense that French might not be much use to me, and asking a teacher if I could learn Māori instead, but when he said it wasn’t on the curriculum, I wasn’t surprised, and it didn’t seem to warrant protest. After all, this was an English speaking nation. The years passed, I trained as a teacher, and it seemed to me that New Zealand was a world wide example of racial harmony and equal opportunity for all. This was the accepted, taken for granted assessment of the status quo among my Pākehā peers. I had a musician friend who was Māori, but she and I were focussed on promoting our music and racism was never discussed. It wasn’t until much later, when I took up voluntary prison ministry work on inter-denominational church teams, and found myself meeting regularly with fellow workers who were Māori, that I began to hear things that made me question my assumptions about Aotearoa New Zealand.

The first of these was when a close friend, a Māori married to a blonde Pākehā, told me that her equally intelligent, healthy children had been treated differently by teachers at school. They had assumed that the child who was phenotypically Māori would be interested in rugby, and the child who was of Pākehā appearance, would be academically inclined. Their teachers had constructively encouraged them in these directions, without mentioning the supposed ethnic orientation. This shocked me, not only that it had happened, but that I, an ex-teacher had had no idea. From older Māori, I heard accounts of their childhoods, including beatings from teachers for letting slip with a Māori word, having to give up their seats on buses for Pākehā, and sitting separately in the cinema. Others told me quite bluntly that Māori were still discriminated against today, especially in the legal system, and the fact that many Māori were overly represented in prisons was a miscarriage of justice. This I balked at; after all, everyone in prison had a record, and I knew nothing of aversive racism manifesting in biased sentencing practices. No relevant statistics ever made the papers.
Seeking bridges, I began to learn te reo and Māori studies. I was endeared by the hospitality and friendship, and always felt challenged by accounts of racism, however mild. I began to wonder if it was possible to look deeper, to understand more about the lived experience of Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, and to focus the light of academic research on what was being said to me. It occurred to me that what they were telling me was not generally known, and sat outside the parameters of existing studies written by Pākehā; that if I hadn’t expected their statements, then maybe other middle class Pākehā would not expect them either. This melded well with the concepts of social constructionism, in which a researcher might create their own reality, by composing a questionnaire which limited the answers to what they expected to find. I considered the idea that if Māori constructed their embodied experience with their own words, instead of trying to fit Pākehā created frames, it might be possible to understand things which did not currently exist in a Pākehā ontology. This was an exciting thought. Although I didn’t realise it, my journey towards the doctorate had irrevocably begun.

In the course of the research, I found myself challenged. There were many occasions on which I found myself reflecting on my own situatedness as a middle class Pākehā, in a bicultural Aotearoa New Zealand, trying to understand what I was reading. It became clear to me that my background and goals had created an ontological blindness. Why had I chosen to trust a certain epistemology? Had that worked to screen out Māori constructions? Throughout, my Māori friends guided and steered me, kindly, joking, sympathising with the hard work involved, but always bringing me back to what they saw to be self evident: Pākehā do not see things the way Māori do, and they are generally ignorant of Māori experience. It needed explaining, and they were glad I was listening. I realised it was therefore my honour, and my academic challenge, to analyse and present themes and discourses of the Māori experience of racism in Aotearoa New Zealand, as told by Māori participants and their partners.
Glossary of Māori words

Māori words in the text are italicised, except for ‘Māori’ ‘Pākehā’ and ‘Aotearoa’ which are in common usage. The translations relate to the Māori words or phrases as used in the context of the thesis and the excerpts from participants’ interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aroha</td>
<td>love, caring, compassion, empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ako Māori</td>
<td>to learn the Māori way of doing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āta</td>
<td>A kaupapa Māori principle relating to the building and nurturing of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haka</td>
<td>Māori war dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He aha te mea nui?</td>
<td>What is the most important thing in the world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.</td>
<td>It is people, people, people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hongi</td>
<td>to press noses in greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>a people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kānga</td>
<td>sweetcorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiwhakamana</td>
<td>respected elder in authority, who empowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanohi ki te kanohi</td>
<td>face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapahaka</td>
<td>Māori culture performing group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumatua</td>
<td>old man or woman, a person of status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Māori approach or methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga</td>
<td>A kaupapa Māori principle relating to Socio-Economic Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwi</td>
<td>New Zealand citizen regardless of ethnicity (coll.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koha</td>
<td>gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanga Reo</td>
<td>Māori language immersion schools for children aged up to six years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kunekune | fat, short-legged, feral pig
---|---
Kura Kaupapa Māori | Māori language immersion schools
 mana | authority, influence, prestige, power
 marae | (Māori) village common
 manuhiri | visitor
 Māori | Person of the native Polynesian race, New Zealander
 mokopuna | grandchild
 Moriori | Chatham Island Māori
 mōteatea | poetry, lament
 Ngāti | Prefix or separate word meaning tribal group
 paiheretia | unity and connectedness
 Pākehā | a New Zealander of predominantly European descent
 poroporoaki | traditional farewell ceremony
 pōwhiri | welcoming ceremony
 rangatiratanga | evidence of breeding and greatness; chieftainship
 reo, te reo | Māori language
 tangata | human being
 tangi | Māori funeral
 tauiwi | European or New Zealander of non-Māori descent (literally ‘other people’)
 tautuutu | the principle of reciprocity
 Takapuwahia | An area between Porirua and Titahi Bay
 taonga tuku iho | the principle of cultural aspiration
 te ao Māori | the Māori world, Māoridom
 te reo | Māori language (literally ‘the language’)
 tikanga | rule, method, customs
 tīna rangatiratanga | the principle of self determination
 whaka | prefix/particle: to cause something to happen
whakaiti

As a principle or value: Humble oneself so that the message can be heard

whakamā

to be ashamed, shy, bashful, embarrassed

whānau

family, extended family

whakatauki

Māori proverb
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Introduction: Journeying through the thesis

This thesis is unusual because of its topic, and because of the way in which that topic was investigated. Racism against Māori is constructed in the accounts of Māori and their partners, and this in turn is investigated by a Pākehā researcher. As I planned how to complete this in a manner that was both ethically and academically robust, I decided that I must start by reading extensively for background on several aspects of my subject. Informed by social constructionism (SC), my first crucial search would be to know the context which would inform the constructions and rhetoric. Did the history and colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand (Aotearoa NZ) produce a cohesive egalitarian society, and what power structures lay behind contemporary politics? How were Māori and Pākehā defined? I wondered also if there could be what might be called evidence of marginalisation, of racism against Māori. This is all explored in Chapter One.

Having decided that there was a very clear case for investigating racism against Māori, in Chapter Two I study how other researchers in social psychology defined the frameworks for studying racism, from its inception to the present day. What could I learn from this which would help me decide how to embark on this project? After attention to the semantics involved, and further reading, I began to appreciate the ground breaking steps made as the paradigm shifts occurred, from early essentialist positivist epistemology through Foucault’s influence, challenges to positivism, and finally, social constructionism. I consider the accompanying conceptual changes that evolved in design and analysis, and study examples of research using discursive and thematic analysis.

Having looked at the context of Aotearoa NZ and gained a broad understanding of how racism might be studied, in Chapter Three I focus on drawing these together: how has racism against Māori been researched in Aotearoa NZ? I examine renowned discursive studies of Pākehā talk and text, and a few qualitative analyses of Māori targets’ accounts. The paucity of studies on targets’ perspectives is pivotal in the rationale for the present study, and the aims are then set out.
In Chapter Four, I evaluate and decide on an epistemology and analytical methodology which will fit in best with both the aims of the research and the requirements of the Treaty of Waitangi. Cultural awareness and sensitivity are integrated into all aspects of the procedure, including recruitment, confidentiality, participant rights, the interview, and provision for ongoing feedback. The analytic methods used in the thematic analysis and discourse analysis, both informed by social constructionism, are outlined.

The findings are presented in the four chapters which follow, each of which reflect the three main questions used in the interviews. In Chapter Five, the focus is on participants’ accounts of particular episodes and racist incidents. Attention is given to their positioning, emotional response, and some consequences of their experiences of racism. Chapter Six examines resistance, a key response of participants to the racism encountered. Three main themes are identified and explored: difficulties in verbally expressing resistance to racism, the practices of silent or non-vocalised resistance, and vocalised resistance. This is compared with previous research, which highlights participants’ management of resistance and their underlying desire to inform perpetrators about racism. Chapter Seven uses discourse analysis to look at how the participants accounted for racism. Of four main discourses discussed, two are already well cited in the literature: negative media representation, and institutional racism. The others open new areas of interest; a discourse of ignorance functioned to demonstrate the impact of Pākehā ignorance of Māori people and culture, and of racism itself. Unexpectedly, in the fourth discourse Pākehā were constructed as possessing an innate sense of superiority which contributed to racism, and this is explored. Chapter Eight looks at four main themes in participants’ insights and perspectives around the important area of reducing racism. These were the need to attend to structural racism, particularly bias in the justice system and imbalances in the workplace. Educational strategies were suggested such the teaching of Aotearoa NZ history, the Treaty, cultural expectations and anti-racism. Greater integration was encouraged, and also the inclusiveness of being Kiwi. These findings are then set in the wider literature.

Lastly in the discussion and conclusions, Chapter Nine, there is a brief return to the research aims and findings. This is followed by an in-depth look at the implications for praxis in education and clinical practice, for policy, and theoretical implications. Limitations and problems emerging from the methodology are discussed, and
suggestions made for future research. The study concludes with final statements reflecting the integration of study findings, their interpretation and their contribution.

Each chapter is given a small introduction, and summarised briefly at its conclusion. Reflexivity boxes supply autobiographical reflection throughout.
Chapter One

Racism against Māori:
Crucial connections with context and conditions

Introduction

This study examines the views of Māori participants and their partners on racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ as expressed in their talk and text transcripts. Working within a social constructionist paradigm, it is important to acknowledge that talk and text does not exist in a neutral void, and the conceptualisation of any topic bears the contextual influences of a changing society (Burr, 2005). This chapter therefore begins by examining contemporary Aotearoa NZ, contextualising Māori-Pākehā relations in the brief history of the country, and looking at the semantics of how Māori and Pākehā are defined. Anti-racism laws in place are looked at, and the denial of racism targeting Māori. Finally, there is an evidential look at the impact of racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ today.

Colonialism and the confabulation of coalescence

For social constructionists, the constructions of the history of Aotearoa NZ make a compelling prequel to study, and provide a rich backdrop to the rhetoric of groups who allege or deny the existence of racism against Māori. For Māori, the 19th century colonisation of Aotearoa NZ by the British was a display of power in which foreigners with superior numbers and weaponry, invaded and conquered their country. In doing so they annihilated the language, the culture, and the economic superstructures, and killed or imprisoned any protesters (James, 2000). Māori were driven from their lands, their way of life superseded by an uncaring European culture, and surviving Māori marginalised. For Pākehā who deny racism today, colonialism is remembered differently, and a different construction emerges. The Europeans were enterprising pioneers, who arrived peaceably, signed an egalitarian Treaty, and apart from initial skirmishes with the more aggressive Māori, cohabited peacefully and were united with
Māori in the years that followed. The ongoing stability of Aotearoa NZ provides proof of the unity of all New Zealanders, who believe themselves to be one people living in a land of equal opportunity, ‘Kiwis’ regardless of race.

The history of actual events is also filled with academic controversy. Māori arrival to the country is variously attested to be 950 AD (Buck, 1926) or 1200 AD (King, 2003) from a mythical Hawaiiki (Sorenson, 1979) Tahiti (Smith, 1910) or the Hawaiian islands (Buck, 1926). Scholars of the late 19th early 20th century recorded that Māori had been preceded by the Moriori, whom they conquered and annihilated. This stance allowed for the theory of the survival of the fittest, and justified colonisation by Europeans (Walker, 1990). Recently, writers have also asserted that even prior to the Moriori, Aotearoa NZ was inhabited by non-Polynesian peoples (APNZ, 2012) a theory which similarly repositions Māori as foreigners with fewer rights than indigenous people. The most widely accepted account is that Māori arrived some hundreds of years prior to the earliest arrival of the European settlers, which began in the mid 1700s (Orange, 2011). Historical milestones become clearer after this point, with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840.

This briefly written, three articled founding document for Aotearoa NZ, was drawn up by the British, to counter American and French plans of settlement, and to open the way for British governance and immigration (Orange, 2011). Today it is largely viewed as promoting the egalitarian principle of two peoples in equal partnership (Lyons, Madden, Chamberlain, & Carr, 2011). In the first article, Māori ceded powers of sovereignty to the Queen of England, giving the British the right to set up laws including those relating to land ownership. In the second, Māori were guaranteed sovereignty over their land, and the British the right of pre-emption in sales. In the third, Māori were granted equal rights with the settlers, as British subjects (Waitangi Tribunal, 2013). The Treaty was signed by representatives of the Crown, and more than 500 Māori chiefs. Williams, the translator, struggled to draw together the two ontologies, finding the Māori collective owning of land did not marry with European legal terminology for individual ownership. Neither did the linguistics which described the Māori tribal system provide words to construct the extent of royal command over the British Empire. Kawanatanga, a transliteration of governor, was chosen as closest in meaning to sovereignty;
rangatiratanga, which could be translated as chieftainship, equivalent to the word possession (Orange, 2011).

Translated and presented in the two languages, often with neither parties being fluent in both, the Treaty contained ambivalences which would give cause for future debate, particularly with regards to land. In the decade following the signing of the Treaty however, it seemed to have been proactive in providing peaceful co-existence between Māori and settler. It was following this brief time of peace that colonisers became more aggressive in their desire for ownership of land, actively using various measures to gain land and control. Māori did not own land individually but collectively, and under the Native Lands Act of 1862, courts refused to recognise communal ownership of land. Its sequel, the Native lands Act of 1865, allowed European settlers to legalise their own title to such land, even if Māori were unaware of the process. Under the Rating Act of 1882, the Property Tax Department rated Māori land at three times its market value, resulting in further acquisition of land from Māori who could not pay. Land of ‘rebellious’ Māori was also confiscated by force (Ballara, 1986).

The destruction of pre-existing Māori cultural, social and economic structures (Walker, 1987) continued. Māori language, property, and social fabric would be diminished, with Māori expected to relinquish land and become tenants who provided cheap labour. They were also expected to become Anglophones, discard tikanga and social community, and they struggled with the celebration of individualism in the new European ontology. Māori, whom it is estimated made up 99% of the population at the time of the Treaty, by 1858 numbered only 50% of the population (Yensen, 1989). This disproportional decrease continued, due to the effects of war, increased arrival of colonists, and a lack of immunity to European illnesses. Increased expansion of the non-Māori population today places indigenous Māori at just 14.9% of the population of Aotearoa NZ (Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

The fact that the Māori world was disappearing was not considered an act of racism by colonists in their time. Darwin’s 19th century theories of evolution allowed Māori to be constructed as not only less advanced in the evolutionary continuum, but backward and less able, a dying race. Generally, they were seen as physically rather than intellectually capable (Hokowhitu, 2004). The colonists also saw themselves as replacing Māori, and
effort was therefore made to research Māori life and culture for historical record (Jahnke & Taiapa, 1999). For Māori who survived, Europeanisation was considered a mandatory improvement (Te Hiwi, 2008). This historically rooted concept of the inferiority of Māori in a predominantly Pākehā world endured, adding moral impetus to the notion of British rule. Any agitation against marginalisation was viewed with disfavour from a powerful Pākehā system backed by might, a situation set to continue to the present day (Thomas, 1993). This notwithstanding, many Māori challenged marginalisation. Since the 1960s, a resurgence of Māori culture and cultural identity has occurred, with Māori leaders citing the Treaty principles in a call for self-determination, re-emphasis on Māori language and culture, and recompense for past injustices (McCreanor, 1993a), a cry which still resonates with Māori today.

This cry from Māori has been met with rebuttal from Pākehā. A rhetorical device used to achieve this has been the discourse of intermarriage, in which it is argued that by the late 20th century there were no full blooded Māori in Aotearoa NZ (Glynn, 1998) and therefore there are no ‘real’ Māori to compensate. This discourse functioned to construct all protest on behalf of ‘Māori’ (including racism) as invalid (McCreanor, 1989). In Aotearoa NZ, approximately half of Māori with partners currently have non-Māori partners (Callister, Didham, & Potter, 2007), and therefore the question arises as to who ‘Māori’ and ‘Pākehā’ actually are, and how they are defined.

**Definition of ‘Māori’ and ‘Pākehā’**

Directly translated the word ‘Māori’ means normal, native or the indigenous people of Aotearoa NZ (Moorfield, 2005). Such traditional genealogical definition however, does not speak to self-identity. Aware of the high degree of inter-marriage, Statistics New Zealand (2005) therefore declared ethnicity to be a self-perceived measure of cultural affiliation, rather than a declaration of ancestry; people who had little or no Māori ancestry could claim to be Māori, or conversely, if of Māori descent, could claim to be another ethnicity (Statistics New Zealand, 2005). In the 2013 Census, of those who identified as Māori, roughly half also identified with other ethnicities, and half gave Māori as their only ethnicity (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a). Such a definition did not need to tackle DNA, genotype, phenotypical features, or degrees of embeddedness in Western or Māori culture, or the heterogeneity cited in *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* (Durie et al.,
However in other instances government departments defined Māori according to ancestry, for example regarding Māori health. Statutory or legal bodies also, when deciding allocations of funds, required ancestry (Jackson, 2003). The definition of Māori could therefore be said to be contextually fluid.

Pākehā translated refers to non-Māori of any ethnicity, and is generally used to indicate a New Zealander of European descent (Moorfield, 2005; Williams, 2000). King (1985) referred to the word Pākehā as indicating a mainstream of Aotearoa NZ’s heritage, a people who have some degree of awareness of Māori, but whose culture is not Māori, have no other nationality or country as a homeland, and therefore have a strong sense of belonging to Aotearoa NZ. Spoonley (1991, 1995) emphasised the notion that people who chose to call themselves Pākehā also tended to acknowledge Māori Treaty claims and the effects of colonisation. This was born out in a study by Sibley, Houkamau and Hoverd (2011) who found New Zealanders who preferred to be known as “Pākehā,” expressed more positive attitudes toward Māori than those who chose the terms New Zealand European, New Zealander, or Kiwi. However throughout the current study, the word Pākehā has been used without political intent, simply in its directly translated form to indicate a person of predominantly European descent. The word tauiwi, although favoured by some researchers (McCreanor & Nairn, 2002b) has not been used as it translates as strange tribe or foreign race (Williams, 2000), which is not what Pākehā now feel themselves to be.
Reflexivity: what does ‘Pākehā’ mean to me?

Even as I disavow political intent, and reaffirm myself as a researcher intent on understanding and honouring participants’ talk, I remind myself that my conceptual viewpoint is specific to my culture, social status and history (Gavey, 1989). What does ‘Pākehā’ mean to me? And does this definition influence my analysis? Why do I choose to call myself ‘Pākehā’ and what are the options? I am uncomfortable with the term White because it does seem to be associated with racism. So why not European New Zealander, because my parents were English and Scottish. Born here, I grew up trying to rid myself of my ‘different’ accent, and I assumed that when I one day met my unknown relatives they would knowingly pronounce me one of them. But when as an adult I finally made the trip to England, I found I wasn’t English at all, my cultural expectations and my New Zealand accent were what they resoundingly called Kiwi. Not only that, but at a distance I felt increased recognition of, pride and identity with, ‘my’ country, which included Māoridom, because it made my nation uniquely different to all other countries. As Michael King (1985) put it, I knew I didn’t belong anywhere but here. I conclude now, that calling myself Pākehā not only indicates my understanding of te reo, but may be indicative of the fact that I will deliberately seek to understand the Māori viewpoint in this analysis because I recognise, value and respect that integral part of Aotearoa NZ, indigenous Māori.

Racism and the law

As well as the census definitions, the laws on racism were also redefined. Historically, laws made between the mid-19th and mid-20th century had disadvantaged Māori in the areas of land possession, employment and suffrage (Ballara, 1986; Yensen, 1989). By the late 1950s, notices stating ‘Māori need not apply’ for accommodation or employment were still common (Hilliard, 1960). In the 1960s, change came about as international civil rights movements worked to challenge racism and the laws which enabled its continuance. Under international law, the term ‘Racial Discrimination’ was newly defined as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race,
colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life” (United Nations 1965, Part 1, Article 1, Para. 1). Aotearoa NZ followed this lead by passing the Race Relations Act 1971 (Human Rights Commission, 2006) the New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990 (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2013a) , and the Human Rights Act 1993 (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2013b). Under these laws, racism and discrimination, ethnic slurs, and the inciting of racial disharmony, were prohibited. If the person instigating discriminatory activities claimed to be unaware of their actions, the views of the person targeted would be privileged (Human Rights Commission, 2006). The Treaty of Waitangi was cited as a legally binding charter for bicultural equality, and a resource by which to counter discrimination, especially in the area of government and decision making (Glynn, 1998). Legitimate avenues were established for putting forward suggestions for improvement in race relations, and institutions advised of these. Blatant or quantifiable racism therefore became disallowed and unfashionable in Aotearoa NZ in the latter half of the 20th century. Some however alleged that it had not disappeared overnight, but merely gone underground.

Racism denied and hidden

Cormack (2006) commented that for most Pākehā New Zealanders, racism was an unpopular word which was understood to relate to countries such as the United States, and if it had happened at all in Aotearoa NZ this was in the distant past, certainly not today. When former Prime Minister Helen Clark described Aotearoa NZ as “deeply racist” (McKellen, 2010, para. 1), this provoked public denial from Pākehā, but agreement from Māori academics. When former All Black Andy Haden suggested that the Crusaders rugby franchise was racist and had only recruited “three darkies” (NZPA, 2010, para.1) there was public condemnation of the use of the ethnic slur ‘darkie’, but more importantly, denial of the insinuation that racism was happening in sporting selection processes in Aotearoa NZ. Alongside this, self-reported racism from Māori showed that they were almost ten times more likely to experience racial discrimination in three or more settings than were Pākehā participants (4.5% versus 0.5%) and had the highest prevalence of experiencing racial discrimination compared to all other ethnic groups (Harris et al 2006a, 2006b). Widespread denial of racism against Māori
however, in both overt and subtle forms (Lyons et al., 2011) gave rise to an important question regarding the current research: was the investigation of reported racism to be an analysis of constructions of imagined prejudice? Or was there valid scientific evidence to substantiate the claims? In the next section, without descent into quantiphrenia, the documented effects associated with racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ are reviewed.

The impact of racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ

Those who blame Māori for their negative positioning in society frequently point to the disproportionate representation of Māori in custodial sentencing figures, and deduce criminal tendencies in Māori (Trotter, 2008b). Approximately one seventh of the population are Māori, yet half of all prison inmates are Māori (Statistics New Zealand 2009). The United Nations Committee Report on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination however ignored genetic rhetoric, underscoring instead the need to recognise racial bias within the Aotearoa NZ justice system (United Nations CERD, 2007, C.21). Studies showed that Māori were initially more likely to be apprehended by police (Fergusson, Horwood, & Lynskey, 1993) partly because the public were more likely to regard Māori as suspicious and report them. Once charged, Māori were two to five times more likely to be convicted than non-Māori (Fergusson, 2003; Fergusson, Swain-Campbell, & Horwood, 2003a, 2003b). These findings included statistical controls for socio-economic status (SES), education qualifications, gender, and offending history. Māori youth were more likely to face the youth court than a family group conference (Maxwell et al., 2004), and Māori of all ages were found to have less access to legal advice and representation (New Zealand Law Commission, 2004). Some of the far reaching and marginalising results for incarcerated Māori were reduced employment following a criminal record (Robson et al, 2007).

Institutional racism also limits levels of opportunity in employment (Reid & Robson, 2007) and was linked to the disproportional finding that two thirds of Māori youth were unemployed at the end of 2009 (Tan, 2010). Māori were found to be underpaid, and Pākehā overpaid, in various corresponding occupational classes; Māori were also under-represented in executive, management and higher earning positions (Sutherland & Alexander, 2002). This was attributed to an example of institutional racism, in which
Pākehā executives encouraged Māori to remain in manual jobs, or advise on Māori culture, rather than rise to equal or above Pākehā (Trotter, 2008a). The higher percentage (per population group) of Pākehā in executive roles, also allowed increased hiring of Pākehā over Māori in higher paid positions, and a generalised job discrimination based on race (Robson, 2008).

The subsequently lower socio-economic status of Māori was reflected in the fact that in 2013, 28.2% of Māori owned their own home, compared to nearly 56.8% of Pākehā (Statistics New Zealand, 2014), a factor exacerbated by discrimination against Māori in renting and mortgage lending (Harris et al. 2006a; Robson, Cormack & Cram, 2007). Forty percent of Māori families, compared to 19% of Pākehā, lived with financial hardship in 2004 (Jensen et al. 2006), a trend which continued. On average from 2011 to 2013, around 34% of Māori children lived in what Statistics New Zealand (2014) defined as ‘poor’ households, more than double the rate for Pākehā children, which was 16%.

Racial disparities in educational outcomes showed in an achievement gap demonstrated by the smaller percentage of Māori gaining formal qualifications (Maxim Institute, 2006). Such outcomes were linked to lowered socio-economic status and also institutionalised policies and pedagogical practice, in particular lowered teacher expectation for Māori (Hynds et al, 2011). An example of institutional racism was Māori secondary students being found to be granted early-leave exemption more readily than non- Māori (13% to 5%) (Robson et al., 2007). Lowered teacher expectation was attributed partly to lack of cultural understanding (Hynds et al, 2011) and also a racist discourse of lesser intelligence. This was fuelled by empirical results from Binet’s psychometric model, despite its being cited as lacking validity for ethnic minorities (Armour-Thomas, 2003). Such unfounded pseudo-scientific racist assumptions, surprising in educated personnel, were also found in the field of mental health.

Māori mental health in every area was found to be considerably lower than that of Pākehā, particularly in the area of anxiety disorders (Baxter, Kingi, Tapsell, & Durie 2006). In 2012, Māori had an age-standardised suicide rate of 1.78 times the non-Māori rate, and a Māori youth suicide rate of 2.8 times the non-Māori youth rate. Māori youth were also significantly less likely to access the health care they required (Clark et
Epidemiologists cited the Human Rights Commission (2004), who stated that racism could lower self-esteem and cause health problems. They also noted that in Aotearoa NZ, Māori reported more discrimination than other ethnic groups, and lower levels of self-esteem (Ward, 2006). Studies of indigenous people in other colonised countries revealed similar data, with racism cited as a cause of ongoing emotional distress, and the main risk factor for depression in all minority ethnic groups (Saez-Santiago & Bernal, 2003).

Grave concern regarding treatment methods was voiced by Johnstone & Read (2000) whose survey showed that ‘nearly one-third of New Zealand born male psychiatrists and well over half of New Zealand born male psychiatrists with 10 or more years experience believed that Māori were more biologically or genetically predisposed to ‘madness’ than others’ (p.143). Other analysts suggested that cultural institutionalised racism was an emerging contributor to mental ill health, in the form of a wilful ignorance to comprehend that many Māori found Pākehā treatments untherapeutic (Cram & McCreanor, 1993). They claimed that Pākehā clinicians were academically trained (Tutua-Nathan 1989) from textbooks scripted in the UK or the USA (Durie 1985) with no understanding of Māori perspectives (Tutua-Nathan 1989). Pākehā also ignored the fact that medication was seen as a one-sided reductionist avoidance of the holistic Māori approach (Durie 1985); Pākehā mental health goals of individual self-actualization and being able to stand alone were also undesirable for Māori, who aimed for connectedness or paiheretia. The seemingly egalitarian proposal that everyone was a New Zealander and entitled to equal treatment (Black & Huygens, 2007) in practise meant that everyone would be treated according to the understandings of a Pākehā psychological service. Māori responded by being less likely to access the Europeanised mental health care system than Pākehā (Clark et al, 2008).

Dominant groups tend to normalise their culture within society (Black & Huygens, 2007) and in Aotearoa NZ this led to the establishment of a normative, Europeanised culture. Within this ontology, Pākehā arts, values, habits, social actions and ways of thinking are expected to be adopted to the exclusion of those of the Māori culture. Te Hiwi (2008) described this process as a painful chronic illness passed to her by her mother, who had with difficulty, consciously rejected all Māori culture for Pākehā culture. One of the many impacts of cultural racism was examined by Bennett (2002)
who found that for Māori students, positive Māori identity moderated the effect of student problems on academic success, but among those with low cultural identity, student problems were associated with decreases in grade point averages.

The place where Māori might expect not to be troubled by cultural differences, the sports field, was found instead to be the scene of pejorative positioning. Texts of sports commentators were found to include discourses in which Māori sportsmen were constructed as succeeding due to their physicality, but Pākehā through their intelligence (Hokowhitu, 2003; Hyde, 1993; Matheson, 2001). Laidlaw (2010) a popular sports writer, described Polynesians in physical terms, “explosive energy” (p. 166) “lightning fast” “sidestepping” “loose” (p. 168) and the Pākehā in terms of mental strength and leadership “tight” “hardened” “pragmatic” (p. 168) “marshalled by a dictatorial Pākehā” (p. 166). He wrote that Māori and Pacific Islanders tended to be instinctive players, but that every team needed players who could plan, and named Pākehā examples. Laidlaw then used an American friend to say “The thinking guys in any football team are all white. This ain’t prejudice. We have the stats to prove it” (p. 167) to which Laidlaw replied not with denial, but “we don’t much like talking about these kind of differences in New Zealand” (p. 167). Such attitudes were alleged to have their roots in colonialism (Hokowhitu, 2004) which provided an ongoing discourse of the Māori warrior as naturally physical rather than intelligent. Racism is therefore evident on the sports field, even though it is regarded as a place to reduce stress and increase physical health.

The lower standard of Māori physical health was also attributed to racism (Ministry of Health, 2002a) for a number of reasons. Indirectly, it was strongly attributed to lower socio-economic status, itself the result of institutionalised racism (Harris et al., 2006a, 2006b). In another example of systemic racism, Māori were found to receive fewer referrals and diagnostic tests, and to have less access to medical care and treatment plans (Walker et al., 2008). In the same study it was noted that some health professionals tended to linguistically construct Māori in racist ways to colleagues and that some health workers made differential assumptions about Māori and treated Māori inadequately. Māori internalised the racism, and came to expect and accept lesser treatment (Walker et al, 2008).
However, other analysts looked at the chronic stress caused by ongoing daily racism. Studies showed that even indirect instances of racism affected the cardiovascular system (Clark & Hill, 2009) and that the chronic stress produced by ongoing self-perceived racism, was a cause of essential hypertension, a leading cause of cardiovascular disease (CVD) (Specialist Medical Review Council, 2002). The Māori mortality rate for CVD was more than two and a half times than that of Pākehā (Ministry of Health, 2006). Chronic stress was also blamed for the breakdown of the immune system which would otherwise help prevent cancer and infections (Hubbard & Workman, 1998). For Māori, rates of stomach cancer mortality were three times higher (Ministry of Health, 2006) rheumatic fever notifications five times higher, and the pneumonia rate three times higher than that of Pākehā (Chambers et al., 2006). Chronic stress was also cited as causing chronic elevations of glucocorticoid levels thought to damage the hippocampus and/or lead to insulin antagonism and diabetes (Hubbard and Workman, 1998). Prevalence of diabetes among Māori was found to be three times higher than that of Pākehā (Ministry of Health, 2002b). Psychosocial chronic stress had also been linked to increased asthma (Reading, 2004), with Māori twice as likely as non-Māori to be hospitalised for asthma (Ministry of Health, 2006). The gap in physical health for Māori was therefore theorised to be in part stemming from chronic stress, brought on by self-perceived ongoing daily racism.

All the effects of racism detailed above are interactive, each in turn multiplying the effects of racism as it impinges on another area. This is depicted in Figure 1. The impact of racism on Māori in a specific field is indicated by the horizontal arrows from the left. The arrows moving away perpendicularly from these indicate the other areas implicated and impacted. For example, in the area of justice, racism has an immediate and direct effect in that (as shown) Māori are more likely to be sentenced and incarcerated for the same crime, than non-Māori. An arrow leads from this line to mental health. This is because imprisonment will detrimentally affect their mental health, as well as which, 50-80% of inmates on entering Aotearoa NZ prisons will be diagnosed with an inflexible Axis 2 disorder, Antisocial Personality Disorder (Ogloff, 2006), which will remain on their medical record and affect the way they are treated by health professionals following release. Their record will reduce their employment chances, which will in turn reduce their income and lower their socio-economic status. Due to the expense of private lawyers, there will then be little chance of their reviewing
their sentence, which means the situation will continue. Lowered socio-economic status will mean they receive inadequate housing in less favourable neighbourhoods, find fewer educational options available to them, and experience reduced health (Harris et al, 2006a).

Figure 1: The interactive effects of racism against Māori

Summary

In summary, it can be seen that racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ has been extant since it ‘stepped ashore’ (McCreanor, 1997) with British colonists. Racism has since been legislated against and become unfashionable and denied, with the consequence that although overt racism is not easily apparent, subtle racism persists and leads to a lowered standard of wellbeing for Māori in all areas of life. The challenge of how to study such racism is considered next.
Chapter Two

Studying racism: A chronological review

Introduction

In order to gain some idea of how to study racism in Aotearoa NZ, and choose an appropriate epistemology, it was considered valuable to look at the ways psychologists and researchers in other Western countries have studied racism. This chapter begins by defining the words which will be used throughout: race, racism, ethnicity, and prejudice. It then takes a chronological look at the development of analytical methods used for studying racism, which evolve from early essentialism through to contemporary discursive and thematic analysis (TA) informed by social constructionism.

Linguistic semantics: Defining key terms

Race and ethnicity

Central to a study on the causes and effects of racism, are the words race and ethnicity, which are often used interchangeably, as are the terms racism and prejudice. Race, a term first used in the 16th century, indicated a group of people of common descent and language. By the end of the 18th century and during the Age of Enlightenment, when a more rational, scientific approach was being explored, biologists began to position humans in the same type of classification system used for plants and animals (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). The result was that physical characteristics and hereditary factors were used to define tribes or races. This continued into the 19th century, when under the influence of Darwin’s evolutionary theories, race became a specific means of classifying all humans (Banakar, 2007). This theory of ‘race’ was scientifically discredited in the 1930s (Richards, 1997), but remained the erroneous criteria used to promote the supposed superiority of ‘White races’ such as Hitler’s Aryans (Proctor, 1988). Following World War Two, an acknowledgement of the social and cultural construction of ‘race’ and the dynamics of group interaction led to a preference for the
term ‘ethnicity’ (Banakar, 2007), although a belief in race as lineage continued as a pseudo-biological concept by which people could be assigned to phenotypically similar groups assumed to share moral and intellectual traits (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Social constructionists of the late 20th century posited that the term ‘race’ could no longer be used indexically as a purely essentialist biological construct. It would instead represent a continually re-negotiated dynamic, an ethnic group identity situationally constructed within changing social boundaries (Nagel 1994). Statistics New Zealand (2005) also chose ethnicity over race, defining it as a self perceived measure of cultural affiliation to a community which shared interests, feelings and actions, and possibly ancestry. This meant that race increasingly referred to culture rather than biological or genetic influences. The ensuing lack of consensus on how to distinguish ethnic groups led to an interchangeable use of the terms race and ethnicity, despite the former term’s biological exclusivity, and the cultural distinctiveness of the latter (Pearson, 1996).

Prejudice and racism

Prejudice has been defined as referring to an individual’s irrational negative orientation towards a person who is a member of another group. It is a pejorative term alongside discrimination, because of the negative consequences it can engender. Racism however is the belief of one party that their racial or ethnic group is better than another (Bhopal, 2006), and, as scholars have argued, involves the systematic implementation of societal group power against the target of the racism (Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001). The United Nations also declares the paradoxical inclusiveness of the concepts of ethnicity and race by defining the word ‘racism’ as any discrimination based on race, colour, lineage, nationality or ethnic origin (United Nations, 1965, art. 1). In this study, the term racism is generally used in a broad sense to describe prejudice and discrimination, as depicted in any of the types of racism detailed in the following sections of this chapter, whether group or interpersonal racism.

Targets and victims

The target person is defined and positioned as the intended victim of perpetrator attacks, who experiences the need for self-preservation and defence. Following an attack, they are exceptionally well motivated to assess the contextualised episode in detail, and carefully analyse the motivation of those holding prejudiced beliefs (Swim & Stangor,
1998). Although at times victimised, the term victim is too limiting; they are the targets of perpetrators, but also intelligent and informed defenders whose information is academically vital. The word target is used throughout the study.

Black and White

The words ‘Black’ and ‘White’ have been described as binary opposites used to imply power imbalances (Hall, 1997) but they and the word ‘Brown’ have been used here only when quoting other authors’ or participants’ data, and must be taken in that context.

The progression of a psychological aetiology: Character, cognition, and categorisation.

There is a rich historical progression of ground-breaking studies on racism. In the early 1900s, individual level theories dominated by the Freudian psychodynamic tradition purported that all behaviours, including racism, were intra-psychically determined, with individuals displacing unresolved personal but unconscious aggression onto certain groups. These theories were dominant from the 1930s to the 1960s (Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001), decades in which psychoanalysis and the discovery of what were believed to be universal essential truths, occupied the field of psychology. In the 1940s and the 1950s, blatant and criminal expressions of racism, in particular the atrocities of Hitler’s regime, prompted wide scale investigative etiological studies. Lewin (1936), provided divergence away from purely essentialist theories by suggesting that both nature and nurture shaped the individual, in his famous heuristic equation for behaviour \[ B = f(P,E) \]; or, behaviour is the function of a person’s personality and their environment rather than simply personality and past experience alone. In 1946, he established a ‘change' experiment, a forerunner of sensitivity training, to challenge racial prejudice. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford, (1950) hypothesised that extreme prejudice was due to measurable personality traits, in particular authoritarianism. Sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, their Berkeley studies provided psychometric tools with which to predict personalities with potentially Fascist tendencies. Scales were developed to measure antisemitism, political-economic conservativism, and in particular authoritarianism, the F-Scale (Adorno, 1950). These works and others relating to essentialism and context provided input to the studies of Allport (1954/1979), who in 1954 offered his seminal work The Nature of Prejudice.
Allport continued the focus on personality and cognition, and widened the field by investigating a broad range of contributory factors. He founded the cognitive approach, which proposed that it was unavoidable for the human mind to think without categorisation, a theory later used to understand social justification within an in-group. His work on personality and emotions constructed guilt as enabling people to turn away from racism in order to achieve psychic peace. Like Lewin, Allport acknowledged the importance of situational factors, but went beyond this to include broader zeitgeists such as the power of religious and cultural differences, historical racism, and prevailing competition for resources. He challenged biological concepts relating to race and superiority, and the notion that such perceived differences were necessarily threatening. Allport constructed racism on a scale of one to five, in which antilocution was positioned as a first step, social exclusion or avoidance as the second, discrimination the third, physical attack the fourth, and genocide a fifth and most extreme example of racism. Allport’s psychodynamic explanation of genocide as scape-goating due to maladjusted ego-defence mechanisms did not endure, and his definition of racism as an antipathy emerging from erroneous generalisation has also been criticised (Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005). Much of his classic work however, in particular his contact hypothesis, in which racism is reduced by social contact between dominant and marginalised groups who come to perceive common interests and humanity, remained and was built on. Moving into the then unknown area of social constructionism he also acknowledged the power of words, for example disparaging ethnonyms, to hold cognitions and construct a negative reality.

Tajfel (1978) agreed with Allport’s cognitive categorization theory, and challenged the premise that unusually strong individual personality factors such as Adorno’s authoritarianism, determined prejudice, for example, in the mass support once given to Hitler and his anti-Semitic views. His Social Identity experiments (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) showed that people had an innate ability to establish themselves as members of an in-group, even when this was randomly assigned, in such a way that underscored its positive traits, enhanced identity and self-esteem, and encouraged bias or prejudice against the out-group. Pettigrew (1979) proposed the Ultimate Attribution Error, by which people would make the cognitive mistake of automatically attributing negative behaviours by an out-group member to their personality. They would then generalise
this supposedly innate characteristic of personality to the entire out-group, fostering a belief in a genetic disposition or propensity.

The essentialist belief in the power of personality traits over context, was returned to by Altemeyer (1981) who built on Adorno’s studies and developed the concept of racism as a product of Right-Wing Authoritarianism. Sidanius and Pratto (2001) proposed another personality trait: Social Dominance Orientation, assessed with a psychological scale. This measure was thought to be an important indicator of prejudice, as it predicted peoples’ beliefs about group dominance, by asking such questions as, did the participant feel that some groups were inferior to others? Sidanius and Pratto theorised that both temperament and socialization contributed to Social Dominance Orientation (2001).

In contrast to ‘dominative racism’ or the blatant acting out of racist beliefs, aversive racism represented a less obvious example of racism, in which individuals who professed to be egalitarian and non-racist would nevertheless make powerful choices which favoured the in-group and restricted the out-group. Dovidio and Gaertner (2007) showed how a pro-White in-group bias was subtly advantaging the dominant culture. Aversive racists, when faced with job applicants, would choose in favour of the applicant more suited for the position when there was a clear disparity in ability. However when it was less marked, they would choose the White applicant. Such persons’ genuine desire and self-expectation to be non-racist was complicated by unconscious racism. Aversive racists also experienced social unease and anxiety when interacting with Blacks, and therefore practiced avoidance of this out-group (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2007). The function of such racism was to invisibly increase the power of the dominant White majority, a consequence not unnoticed by scholars who had already cited the importance of the theories of Foucault in relation to racism, power, and society.

**Foucault. Power paradigms and prevailing privilege: A controlling context.**

Miles (1989) and Spoonley (1988) explored the concept that racism was actually less about personality and more about a macro perspective of materialism and selfishness, economics and the power to control them. A dominant ethnic group would use its
power to maintain control of economic resources, by means of institutional or systemic racism embedded in structures of power. Cultural racism would be effected by institutionalisation of the monocultural norms of the dominant group. Both would facilitate continued marginalisation of ethnicities socially constructed as ‘lower’. Successful societal power overall would mask or distract from systemic racism. The means by which the power relations that maintain such benefits might be constructed, and the resistance possible at a micro-level, were explained in part by the study of Foucault’s notions of societal racism.

Foucault (2006) as a Eurocentric, had little to say about colonialism per se, but a great deal to offer on power in society, and how racism was a part of this power. He introduced a new concept of prejudice ‘state racism’. He contended that society must be preserved and defended, and that state racism occurred when an ethnicity was considered a threat to society’s status quo. In such a case they might be discriminated against for the ‘better good’ in terms of having their opportunities restricted through institutional racism. The extreme ‘turning in’ of Jews under Hitler would be self-legitimised by neighbours, as a means to make life better for society as a whole. Such biopower was the state’s power over life, defined as the ability to nurture life, or to disadvantage it, even to death. According to Foucault, modern states exercise their biopower by administrating life rather than death. The health care advantages of belonging to a wealthier dominant group, superior treatment through health institutions, and the accompanying increase in life expectancy, would be an example of this in a modern society (Foucault, 1979).

In these examples of biopower, racism would appear to be functioning at a macro-level. However Foucault also described an interleaved prejudice reaching to a micro-level, an over-arching racism carried on by individuals invisibly and more importantly, without and even in the absence of, actual controls. For racism to function in this way would require society to take on as normal and beneficial the concept of one race being dominant, and others being positioned as inferior and less deserving. Citizens of the dominant group would then monitor societal procedures which instigated and maintained the status quo, for example through ethnic preference in hiring and firing, or through assumptions of lesser ability in the marginalised. The marginalised group
would internalise racism as a norm and choose from the lesser positionings offered by society in order to benefit as a member of the status quo.

A contemporary example of this reproduction of the status quo could be seen in Aotearoa NZ, when a billboard advertisement based its humour on a derogatory use of the Māori prefix, whaka, in which the letters wh are pronounced as an f. In an example of cultural racism manifesting in institutions, the Māori Language Commission complaints were not upheld by the Pākehā Advertising Standards Authority. Pākehā individuals unwittingly reflected Foucault’s interleaved state racism by verbally objecting to the Māori protest, with one suggesting that the reaction by Māori should be delegitimised because they represented a small portion of the population, and their expressed feelings were a threat to Aotearoa NZ society’s structure. “This country has got out of hand when something this funny has been found offensive by a minority” (Anonymous, 2008, para. 9).

The focus of Foucauldian analysis was on the marginalised as well as the dominant majority, and supported challenging the status quo where appropriate. Foucault’s focus was on the constructive power of language as it related to social structure, subject positions, speaking rights, agency and empowerment. It was primarily macro in orientation in that it required attention to the influence of political power and broad societal structures. Prevailing discourses were then analysed to explore how at both a macro and micro level they were tied to social arrangements which supported and maintained powerful groups. The discourses were seen to have a normative role in recreating a societal structure, and to be regulatory in function (Foucault, 2002). Exactly how language was used to enact societal racism would become increasingly examined under the microscope of future analysts working from a social constructionist epistemology.

**Positivist problems**

Foucault’s construction of state racism as an interleaved, self-regulating systemic process maintained and reproduced at a micro-level by individuals, was obviated in discriminatory employment practices and openly racist interpersonal comments such as ethnic slurs. However laws against racism (United Nations, 1965) and an accompanying
move away from what became considered ‘old fashioned’ overt racism found racism evolving and reappearing in new, modern, subtle forms (Pettigrew & Meertens, 2001) which were equally powerful, but defied quantification. Arguments justifying a negative positioning of another ethnicity were being constructed delicately, in a linguistically sophisticated rhetoric which avoided the appearance and accountability of racism. Kinder and Sears’ (1985) coined the term ‘subtle racism’ to describe the coherent set of beliefs in which modern day Blacks were rhetorically constructed as receiving little or no discrimination, their lack of progress self-inflicted, and any demands for positive discrimination unwarranted. Grounded in expressed beliefs in individualism and ‘responsible’ self-reliance, this modern version of racism was socially acceptable despite its systemic blindness (Tuffin, 2008). Positive and negative opinions about the out-group could be freely expressed and apparently justified (Katz & Hass 1988) using neo-liberal arguments devoid of references to ethnicity. The rhetoric included economic rationalism (Tuffin, Morgan, Frewin, & Jardine, 2000) in which affirmative action for the marginalised was constructed as not only discriminatory but also detrimental for society (Augoustinos, Tuffin, & Every 2005).

Such subtlety and deniability rendered racism unquantifiable in a positivist epistemology. Scales such as The Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) were developed to measure what was posited as personality traits producing these modern, varied, and complex racist feelings, but were criticised for allegedly measuring other factors such as political conservatism (Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986). Other empirical tests were unable to quantify the contradictory ambivalence and variability of racism (Tuffin, 2008). By the latter decades of the 20th and the early years of the 21st centuries, none of the psychometrics developed to test individuals’ racism were without challenge to their validity and adequacy, and a general disillusionment with positivist methods led to a demand for other modes of research. Analysts such as Roets, Van Hiel and Cornelis (2006) postulated that materialism and selfishness were important variables that had been excluded in scientific findings. Bernal, Trimble, Burlew and Leong (2002) challenged the entire premise that the findings of any psychometrics could be universal and more specifically, that racism itself could be measured as a personality trait. Post positivists regarded all knowledge as theory laden; Jahoda (Jahoda, 1988) had already accused those promoting textbooks which claimed to have discovered universal truth without providing grounds for belief, of *suggestio falsi*, or fraudulent falsehood. The
science based, empirical methodology practised in European and American social psychology was alleged to contain cultural perspectives indicative of an ethnocentric fallacy which flawed the entire debate regarding prejudice and racism. This belief relocated the field of enquiry to those working outside a purely scientific ontology, social and critical psychologists informed by a new philosophical paradigm, social constructionism.

Social constructionist solutions

To social constructionists, truth was not universal but relative, and racism was informed not by essential traits but by conflations of history and social change. While positivists continued to construct individuals as possessing a fixed measurable attitude across timeless universal situations, social constructionists were focussing on the influence of social practices and contemporary ideologies, expressed and actioned in language. Rather than the endogenic product of the intra-psychic, racism was being constructed as exogenic, a continually re-negotiated dynamic, situationally constructed in language, and changing with the cultural, economic and political landscape of the time (Augoustinos, Walker, & Donaghue, 2006; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). To understand such racism required an analytic system which looked closely at the language used to express racism, the discourses and themes inherent in rhetoric, and the racist actions and structures they supported.

Discursive divergence and discoveries

Discourse analysis began at a time when racism was still being defined as an essential mental state and/or a cognitive process (Wodak & Reisigl, 2001). In an early form of the thematic analysis of language, Quasthoff (1973) instead looked for categorisable themes in everyday argumentation, distinguishing between attitudes, convictions and prejudices. VanDjik (1991) at first used the socio-cognitive approach, exploring the reproduction of mutual social representation among group members. Echoing Tajfel (1978) he established discursively that racist or prejudiced talk was often an attempt at positive self-representation and identity. His discursive analysis of media text demonstrated how it influenced social cognition and reproduced societal power structures and racism in the Netherlands, the United States and Great Britain. Barker
(1981) underscored the need for a move away from a positivist study of prejudice by documenting what he termed the ‘new’ covert and deniable modern racism which he found concealed in the talk and text of people within political circles.

Jäger and the “Duisburg group” of Germany, drew on Foucauldian concepts linking power and discourse, and elements of Van Dijk’s socio cognitive theory (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). Continuing the focus on perpetrator language, they researched media and group constructions of the ethnic ‘other’ with an emphasis on ‘collective symbols’ or linguistic stereotypes or metaphors such as ‘nigger’ used to form what they termed ‘discourse strands’. Their research was motivated by the 1992 racial violence following unification and stricter immigration laws. Their analyses were exclusively linked to power, to the extent that if the discourse proceeded from a group which was not in power, the utterance was not classed as racist (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001).

In England the ‘Loughborough group’ including Wetherell and Potter (1988, 1992) embraced the social constructionist tenet that language was never neutral, but a dynamic field in which meanings were constructed or deconstructed and social structures and positions established or challenged. They refuted socio-cognitive approaches such as social identity theory, and van Dijk’s definition of the role of discourse as the interplay between social cognition and group interaction (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983), citing an absence of social theory. They posited instead that racism was a changing social process constituted by and constructed in talk and text (Wodak & Reisigl, 2001). Like the Duisburg group they regarded racism as inextricably context dependent. However their focus on narrative argumentation and justification rather than the linguistic symbols used by Jager and the Duisburg group, aligned them more with Billig (1988) who asserted that the language of racism was an example of ideological effects, neither static nor uniform but variable and even contradictory, with ambiguity and denial an important part of rhetorical construction. The Loughborough group also acknowledged that linguistic resources could be employed differently depending on the rhetorical requirements of the situation. It was therefore important to identify and understand the cultural resources used, to theorise the linguistic patterns employed, and explain the wider social implication of the active discourses. Three key features of their analytic method were the exploration of the construction of the rhetoric, its function in terms of the action orientation of language, and the purpose of variability. Their work could be
said to focus more on the themes of ‘light’ social constructionism, a ‘bottom up’
examination of micro features of text and talk and its influence, rather than ‘dark’ social
constructionism, examining broad interpretations from the top down and aiming to
challenge the status quo, again following the inspiration of post structural theorists such
as Foucault (Tuffin, 2005). Critical analysts working more under the latter influence
included those such as Fairclough (2003), Van Dijk (1987) and Wodak and Reisigl
(2001) who studied the discourses which contributed to maintaining power structures.
Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) seminal discursive work on racism in New Zealand is
looked at in the next chapter.

Social constructionism and thematic analysis

At the same time, social constructionism was also being used to inform another form of
critical analysis, thematic analysis. This was a similarly data driven but more organic
analytic method whereby themes and patterns in talk and text could be critically
explored, at a micro or macro-level. The constructive role of language could be
attended to in terms of its function within specific power structures or social context, for
example its deployment to recreate or resist, and organisations or patterns of meaning
underpinning the use of language could be explored. Thematic analysis could therefore
employ the philosophical mores of existing constructionist critical analysis in a method
which required rigorous familiarisation with and examination of data-sets, recursive
data coding, and theme development (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

From such analyses, the latent themes and their analysis produced findings in some
ways analogous to those explored through discursive analyses, for example in relation
to power imbalances and cultural racism. They also provided the advantageous leverage
of being considered easier to disseminate. When the European Union Agency for
Fundamental Rights was required to provide the Member States with expertise on
fundamental rights including incidents of racism, published conclusions in the form of
thematic reports were specifically requested (European Union Agency for Fundamental
Rights, 2013). These laid out findings on hate speech and inter-cultural dialogue, and
included consideration of socio-political context in each discussion and
recommendation. These requirements for attention to language use and power issues
are part of critical discursive analytic considerations, and informed by social
constructionism, but the findings were required by the governmental agency to be presented in thematic rather than discursive form, which thematic analysis enabled. In the academic field, researchers also found success working with TA, and used the method to cite results understandable to those not familiar with discourse analysis. In the United States, for example, one study cited eleven themes in an analysis of racism subtly implied in nursing textbooks (Byrne, 2001). Another analysed in depth interviews with five African American educators and unpacked seven themes in context (Jay, 2009).

Movement away from the use of discourse analysis into other qualitative methods, particularly thematic analysis, was found to be primarily employed where research was being conducted into targets’, rather than perpetrators’ views and experiences. An example of this is the analysis of targets’ accounts collated and reviewed by Brondolo et al. (2009) and a collection of works on the target’s perspective provided by Swim and Stangor (1998). In Australia, Aboriginal Australians’ accounts of racism experiences and responses were thematically analysed by Mellor (2003). Other Australian examples of the use of thematic analysis to study racism described by participants who were targets of racism commonly included attending to the socio political context (Watt, 1999) and how systemic power and agency interacted and the targets responded (Ziersch, Gallaher, Baum, & Bentley, 2011). The thematic methodology was also found useful for identifying and itemising specific themes and sub themes around targets’ responses (Mellor 2003, 2004). These and other studies are looked at in more detail in Chapter Three.

Summary

In summary, this chapter on analytical methods for the study of racism has focused entirely on groundbreaking Western trends in research, as they moved from psychoanalysis and personality traits, into cognition and categorization and group psychology, then to less positivist areas such as systemic and cultural racism. Foucault’s state racism, and modern racism’s changing face from overt to subtle, were examined alongside postmodern social constructionism which underpins discourse analysis and can be used to inform thematic analysis. In the next chapter, the focus is on studies of
racism against the indigenous people of Australia and Aotearoa NZ, and the analytical methods employed within these contexts.
Chapter Three

Studies of racism in Australasia

Introduction

This chapter first looks at Connell’s (2007) division of socio-psychological research into Southern and Western paradigms. In the Southern philosophy analyses informed by social constructionism feature rather than positivist experimental studies, and Kaupapa Māori is explored as an outstanding and prominent example of a Southern methodology. This is followed by examples of the work of discursive researchers in Aotearoa NZ as they take up the challenge to understand racism against Māori and the influence of local context and culture in its maintenance and reproduction. The overwhelming majority of these studies are shown to analyse perpetrator talk and text rather than targets’ perspectives, and a gap in the scholarly literature is identified. This gap informs the rationale leading to the current study, the aims of which are then presented.

Western or Southern?

The analysis of Western studies and epistemologies in the previous chapter included an exegesis of the historical progression of methodology from a reductive social science based on psychoanalysis through group psychology, to Foucault’s power and politics, and the postmodern contextual awareness inspired by social constructionism. As a Western nation, Aotearoa NZ can be considered as situated within and influenced by these understandings. Connell (2007) however provides an interesting and slightly divergent construction. She groups then defines theoretical research areas in broad geographical terms ‘Northern’ and ‘Southern’. ‘Northern’ theory is considered Eurocentric, the product of European and Northern American scholarship, and still hallmarked by enduring positivist abstract theory aimed at producing simulated universal findings. Historical contexts such as colonialism and power imbalances are regarded as irrelevant. ‘Southern’ theory focusses on social experience, context and positioning, and requires researchers to synthesise a unique blend of political, historical,
psychological, social, cultural, and economic understandings. It is marginalised by Northern theory, which enjoys the privilege of claiming scientific irrefutability. Connell’s (2007) alternative perspective re-positions Aotearoa NZ researchers away from European and Northern American scholarship, instead aligning them with social psychologists who have explored the results of economic and cultural dominance in Africa, India, Latin America, and Australia. Australia, a close neighbour with some historic similarities, offers race theorists such as Mellor (2003, 2004) who provides qualitative thematic analyses of indigenous targets’ responses, and Augoustinos and Every (2005) discursive analysts informed by social constructionism. Connell’s (2007) view positions Aotearoa NZ alongside Australian rather than European researchers, which adds an intriguing facet when investigating the methodology chosen by Aotearoa NZ researchers in this field. Work by discursive analysts informed by social constructionism are examined in this chapter. Another ‘Southern’ aspect lies in the attention and credence give by social psychologists and researchers to an alternative Aotearoa NZ indigenous epistemology in which knowledge is gained through using Māori methods, or Kaupapa Māori. The support for the use of this alternative and decolonising methodology is inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi which affirms equal citizenship between Māori and Pākehā, thus providing a basis for Māori to critically analyse existing methodologies and challenge them if they are not fruitful, harmonious, or acknowledging and respecting the dual importance of the bicultural setting.

Kaupapa Māori

Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1990) is credited with initially identifying six main principles of Kaupapa Māori research methods which actively work to decolonise research frameworks set up under the auspices of Western thought and assumption. The first of these is Tino Rangatiratanga, in which the goal is to allow Māori to determine and control their own destiny and culture in all matters, including research. Māori must at least have access to formulating, assessing and approving the study, and to control of the results. The second is Taonga Tuku Iho, or the principle of cultural aspiration. This legitimises the inclusion of Māori language, culture, customs, spiritual awareness and knowledge in the research process. In the third principle, Āko Māori, the emphasis is on acknowledging research methods that are inherent, unique, and preferred by or
essential to Māori, for example, face to face or group interviews rather than anonymous tick box schedules.

The fourth principle  *Kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga,* or socio-economic mediation, establishes that the research must be of benefit to Māori people, and acknowledges the importance of Māori involvement. It negates historical precedents in which research typically compared Māori unfavourably with European Pākehā and Western culture while ignoring negative contextual factors affecting Māori and arising out of colonization (Cram, 1997). The fifth principle of *Whānau,* or extended family structure, decolonizes by challenging a tendency in Western research to isolate participants from other people who are part of the also often neglected context. *Whānau* acknowledges an essential intrinsic factor woven throughout Māori society and culture, the importance of relationships, not only between extended family members but also those in groups (Metge, 1995) and that formed between researcher, the researched, and the research itself. The researcher is required to recognize, respect and nurture all these relationships. *Āta,* or the principle of growing respectful relationships, was described by Pohatu (2004) as focussing on building relationships by understanding reciprocity, giving energy to planning, to establishing safe boundaries and spaces, to being respectful, reflexive, and disciplined. In the sixth principle, *Kaupapa,* again the Western notion of one person working alone is quashed. This principle of collective philosophy encompasses the meaning of collective purpose and collective vision, and goes beyond the supposedly finite limit of the topic of research to include the aspirations of the Māori community; the research must contribute to the overall knowledge.

*Kaupapa* Māori research has also been specifically aligned with critical theory (Pihama, 2001) as a common theme in analyses is the examination of unequal power relations and the concealing of oppression, with an emphasis on positive social change. It is highly esteemed as appropriate for and germane to all research relating to Māori, and has also been widely used in critical social psychology studies involving Māori (Cram, 1993, 1997; Kerr, Penney, Moewaka Barnes & McCreanor, 2010; Pihama, 2001). Its principles are observed and noted throughout the methodology of this study.
Southern discursive studies

Discursive analysts in Australia and Aotearoa NZ used their methodology to explore the function and power of language as employed by the majority group in media, talk and text. It was found that specific linguistic patterns were being used to establish social positioning and to reinforce the status quo of a colonial power structure.

In Australia, discursive analysts in the tradition of Wetherell and Potter (1992) examined subtle modern day constructions of racism against Aboriginal Australians, with attention to a context of historical colonisation, violence against Aboriginals and ongoing marginalisation (Riggs & Augoustinos, 2005). Augoustinos, Tuffin and Rapley (1999) found a divisive linguistic strategy which also privileged the majority culture: only Aboriginals who had succeeded financially while adopting the standards of the dominant European culture were constructed favorably (Augoustinos, Tuffin, & Sale, 1999). The analysis of every day talk regarding Aboriginal people provided several linguistic resources: ‘Aboriginal plight’, for which Aboriginals were blamed in neoliberal rhetoric, and positive discrimination pronounced discriminatory (Augoustinos et al., 2005), ‘one Australia’ in which Aboriginal culture would be subsumed or discarded, and ‘history’ in which the colonial culture was constructed as advanced, and Indigenous culture as primitive and in need of assimilation. Wrongs committed in the process of colonisation were unable to be righted, and consequently they could be constructed as irrelevant in modern society. An exploration of the rhetoric of reconciliation (Riggs & Augoustinos, 2005) similarly pointed to euphemistic constructions of historical atrocities.

For social psychologists researching racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ, the historical and socio-political contexts form the basis for understanding, and provide the substructure for contemporary racist practices (McCreanor, 1997). This background includes the arrival of Pākehā settlers, and the seizing of Māori land. Māori culture, language, economics, systems of justice and social mores were overtaken and subsumed, annihilated or at best marginalised, by Europeans whose culture was markedly different and was to become powerfully established. Mitigating this, the Treaty of Waitangi promised equality and independence for Māori, and in 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal was established in an attempt to honour this and retrospectively
address historical grievances. For most New Zealanders, the Treaty symbolises the importance of Māori as a national entity and speaks to notions of biculturalism (Sibley & Liu, 2004); however, racist practices continue to challenge researchers in their responsibilities (Tuffin, 2008). This challenge was heightened by the development of modern, symbolic or subtle racism, in which racism was implied rather than overtly stated or enacted, and was therefore less easy to examine. A key strength of discursive research and other social constructionism research, is the ability to explore and identify the dynamics of talk and text which can recreate and perpetuate discriminatory themes while at the same time appearing non-racist and egalitarian (Tuffin, 2008), and these methodologies became prominently employed.

A seminal work conducted by Wetherell and Potter (1992), explored Pākehā talk and text concerning Māori. Their work was based on the premise that concepts such as nationhood, race and culture were not singular or universal, but subject to context, politics and history. They aimed to demonstrate that the descriptive methods used to form these constructions also had the power to create unique ontologies in which the related ideologies and social theory were justified and accepted. They examined data from Parliamentary proceedings, media, and interviews with 81 Pākehā, and analysed how and why Pākehā arranged their accounts, and what social system was being constructed by the action orientation of their language. They showed that despite the Treaty, Pākehā were continuing the political ideology of an agentic power structure established at settlement, by employing discourses which reproduced British colonial ideology and power inequality. They explored two main themes found in the fluid use of linguistic resources employed to subtly control these difficult areas.

In the first theme, they looked at how Pākehā were constructed as more worthy of rule, for example, by virtue of having a culture more suited to governance. Māori culture was constructed in two ways. One, it was presented as a valued historic heritage, a national treasure frozen in time, which pragmatically had little political relevance today. Two, it was constructed as a personal therapeutic tool by which anomic or troubled Māori might feel more grounded. In this culture therapy discourse, Māori were constructed as floundering weakly due to the loss of ancient cultural identity, which they needed to return to in order to function more positively. The function of these constructions was to underscore that Māori culture, being outdated, was obviously unsuited for present day
governance. This effectively rendered the notion of Māori nationhood a silent discourse (Tuffin, Praat, & Frewin, 2004).

In the second theme, they explored Pākehā discursive handling of the ‘prejudice problematic’, or, how to phrase discrimination deniably. In this form of modern, subtle or symbolic racism, the language used was devoid of obviously racist utterances, for example, it did not refer to ethnicity, or use the word Māori. Rhetoric was formulated using taken for granted discourses which were hard to fault; it included every day, rhetorically self-sufficient common sense phrases such as it would be unrealistic to turn back the clock, one must live in the present, we today cannot be blamed for past injustices. Neo-liberal rhetoric invoked notions of fair play, equal opportunity and individual responsibility. Aotearoa NZ was constructed as an egalitarian society in which all New Zealanders had an equal chance of succeeding, and structural racism did not exist. This cohesive set of socially acceptable beliefs drew not on racist declarations, but on recognised principles of individual freedom to choose and succeed, and responsible morality. Those who did not flourish in this system were innately or deliberately deficient, and therefore less deserving of power or ownership (Tuffin et al., 2000). This highlighted the lesser achievement of Māori, and promoted a reasonable sense of cultural superiority for Pākehā. Other argumentation reducing Māori right to rule included marginalisation framed as apparent praise, such as ‘To be able to sing well seems to be a general trait’. ‘It’s this innate shyness they’ve got’. Such constructions of Māori carefully underscored supposedly innate qualities which did not indicate leadership potential, but could also be approved, which sanctioned the speech as non-racist. Liu and Mills (2006) termed this Pākehā rhetoric ‘plausible deniability’. Agentic statements such as ‘The Māoris seem more advanced than the Aborigines’ implied that all indigenous people could be positioned as nonetheless still less evolved than Pākehā. The need for biculturalism was discounted in the togetherness discourse, in which the emphasis was on breaking down barriers, and living together as one people in peace. Implicitly, this required all New Zealanders to embrace Pākehā culture and values, and live willingly under Pākehā control. In this discourse, any Māori who objected were positioned as disturbers of peace and destroyers of goodwill throughout the country.

McCrenor (1997) also demonstrated that carefully ambiguous constructions of Māori as inferior had unapologetic beginnings in pioneer publications such as Wakefield’s
The British colonisation of New Zealand (1837). The term ‘savage’ was widely used to simultaneously construct Māori as both bestial and innocently or naively ignorant, predominantly physical rather than intellectual, bodily powerful but childlike. The deployment of the adjective ‘noble’ in the dualistic and contradictory descriptor ‘noble savage’ justified the term, and also implied that Māori would be open to ‘cultivation’ by the British. By this means some Māori would become Europeanised and improved. Pākehā constructed markers by which settlers could divide off ‘good’ Māori, those suitable for Europeanisation: honesty, cleanliness, European morality, and intelligence.

Nairn and McCreanor (1991) and McCreanor, (1993a) identified similarly functioning patterns continuing in contemporary Pākehā talk and text around Māori, which they drew together under the term ‘the standard story’, as in the dominant group’s commonly accepted ideological construction of Māori. This version of events, rhetorically strong and robust, and widely used, was largely unquestioned, to the extent that alternative stories would not be spoken or heard. McCreanor uncovered and collated commonly used examples of the rhetorical devices and showed how they were deployed to reproduce the status quo, an Aotearoa NZ society in which British colonial values had been established and privileged over Māori. His findings included the key point that Pākehā ideology had produced in the standard story a closed system of discourses and supporting rhetorical devices which not only self-sanctioned but also successfully defied alternative arguments. His research in the area (1989, 1993a, 1993b, 1997) identified a number of discourses, as shown below.

In the discourse which constructs Aotearoa NZ as ‘the world’s best model of race relations’ the current imbalance is seen as the result of a fair fight in the wars of the 19th century, in which Pākehā settlers displaced Māori in the same way Māori are said to have once displaced the Mori Ori. The Treaty of Waitangi, although symbolic of biculturalism, is a historical artefact bearing little relevance to the present day. Mutual respect between Māori and Pākehā since then has produced the harmonious and cooperative society New Zealanders enjoy and most Māori do not dwell in the past, but support this union for the common good. Those who do not, are needless ‘stirrers’ or inept socially, and have inherent negative character traits. McCreanor (1997) termed this discourse ‘good Māori and bad Māori’, echoing colonists’ early constructions. Bad Māori were innately violent, especially the males, had low moral standards, and were
dishonest. The function of this discourse was to pressure all Māori to be ‘good’ and fit into a Pākehā society. McCreanor also drew attention to the justification of the Europeanisation of Aotearoa NZ via the ‘Māori culture discourse’, in which Māori culture is depicted as primitive, and complex mōteatea, or ancient Māori poetry, ignored. Like Wetherell and Potter, McCreanor notes the advice of Pākehā that Māori use their culture for therapy, keeping it separate from political and social significance.

The one people discourse, similar to Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) togetherness repertoire, argues that all people in Aotearoa NZ are New Zealanders, and should be treated the same. This seemingly egalitarian rhetoric implies unity under an overall European system, and functions to condemn those claiming Māori rights. Within the one people discourse, any privileges or affirmative action for Māori are also logically considered racist and discriminatory (Augoustinos et al., 2005). Māori who challenge this discourse are constructed as creating racial disharmony.

Māori who allude to the Treaty, and the legality of Māori rights, are challenged to prove their biological claim to Māoridom; the phrase ‘there are few Māori left’ refers to the high rate of intermarriage in the country, and casts doubt on claims of Māori inheritance. Finally, Pākehā argue that if they offend Māori in any way, this is simply through ignorance of Māori culture, a discourse which functions to blame Māori for lack of information. In a discourse of sensitivity, the argument is closed by the notion that Māori are being over sensitive.

Researchers have given particular attention to the role of media in producing and reproducing these discourses, working from the standard story rather than challenging negative discourses (Lehrman, 2007; Nairn et al., 2006). They found Māori to be trivialised, vilified, and positive achievements under-represented, representations which supported a Pākehā right to dominance. The trivialisation and vilification also led to generalised erroneous assumptions among the public, such as, that Māori are physical rather than intellectual (Hokowhitu, 2004) or all young Māori have criminal tendencies (McGregor & Te Awa, 1996). The under-representation of positive Māori news increased the plausibility of such generalisations. A striking example of this was a media report of cancer research, in which a series of omissions allowed the Pākehā researcher to be shown positively, but equally important Māori researchers to be
sidelined (Rankine & McCreanor, 2004). Analysis of other media reports showed a challenging of the Treaty’s bicural principles (Tuffin et al., 2004) and a representation of Māori interests as the voice of a minority rather than a bicural Treaty partner (Barclay & Liu, 2003). The positioning of Māori as ‘other’ in public texts such as parliamentary speeches (Kendall, Tuffin, & Frewin, 2005) and other media reports (Hokowhitu, 2003) also was shown to undermine biculturalism and minimise Māori claims.

In the health sector, studies by Kerr, Penney, Moewaka Barnes & McCreanor (2010, 2011) detailed clinicians’ discourses regarding Māori patients. Health professionals were found to create barriers by using complex language to Māori patients and not explaining their decisions. They failed to appreciate the important supportive roles of whanau in information uptake, and chose to remain uninformed regarding cultural differences in a manner which could be categorised as discrimination or racism against Māori. Māori non-compliance or lack of response was constructed as ambivalence around health issues, fatalism, lack of long-term vision and even wilful self-destructiveness, thus attributing blame to the Māori patient. The impact of racism in this area was seen to create pathways to crucial repercussions for Māori in terms of morbidity rates and life expectancy.

The corpus of discursive studies focussing on talk and text in media and everyday life is a large body of work which informs on the power of everyday language when deployed to maintain colonial power structures and continue the marginalization of indigenous people. A smaller number of studies spotlights the impact of racism on indigenous people and Māori, and an even lesser number give results from studies in which targets are interviewed and their experience and meaning making validated, reflected on and represented in academic findings. The next section looks at studies in Australia and Aotearoa NZ in the area of impact, and personal experience and response.

**Southern studies of indigenous targets of racism: impact and response**

Australia, a close neighbour of Aotearoa NZ, has a contextually similar history of colonisation and continuing marginalisation of its Indigenous Aboriginal people, and the considerable inequalities that exist between Indigenous and non-Aboriginal
Australians, notably in the areas of education, employment, socio-economic status and health, are typical of indigenous people in other colonised countries worldwide (IDF, 2015). Of these areas, concern regarding health disparities has prompted the most research on the impact of racism to date. Aboriginal Australian males’ and females’ life expectancy is 10 and 12 years lower than non-Aboriginal Australians, their levels of mental distress and mental ill health significantly higher (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2009) and they also report experiencing a high prevalence of racism (Paradies, Harris & Anderson, 2008; Ziersch, Gallaher, Baum & Bentley, 2011). In one study concerning health disparities, Ziersch et al investigated the ways in which racism affected health and wellbeing for Aboriginal people living in an urban environment. In face-to-face interviews Aboriginal Australian participants were asked about their experience of and responses to racism, and their perception of the impact of this on their health. They responded by giving accounts of old-fashioned overt racism rather than subtle modern racism, and their reactions to these incidents. Using thematic analysis, a number of key elements were identified: emotional and physiological reactions, ignoring, minimising or avoiding racism, countering the effects with alcohol, tobacco or drugs, gaining support from social networks, and confrontation. A strong theme noted was participants’ determination not to allow the racism to affect their health.

Mellor (2003) and Paradies and Cunningham (2009) also noted that in contrast to the construction of modern racism as subtle, indigenous Aboriginal Australians described it as interpersonal, overt and offensive, with ethnophaulisms and obvious racist intent. Mellor (2003) argued that social scientists and researchers had assumed the subtlety of modern racism too quickly, and that this misconception may have been instrumental in camouflaging and preserving social institutions in which overt racism was still taking place. The notion of diminishing racism was attributed to political correctness which did not match the reality of the participants’ experience, and further study of targets’ perspectives was encouraged to investigate for example participants’ claims of, for example, overt examples such as police harassment and bias in sentencing.

Mellor (2004) encountered more accounts of overt racism in a study on psycho-social response, in which he thematically analysed semi structured interviews conducted with 34 Indigenous Aboriginal Australians. Three main response themes were demonstrated. The first broad theme or category was the defending of the self, with subthemes
including acceptance, avoidance, escape, the use of alcohol or drugs, reinterpretation of
events, and the use of support from friends and family. It also included denial of
Aboriginal markers, attempts to excel, and efforts to give their children the strength to
withstand racist incidents. The second main theme of controlled responses listed
subthemes of ignoring the perpetrator, suppressing urges to respond violently, and
imagining responses. In the third theme of confronting the racism, participants spoke of
asserting their rights and their Koori identity, contesting the racism and educating the
perpetrator. This involved taking control, using external authorities such as police where
this was possible, and less commonly, seeking revenge. The wide range of responses
contributed valuable understanding taken exclusively from the Aboriginal target’s
perspective.

In another Southern area (Connell, 2007) Merino, Mellor, Saiz, & Qilaqueo, (2009)
noted the dearth of research into the personal accounts of the indigenous Mapuche of
Chile, and conducted interviews which were later thematically analysed. It was found
that participants constructed racism as prevalent, historic and enduring and
psychologically wounding, producing shame, powerlessness, and anger, and some long
term negative effects. Their responses also followed three main themes in a similar
pattern to Mellor’s study with Aboriginal Australians (2004): self protection, self
control, and confrontation. Sub themes included ethnic pride and again similarly, the
use of positive support from within the Indigenous community to help combat the
impact of the racism.

In Aotearoa NZ, as in Australia, shocking and unjustifiable health disparities provoked
the most studies highlighting the negative influence of racism on health at many levels,
studies made more urgent because illogically, these disparities had become accepted
and expected by both Māori and Pākehā (Reid & Robson, 2000). In contextualizing the
health inequities it was found that racism was a key factor (Harris, Cormack & Stanley,
2013; Robson, & Harris, 2007). They found that ‘socially-assigned’ ethnicity, or how
non-Māori construct and classify Māori and ‘ethnic consciousness’ or how Māori
perceive and rate their ethnicity, were two themes identified as consistent with an
understanding of racism as a health determinant. Racism in its many forms and contexts
(systemic, interpersonal, media representation) was cited as ‘the cause of causes’ of ill
health (CSDH, 2007). Krieger’s (1999) pathways through which racism could
adversely effect health were cited (Kearns, Moewaka-Barnes & McCreanor, 2009), as relating to the marginalization integral to colonization: socio economic deprivation, social trauma, inadequate health care, and illegal or harmful substances, all resonated with the ongoing effects of marginalisation. The historical routes by which these factors became extant and negative impacts on health, were the pathways of belittlement or attempted destruction of Māori people, land use, culture, technology, resource management, politics, philosophical mores, human relations and spirituality during colonisation (Kearns, Moewaka-Barnes & McCreanor, 2009).

The resulting inequities in healthcare for Māori patients (McLeod et al, 2004) have been explained in studies which examine the current impacts of systemic, personally mediated and internalised racism against Māori patients in the Aotearoa NZ healthcare system (McCreanor & Nairn, 2002a). Māori were found to be nine times more likely than were non-Māori to experience discrimination in a wide range of health settings (Harris et al, 2006), and the of negative stereotyping of Māori by health professionals was particularly linked to disparate health outcomes for Māori (Johnstone & Read, 2000; McCreanor & Nairn, 2002b; Mcleod et al 2004). Jones, Crengle and McCreaon (2006) conducted a thematic analysis of individual interviews with a national sample of 66 Māori men, and analysed participants’ in-depth life-story accounts which underscored the existence of racism and discrimination in both institutional and interpersonal healthcare settings. Dr Fiona Cram, a Māori researcher from with Ngāti Kahungungu affiliations conducted a thematic analysis of 28 Māori women aged 17 to 75 (Cram, Smith & Johnstone, 2003) using Kaupapa Māori methods, and found that participants’ experience of Pākehā doctors was often negative. Cultural ignorance or misunderstanding by the doctor often led to a lack of rapport or communication between doctor and patient, for example, where doctors were unaware of the barrier of whakamā (shame, embarrassment) being compounded by lack of rapport, and resulting in patients not being able to visit the doctor or explain their symptoms. Some participants perceived that there was no cultural awareness by the doctors of the need for the Kaupapa Māori principle of Āta, or to grow respectful relationships while treating the patient. Neither was there any understanding of the importance of the spiritual side, or wairua, to healing from a holistic Māori perspective. Miscommunication and lack of cultural understanding was therefore shown to lead to negative experiences for Māori (Johnstone & Read, 2000).
The influence of racism however affects all areas of life and its impacts compound with the interaction (see Figure 1: The interactive effects of racism). Studies have been conducted of many of the facets of racism against Māori, for example the existence of Pākehā prejudice (Ballara, 1986), the negative stereotyping of Māori (Hook, 2009), the impact of racism on mental and physical health (Nairn et al., 2006), bias in the justice system (Workman, 2011), in education (Bennet, 2002) and the compromising of Māori identity (Te Hiwi, 2008). The majority of these and other studies have however been conducted from the perspective of an observer and the results in most cases reflect the ideas of non-Māori. For some researchers, it has become essential therefore to scrutinize carefully instead the accounts of Māori targets in order to learn their insights on everyday racism encountered in daily activities and challenges. Such studies are rare, possibly because Pākehā researchers are perceived by Māori to be uninterested or averse to Māori perspectives. This theory is supported by a study by Hippolite (2010) who interviewed 10 Māori sportspeople regarding their micro-level experiences of racism, and in which they revealed that they felt they were being treated as second class citizens. Her study title ‘speaking the unspoken’ expressed that her participants were providing knowledge that was currently being silenced or ignored. Following are two examples of far reaching studies which aimed to encompass Māori accounts of their ongoing, everyday experiences and response in Aotearoa NZ.

Webber, McKinley, and Hattie (2013) conducted a mixed-method study with 695 Year 9 Auckland students aged 13-14, of whom 66 were Māori. The aim was to explore feelings of self-identification, connectedness, and other aspects of the students’ racial-ethnic-identities, for example, how this was connected to perceived racism. The study employed Phinney and Ong’s (2007) revised multi-dimensional ethnic identity model (MEIM-R), Oyserman, Gant, & Ager’s (1995) tripartite interactive model (TIM), and two open-ended response items in which participants were asked to name respectively two things they did and two things they did not like about their own ethnic group. The results showed that 62% reported overt mockery and negative stereotyping from perpetrators, the latter typically being assumptions of lower intelligence, lower educational ability and gang or criminal association. The participants were highly aware also of negative stereotyping of Māori in media and their local school communities. Possibly as a result of this observance if daily racism, only 22%
answered that they felt a sense of pride or status in being Māori, and only 26% indicated that self-categorising as Māori gave them a positive sense of belonging.

Moewaka Barnes, Taiapa, Borell, and McCreanor (2013) employed a methodology more aligned with Kaupapa Māori, in which open ended questions allowed a holistic response from participants in group settings. Nineteen Māori were interviewed in three focus groups. Group 1 consisted of six females and 1 male aged 25-30 from a tertiary environment in a city, group 2 four females and two males aged 20-30 from a small urban centre, and Group 3 two females and four males aged 25-35, from a provincial town. The thematic and discursive analyses used found four primary levels of impact: internalised racism, interpersonal racism, institutional racism and societal racism. A disturbing subtheme of internalised racism was negative role fulfilment, in which Māori ‘took on board’ constant negative stereotypes of Māori as unsuccessful in work or education and likely to turn to crime, developed their own sense of inferiority and relinquished opportunities for higher education or to succeed. For some, anxiety caused by internalisation was coupled with coping by avoidance or the sacrifice of Māori cultural markers to Pākehā cultural norms. The theme of interpersonal or personally mediated racism included subthemes of discrimination and Māori response to surveillance. The participants talked of discrimination in terms of being excluded, treated unfairly, or disrespected. Being followed unnecessarily by security staff in a store who wrongly and irritatingly interpreted their phenotypically Māori presentation as a need for close personal surveillance against shoplifting was commonly described, as was excessive police surveillance. Such over-surveillance was also perceived to have a negative effect on the participant’s sense of health and wellbeing. A subtheme of both institutional racism and societal racism was media representations, in which negative stories of Māori were not only dwelt on in the media, but exaggerated and extended beyond the original facts. The power of the media to influence public opinion against Māori, for example by focussing on crime and avoiding mention of positive Māori achievements, was clearly stated by participants. The racism created and recreated by media was a particularly strong theme uncovered in the analysis, amplified by participants who explained the on-going effects of the negative stereotyping which emerged in society and resulted in unwarranted surveillance and interpersonal racism. Overall, noted effects of anxiety, anger, underachievement and reduced sense of health
and wellbeing exemplified and illustrated the concerns the participants raised regarding racism they had experienced.

In all of these studies, despite modern perpetrator studies of talk and text pointing to the subtle and deniable nature of modern racism, participants instead cited the continuing existence of overt or offensive racism, or stereotyping which was unmistakable and derogatory. The question arises as to whether modern subtle racism is actually extant (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). However, the racism defined as ‘subtle’ and ‘modern’ is cited as commonly occurring where Pākehā converse with other Pākehā and wished to make discriminatory and marginalizing statements without appearing to be racist (Tuffin, 2013). For this reason it is possible that the Māori participants have not been privy to it. Some subtle racism in media was however noted by participants, with regard to a lack of mentioning positive news and a focus on negative items.

**Conclusions**

Discursive researchers have shown that racism against Māori has not disappeared from everyday Pākehā talk and text, but is instead present in acceptable rhetoric which involves a standard story made of self-clinching arguments utilising everyday common sense phrases supporting an ideology of Pākehā dominance. It constructs a general but durable picture of Aotearoa NZ as primarily White and mono-lingual (Lyons et al., 2011) and effects between Pākehā the agreed maintenance and reproduction of a colonial power imbalance. These conclusions are based on analyses of perpetrator talk and text, findings by Pākehā researchers on the talk and text of the dominant majority, Pākehā, and they provide valuable insights into perpetrator discourse and action. Alongside this, a smaller corpus of qualitative research has brought to light the diverse negative effects of racism covering a broad field from an observer’s perspective and highlighting the psycho-social impact of racism. In contrast, only a very small number of studies have examined Māori targets’ micro-level response and insights into racism in everyday life.
Highlighting the gap

Lyotard (1979) coined the term ‘grand narrative’, to indicate an overarching story in which historical and other events were connected to construct a broad social picture. His objection was that one such narrative excluded another, however much another group’s considered master narrative had as much right to be heard. In the ‘grand narrative’ of race talk in Aotearoa NZ the perspectives of the targets themselves remains largely overlooked or ignored. It has been suggested that concentration on perpetrator studies and inattention to targets’ accounts, has produced results divorced from the lived reality of the target (Feagin & Sikes, 1994). This gives rise to questions such as ‘do the targets of modern racism perceive it to be subtle, nonspecific and invisible?’ However the limited number of studies in this area strongly indicate a gap in the literature in which there is a comparative lack of exploration into the accounts of the Māori.

There is also an almost non-existent exploration into the accounts of non-Māori partners of the targets of racism. Yancey (2007) interviewed 21 White partners of Afro-Americans, and found they were able to construct from experience and their therefore embodied understanding, accounts of racism observed close at hand. Their partnered position meant that racism previously unknown to them as Whites had been ‘forcefully thrust into their lives’ (p.208). Yancey also found that White women partners provided more accounts than White European men, possibly because their gender in the interracial partnership led them to experience more racism than White men. Also, the women in his study were generally more active in the role of child care and therefore more aware of racism directed against their children. In Aotearoa NZ, where nearly half of Māori have non-Māori partners (Callister et al., 2007) yet their perspectives have not been studied. There would seem to be a need for the perspectives of the Māori targets and their partners to be acknowledged and included in academic understanding through examination and analysis.

Rationale

The rationale for this research is therefore primarily informed by the current gap in the literature, with regards to: what do the Māori targets of racism and their Pākehā partners say, and how does this compliment, challenge, or resonate with current understandings?
This study will aim to explore personal responses, and in addition, ask the targets how they understand and account for the racism, and whether there is a solution or a way to reduce it. It is hoped their perspectives can bring new insights to these areas.

The academic rationale is also supported by the ideology represented in Aotearoa NZ law, and the Code of Ethics For Psychologists Working in Aotearoa NZ (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002). The Treaty of Waitangi, the Race Relations Act 1971 and the Human Rights Act 1993 (Human Rights Commission, 2006), affirm that racism against Māori is an undesirable and destructive abhorrence which should be investigated and challenged. This aligns with the professional concerns of psychologists and those researching in this field, who are informed by The Code of Ethics For Psychologists Working in Aotearoa NZ, 2002. This Code honours the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis of mutual and equal respect between Māori and Pākehā (Sec 1.3), and states that equal dignity and respect are due to all because of their common humanity. Researchers and psychologists are ethically bound to use professional expertise to seek out and prevent or correct practices that are discriminatory (Sec 1.2.1) and to advocate for change where society does not respect the dignity of peoples (Sec 4.2). I position myself as an anti-racist academic working in the field of social psychology informed by these principles, and seeking to fulfil the professional responsibilities suggested by these documents.

Aims

The research aims were to listen to Māori accounts of racist incidents, explore their responses, understand how they accounted for racism, and learn how they constructed solutions. In informal language, these aims can be summed up as trying to discover what, why, and where to; in essence participants were being queried on these three points. What happened and what did you do in response? Why do you think it happened? Where do you think we go to from here?

A. General aim: To explore accounts of racism experienced or witnessed by Māori adults and the Pākeha partners of Māori.

Specific aims:
To understand clearly the racism in the situations described.
To understand the setting it occurred in.
To investigate the consequences of specific instances of racism.

B. General aim: To learn how participants account for racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ.

Specific aims:
To learn what participants believed was happening in each situation, both at a macro and a micro-level, in terms of power and subject positioning
To learn if participants believe the perpetrator was aware of what was happening.

C. General aim: To research participants’ recommendations for positive change, and discover solutions or means of reducing racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ.

Specific aims:
In each of the situations listed, to clearly understand participant insight as to what could and should be changed to eliminate or reduce racism.

Summary

This chapter has outlined current studies on racism in Aotearoa NZ, which have been largely studies of perpetrator text and talk. The gap in this literature has been identified, and the rationale and aims given for the current study. In the next chapter, the need to decide on an epistemology and analytical method which meet all ethical and cultural requirements is detailed.
Chapter Four

An ethical methodology

Introduction

In a project involving Pākehā and Māori, particular attention must be paid to cultural requirements and responsibilities. This included considering an appropriate choice of epistemology and methodology, attending to the University’s ethical principles which are informed by the Treaty of Waitangi, obtaining approval and cooperation from the local marae, and incorporating respect for cultural issues. These concerns were never separated from the project, but instead became inextricably integrated in all areas of the methodology, and are described in this chapter. They are followed and accompanied by details of the recruitment, data gathering, and analytic method.

Affirming epistemology and managing methodology

The choice of epistemology raised both methodological and ethical questions. A traditional positivist, empirically based, scientific epistemology suggests individuals worldwide have a universal, timeless, stable and measurable set of essential characteristics and attitudes which function regardless of macro-institutional and micro social influences. From a social constructionist perspective, however, knowledge is not neutral or timeless (Burr, 2005), and many contextual factors such as history, politics, and culture provide a rich backdrop for the changing construction of targets’ perspectives. Racism itself is not universally static, but a changing ideology, a syncretism, a hybrid compositum of political leanings, societal discourses, personal reasoning and stereotypical beliefs. Targets’ responses variously constructed in language can vary and possibly be quite different to what is assumed by the majority group, being a product of their own unique, complex ontology and experience. A social constructionist approach allows the freedom to explore targets’ views and contexts without insisting on uniformity and enables a focus on the action orientation of language employed as people discuss their lived realities. This approach includes the opportunity to identify attributions of blame or justification, positionings constructed by
the target, the use of a range of societal discourses and themes, and the exploring of understanding how these non-neutral, subjective factors work together to produce responses and coping unique to the speaker. In particular, it allows consideration of Foucault’s power theories with relation to societal racism (Foucault, 2006) which as an unofficial discourse of the state is unspokenly maintained both systemically and interpersonally. This is often overlooked, as there is an assumption that because Aotearoa NZ is a democracy, there is no imbalance of power (Hippolite, 2010). The richer and broader approach of social constructionism therefore allows the analysis to move beyond the face value of the target’s response.

Another advantage to a social constructionist epistemology is that within it, subjectively self-perceived racism does not need the reification of a ‘one fits all’ clinical definition before it can be worthy of study. Constructions are considered valid, legitimate and credible within and relative to the speaker’s ontology. In a positivist empiricist paradigm, the Māori target’s racism would be defined by the Pākehā researcher whose standpoint and perspectives could be strikingly different. Their mainstream definitions imposed on the participant would provide a clear example of the invalidating postmodernist theory that scientific research does not discover reality, but also creates it (Riger, 1992). Such positivist methods, including Likert scales and restrictive tick boxes, provide quantifiable data for algorithms but can invisibilise serious issues which may not have been allowed for being outside of the experience of the researcher designing the psychometric measures. Within interviews also, the process of deductive ‘top down’ scientific categorisation has been argued against by critical psychologists warning that epistemic partiality occurs when privileged researchers question, disregard, explain, and construct a reality different from that experienced by the participant (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988). Many Māori are aware of this possibility through the historic error of Pākehā researchers whose privileged theoretical approaches have abnormallyised the indigenous population by comparing Māori data against Pākehā standardised norms (Gavala & Taitimu, 2007) or discredited the Māori perspective (Black & Huygens, 2007). The current researcher’s aims instead specifically involve exploring the views of Māori participants and their partners, in order to respect, accentuate and highlight their unique understandings as ‘expert knowers’.
Dual analyses: employing discursive and thematic analysis

Social Constructionism was therefore chosen as the epistemology, and two methodologies deployed within its framework, discourse analysis and thematic analysis, which share many aspects (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Both of these have the advantage of allowing representation of the participant’s own experiences and perceptions (Luborsky, 1994) and in depth analysis of the action orientation of language (Braun & Clarke, 2006, Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Both employ an inductive ‘bottom up’ data driven approach rather than being theoretical, deductive, top down and analyst driven in orientation. Both go beyond the semantic or explicit level of the data to explore latent themes and underlying ideas, constructions, or discourses.

Discourse analysis in the tradition of Potter and Wetherell with a critical approach which drew also from Parker (1992, 2007) was chosen to provide a sophisticated analysis of constructions of the reasons for racism affecting the lives of Māori and their partners. This would enable the study of its relationship to human factors as well as to the broader issues of power, history and politics. The discourses could also be explored and compared to those found by discursive analysts exploring the same philosophical dynamics in Pākehā talk and text.

Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) informed by social constructionism was chosen as the qualitative method best suited to examine targets’ accounts of how they made sense of their experiences and constructed their reasonings and responses. Clear and accessible themes would be provided, in a similar manner to other studies on targets’ responses (Mellor, 2003). This was in keeping with much of the previous research, where discourse analysis was commonly employed to uncover discourses in perpetrator talk and text (e.g., McCreanor, 1997; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) and qualitative thematic analysis used for the analysis of targets’ responses (for a review, see Brondolo et al, 2009). While guided by the same epistemological principles as discourse analysis, these examples show applied psychology being used to provide results which can be directly related to practical application, and therefore this is the method adopted in the two chapters in this study, on the practicalities of resisting and reducing racism. A more fine grained analysis of the language is required in the chapter
which theorises the participants’ accounting for racism, and here discursive analysis is employed to analyse their interviews in greater depth.

**Observing the Treaty of Waitangi and aligning with Kaupapa Māori**

As a Pākehā and a non-Māori, I cannot claim the Kaupapa Māori approach as my own. However I acknowledge it as a highly respected Southern achievement in terms of research methodology, and the only one uniquely and pertinently suited to research involving Māori in Aotearoa NZ. Therefore many aspects of its methods and principles as outlined in the previous chapter are threaded throughout this study, as are the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The research was conducted according to the principles detailed in the Code of Ethical Conduct (Massey University, 2013), which has particular regard for the principles of the Treaty. These requirements include that the researcher work together with *iwi* and Māori communities (Section 2:3a) and that Māori are involved in the design and control of the project (Section 2:3b). The proposal therefore was a consultative process, which aligns it also with Kaupapa Māori principles of Māori interaction and collaboration. I first talked the concept over with Māori *Kaiwhakamana* (elders) from Prison Fellowship New Zealand, whom I worked alongside with for many years. Over a period of several months we chatted occasionally on researching racism against Māori by interviewing Māori rather than Pākehā. They were excited by the idea, volunteered opinion that most Pākehā had little knowledge about the subject, and expressed wholehearted approval and sanction. The proposal was then considered with Dr Simon Bennett, a Māori clinical psychologist from the School of Psychology at Massey Wellington, who acted as cultural adviser. He approved the proposal, with the proviso of involvement with the local *marae*, which I was happy to facilitate. After the proposal had been approved by the Massey University Ethics Committee, I took it to a *Kaiwhakamana*, who was also a close friend, and she organised a shared lunch with a friend of hers who was a Māori representative from the local *marae*, Takapuwahia. I chose this *marae* because it was in my friend’s locality, and because it was near to where I had grown up and attended school. Over a *kanohi ki te kanohi* (face to face) lunch I was introduced to her friend, who reviewed the information sheet (Appendix A). She recognised Dr Simon Bennett’s name, asked further questions, then immediately offered full cooperation and to obtain
participants. She took the proposal back to the marae, where it was approved by the elders there. It can be seen therefore that the research incorporated principles of Kaupapa Māori from its beginnings: Māori advice and decision makings were sought (tino rangatiratanga), the consultations were face to face and involved time, food and friendship (āko Māori), the research was for the benefit of Māori people (kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga, and the results fed back to the participants and through them, the marae (kaupapa).

**Issues of trust**

Historically, hegemonic Pākehā bias in research has given Māori a distrust of and a reluctance to work with Pākehā researchers whom they suspect work only to under-gird the status quo of domination and marginalisation (Comrie & Kupa, 1998), for example, by constructing Māori as deficient or abnormal when compared with the Pākehā population (Smith, 1992). Pākehā denial of racism against Māori increases the likelihood of non-disclosure; Hippolite (2008), notes that when she asked the Māori participants in her study if they could tell Pākehā their experiences of discrimination, ‘they all spoke at once, “No, no.”’ (p.113). Being able to establish trust is therefore considered even more important than the researcher’s bicultural skills (Hepi & Foote, 2007). Accordingly, trust between the Pākehā researcher and potential participants was considered a central issue, one that could only be settled person to person.

In research with Māori, transparency and *kanohi ki te kanohi* or “face to face” communication is preferred over remoteness, promises or paperwork. I was able to draw on fourteen years’ working as a volunteer on chaplaincy teams in the Wellington Prisons and on the mutual trust and respect developed with Māori fellow workers and *Kaiwhakamana*. This also aligned me with the Kaupapa Māori principles of whānau, or good relationships. I had simultaneously completed a B.A. in Māori studies, and this knowledge together with that I had learned from my Māori fellow workers over many years of interaction and meetings, some on maraes, allowed me to later apply the Kaupapa Māori principle of āko Māori, or using research methods which would be preferred by Māori. Most participants in this study knew each other through Māori connections and the auspices of Prison Fellowship New Zealand. We had already formed a whānau, a family not by kin but nonetheless an ‘assembly of people of like
mind and interests gathered for the common purpose’ where values such as ‘aroha, love, mutual support, cooperation and unity’ and ‘solidarity’ (Metge, 1995, pp. 55-56) were stressed. The study topic was discussed with fellow workers at its inception, who gave ideas in informal collaboration, and some voluntarily expressed interest in participating. Later, their recommendation to other potential participants established my credibility.

Recruitment, rights, and confidentiality

Potential participants were given an information sheet (Appendix A), and in keeping with transparency, a copy of the interview schedule (Appendix B). For the purpose of specifying the aims of the study, the language used in the interview schedule was academically precise, e.g. Take time to consider this in the settings mentioned below, the settings then itemised. Instead of reading these questions aloud from the schedule with neutral formality which would have distanced the participant, to avoid the impression of epistemic privilege or agentic positioning, and in line with kaupapa Māori principles, I instead talked informally in everyday language in a collaborative fashion about the three main areas we were seeking their wisdom on. What happened, why did it happen, where do we go to from here, is there a solution? I underscored the open ended nature of these three main issues. At this time the project itself was also discussed, the importance of their perspectives underscored, any questions answered, and their rights explained. The kaumatua (elder) distributed information sheets to those who were being recruited through the marae. All participants were offered a further meeting at which further questions could be answered before giving consent. They were then given time to assess the research and confer with others, before being contacted again. At this point if they were still agreeable to taking part, they were given the consent form to sign (Appendix C), and another chance to have questions answered. Before signing the confidentiality agreement (Appendix D) participants were assured that I would make every effort possible to maintain confidentiality. The data would be viewed only by myself and my supervisors, and real names would be replaced with pseudonyms chosen by the participant before the interview. All identifiers such as names, place of work, and dates, would be edited out, and digital recordings would be erased following sign off of transcripts (Appendix E). Participants were told they would
be sent a summary of the completed research and that the data would be used for the doctoral thesis, papers and conferences.

The importance of trust and *kanohi ki te kanohi* contact cannot be overestimated, both in facilitating recruitment and interviews. A summary of the main differences I noted, when comparing this recruitment of Māori and their partners to the recruitment of Pākehā for my Masters thesis, is shown in Table 1. These differences are also indicative of the alignment with Kaupapa Māori principles observed throughout the recruitment.

Table 1: **Differences in recruiting Māori and Pākehā participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pākehā</th>
<th>Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants didn’t need to know the researcher; a University sanction provided sufficient credibility</td>
<td>A need to know and trust the researcher/interviewer before agreeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to socialise not expected</td>
<td>Interviewer spent time talking and eating together with participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trust in the academic process</td>
<td>Mistrust of Pākehā research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher privilege expected and trusted within reason</td>
<td>Researcher privilege / hegemony suspected and discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation that academic research would benefit ‘society’</td>
<td>An earnest desire for the research to benefit the lives of all Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of participants

Participants were located in Wellington, the capital city of Aotearoa NZ. The Māori population for the wider Wellington region is 55,434, or 8.09% of the population of the region, 448,956 (Statistics New Zealand 2007b). Twenty four participants were approached, all agreed, and there was no attrition. Nineteen of these were Māori, 10 women and 9 men. Five were the non-Māori partners of Māori, all women. The occupations represented included teacher, communications manager, electricians, home maker, counsellor, bus driver, financial advisor, author, foreman, company director, cook, lecturer. Four participants were retired. The seven *Kaiwhakamana* worked at their cited occupations as well as their voluntary prison work. Ages ranged from 30 – 74
Reflexivity around representation:

As the project snowballed, it went against the grain to turn down people who eagerly volunteered their time after the twenty four participants had been interviewed. Their sincere desire to contribute to a study which would improve the lives of Māori people and the understanding between Māori and Pākehā, was arresting. However turning this over in my mind I realised my uncertainty was not based so much on their request, as my veering towards empirical quantiphrenia, in which greater participant numbers alone could be said to produce more ‘valid’ results. I had to remind myself that this was going to be an in depth exploration of interviews, in which I would be investigating what these twenty four people had to say about racism, and as they drew on everyday constructions, I could expect to hear many of the main themes and discourses repeated many times. Already, I was aware of ‘data saturation’ in the responses. After analysis, I found from the data that my participants did indeed affirm and overlay each others’ constructions, and with such quality that increased quantification was rendered, in this case, unimportant.

The interview procedure and cultural considerations

Interviews were conducted in a time and a place of the participant’s choosing. The interviews with the five marae participants were conducted in their homes which were a part of the marae community on Māori land. Of the non-marae participants, five interviews were conducted in the participants’ places of work outside working hours, and fourteen in their homes. Particular attention was paid to a key element in Kaupapa Māori, āko Māori or doing thing the Māori way. Traditionally when Māori gather to share insights and thoughts, warmth, equality, respect for Māori cultural norms and a humble attitude are valued accompaniments to the interchange of knowledge. The interviews began with awhi and/or hongi, and exchanging of greetings and news. Observing the Māori custom of tauutuutu (reciprocity), I provided a koha of food and
$30 petrol vouchers. I thanked the participants and underscored the importance of their participation, which could benefit Māori for generations to follow by throwing light on racism and discrimination. A karakia (prayer) was given at the start of the proceedings if desired. Participants chose their pseudonyms, and were informed they could at any time stop the interview, ask for the digital audio recorder to be turned off, or withdraw from the research. I went over the consent form (Appendix C) and the confidentiality agreement (Appendix D) and provided the opportunity for any further questions before beginning.

Participants had already seen the interview schedule (Appendix B) and its three sets of open ended questions as follows:

1. Can you recall a time when you felt you, or your whānau or friends were treated in a way that showed racism or discrimination, in any of the following settings? How did it affect you?
2. Why do you think the person acted this way? What was being established? Do you think they were aware of what was happening?
3. What is the solution? What changes are needed to bring about positive change for Aotearoa NZ?

There were also probes and follow up questions (Appendix B) to widen the possibilities of response, and these were covered as they fitted in with the flow of the interview. I had explained that the research would focus broadly on their knowledge and understanding of three main areas: 1. What happened and what did you do 2. why do you think it happened, and 3. Where do we go to from here, is there a solution?

I endeavoured to avoid the traditional researcher’s stance of neutrality and objectivity, instead encouraging disclosure by framing the questions in everyday language and agreeing, exhibiting belief in the racist accounts, and by showing emotions such as regret, shock or anger if accounts warranted this. I acknowledged the validity and perception of their accounts, and showed respect for the knowledge and mana of the participant. I had made a decision prior to the interviews to be led and inspired by the participants’ accounts and rhetoric, and to allow apparent deviation from the topic, even if I became so engaged as to forget the original question (Reinharz, 1992). The aim was
to open the boundaries of the discussion and allow what might not seem relevant to the question at hand to be included, as it could later prove relevant during analysis. Variation, diversity and ambiguity in response to the same question were welcomed, as is integral to the epistemology of discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

During the final part of the interview, the focus moved from the personal to general solutions and we concluded with a wind down of less intense interchange on current or related topics or family. I explained the transcription process, the need to sign off the transcript release form (Appendix E), and that I would email or post the transcripts to them. An opportunity was given for questions, and the meeting closed with a karakia if desired. Two participants thought of extra data they wanted to add some weeks after their interview, before transcriptions began, and were given another short interview.

There were clear differences in the ways in which the interviews were conducted for Pākehā in previous research, and Māori in this study, and these are noted in Table 2. Once again they align the methodology with key elements of Kaupapa Māori: āko Māori (doing things in a way that is inherently Māori) and taonga tuku iho (inclusion of Māori cultural mores and language).

Table 2: Differences in interviewing Māori and Pākehā participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pākehā</th>
<th>Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No physical contact</td>
<td>No physical contact</td>
<td><em>Awhi</em> before and after, and/or <em>hongi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English the only language used</td>
<td>English the only language used</td>
<td><em>Te reo</em> (Māori language) sometimes used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spiritual element</td>
<td>No spiritual element</td>
<td>Prayer sometimes expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food or drink not mandatory</td>
<td>Food or drink not mandatory</td>
<td>Food and drink required as part of Māori protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koha</strong> an accepted part of Massey procedure</td>
<td><strong>Koha</strong> indicated an understanding of the principle of <em>tauutuutu</em> (reciprocity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninterrupted setting</td>
<td>Mokopuna or relatives could arrive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisp timing; a limit</td>
<td>Time was not of the essence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom stopping tape</td>
<td>Often stopped tape to discuss personal issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers pinpointed; a ‘scientific’ response</td>
<td>Larger holistic response: “talking all around the world” “it’s about relationships”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Sometimes emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer not expected to offer comment</td>
<td>Interviewer’s empathy and opinion enquired about and expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quick sign off</td>
<td>Delay getting sign off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer could remain a ‘stranger’</td>
<td>The interview was the start of a relationship and a connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avoiding agentic control**

Agency is always implicit when people give accounts, and in interviews the interviewer is not without agency and can guide the direction of the interview by providing questions, comments and expression. Therefore I made a deliberate effort to avoid the agentic situation of participant marginalisation by a privileged interviewer (Riger, 1992). My aim was also to align myself as closely as possible with the Kaupapa Māori principle of *tino rangatiratanga*, or the preferring of Māori opinion above my own Western interpretations and ideas. This was done by dismantling any suggestion of
researcher power which might inhibit response (Gavey 1989): participants were assured that I was the student and they were the expert knowers, holding knowledge in their context and their opinions (in layman’s terms) would be privileged above my own and my supervisors’. Questions were open ended with no right or wrong or specified choice answers, and I validated their answers. I told them they would be able to not only review their transcripts but also to question my findings at any time to ensure that the intent of their talk had been honoured. In short the power remained with them throughout the project, as much as was feasible.

Risk of harm to participants

In Section 10.1 of the Code of Ethical Conduct (Massey University, 2013) stress is included under the descriptor ‘harm’. My intention was that being interviewed would prove beneficial or at the least, satisfying for participants. A growing body of research suggests that targets of racism who remain silent about racist incidents show greater hypertension than those who recall and disclose (Krieger, 1990; Krieger & Sydney, 1996). They can also experience validation and empowerment at the time of the interview, followed by the ability to handle future racist incidents with greater authority (Myers, 2005). Participants proved keen to disclose, all thanked me for the opportunity and some went beyond this to explain in detail why this was important and why my interview method was successful, letting me know the interview experience was well received and generally beneficial.

Reflexivity on the interview data:

There was good communication in the interviews, particularly with the other prison workers, as we had topic-related cognitive frames in common (Ensink, 2003). These frames made it possible to leave out some things without being misunderstood, because we had known each other and discussed these issues already over the years. For the same reason I didn’t feel that the interviews were constrained by cultural or ideological boundaries (Nairn & McCreanor, 1991). For example, one participant I knew well felt free to joke with me about cannibalism. The question however inevitably arose, did these accounts really construct freely, realities from the ontology of the participant?
How about the ones that didn’t know me so well? If I had been Māori myself, would I have got a different set of data? Were they more restrained out of kindness? If a group session had been possible, would the participants have been inhibited by the audience, or would broader results have arisen from people bouncing the topic off one another? I was aware that because of the trust established, and my strong relationship with some participants in particular, that I was getting privileged information – that is, privileged for a Pākehā. But I wondered if the interviews might have been even less restrained if I were Māori. I reminded myself that whatever I was told, I was told in the context of that situation, and there was little point in speculating on what I might have got. ‘This is what we got’ and the data that I received I knew was of a high quality. As I worked on the analysis, I asked occasional questions of participants regarding my conclusions, and these were answered. I waited for their reciprocal requests to check up that I was representing their views correctly, and reiterated the opportunity to do so. But they charmingly waived the right, and indicated that they trusted me. I have done my best to honour that trust.

Analytic method

This section details the processes of transcription, preliminary coding, and discrete coding. This initial process was identical for both forms of analysis, discourse analysis and thematic analysis. The procedures for the two analytical methods are then described.

Transcription

I transcribed the interviews verbatim, in order to immerse myself in the data. An adapted form of transcription notation used by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) was employed (Appendix F). Identifying names were exchanged for the pseudonyms participants had chosen. Each transcript page was given the relevant pseudonym and the page number on the top right hand corner of each page, e.g., Interview Poto 1, to facilitate referencing. All identifiers such as names of siblings, place of work or addresses, were edited out. Māori words were italicised, except for “Māori” and
“Pākehā” and “Aotearoa” which are in common usage. All Māori words used were listed in a glossary.

Participants had been told that their interview transcriptions would be ‘tidied’ before being quoted in the study, for example by removing minimal encouragers, fillers, repeated prefixes or words, and disconnected morphemes, providing this did not alter the meaning. I had also showed them a made up sample to prepare them for what the transcript would look like before ‘tidying’. Nonetheless some participants objected strongly to the lack of punctuation and correct grammar. One returned the transcripts with attempted amendments. Several refused to sign off until it was re-explained. No participants requested other changes to their transcripts.

Preliminary Coding

The preliminary coding method involved dividing the data into coded excerpts available for use in discourse analysis and thematic analysis. Originally I thought that to render the 770 pages of transcript more manageable (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) it should be copied and pasted into three main files which corresponded with the three main interview questions, then this divided minutely into sub-topics arising from each question. However, the emphasis would have been on thematic analysis alone, which was in some ways the antithesis of DA; using the Word Find programme for libraries, for example, which was one of the probes when asking participants where they had experienced racism, meant that the topic would become more about location than discourse. Accordingly, I decided to form broad coding areas from themes that were rhetorical ideas, revealed strong feelings and maybe core issues, as these were emerging with the reading of each transcript. On reading the first transcript, there was a strong statement about racism, and so the first file in the preliminary coding was opened: General statements about racism in NZ. The Treaty of Waitangi was frequently mentioned, and there were strong sentiments expressed around this, and so it was given a file, then Negative assumptions about Māori emerged beginning yet another file, and so on, until around fifteen coded files had been named and eventually, the entire text corpus reviewed. For each of these, words used which could be ‘hooks’ when later searching with the Word Find programme, were listed under the code to help future searches, for example, Negative assumptions about Māori listed the words ‘stereotype’
files, but reading and re-reading was considered crucial to get closer to the participant’s intent. During this progression, some codes were merged, and others were divided, to facilitate more explicit accommodation for the discrete codes.

Discrete Coding

Discrete coding was conducted to group text portions under these preliminarily coded themes and discourses (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). These would form the ordered corpus of extracts needed for both themes and discourses. This involved once again, the systematic reading of the 770 pages, this time to attempt to divide each transcript into small excerpts which each corresponded to a preliminary code. As I read, I reflexively and consciously attempted to put aside my own preconceptions and ask: What is this participant’s experience, and what do they perceive to be taking place in Aotearoa NZ? What have they observed and subjectively experienced? What rhetoric, experience, feeling or understanding are they recounting from their separate ontology? What new thing can I learn which I know nothing about, yet? The first excerpt was then copied and pasted with the participant’s name, under the first code (General statements about racism in NZ), and given a smaller heading which summed it up and represented its topic: ‘them and us’. This procedure was followed for the entire transcript. I began a ‘slush file’ which was used throughout the process to gather any portions of the data which did not seem to fit under any code, and proceeded to the next transcript. By the end of this process, around five hundred discrete codes had been noted, and data divided into excerpts and copied and pasted to a discrete code, or two or more if appropriate. I then found, by this stage of understanding, that it was possible to also code most of the slush file.

Discourse Analysis

The codes and discrete codes were then examined more thoroughly in order to analyse the rhetoric and identify the main arguments used. Did they seem to mould together and form a cohesive, repeated discourse? The term ‘discourse’ has been used consistently throughout the thesis, and the term ‘interpretive repertoire’ avoided on the grounds that this can be regarded by some analysts as cumbersome and insufficiently sensitive
Discourses were sought which had active linguistic power to create, to justify, to direct attribution and to maintain or challenge social structures. For example, in looking at how participants accounted for racism, constructions of Pākehā as ignorant emerged quite strongly and in several constructions around Pākehā/Māori interaction. I decided to gather evidence for this as a possible discourse, a linguistic pattern in participants’ meaning making which might be allowing certain positionings, for example, Māori positioned as teachers of Pākehā. This involved examining all excerpts containing notions of ignorance, in context. This was made possible under the coding system. I looked at the discrete text portions which had been listed under *Ignorance*, found them in the original transcript using the Word Find programme, and started a new file in which to copy and paste the larger portions around them, needed for this topic. I then carefully read the text around each discretely coded excerpt in order to more thoroughly understand the rhetoric and reasoning that might justify the discourse. Active constructions and positionings used by the various speakers were studied. Variation, an essential part of discourse analysis, was included in the considerations, until finally, it emerged that *Ignorance* was a distinct discourse which had more than one function. It could be used to excuse racism, and also to construct the perpetrator as teachable. This then led to further checking on other participants’ use of this discourse to confirm or disallow it as a general discourse. I followed this procedure throughout the discursive study, continually going back into the data that supported each discourse. This repeated checking was used to examine, cross examine, and justify (or not) the various changes in discourse decisions which inevitably arose as reading and re-reading continued.

**Thematic analysis**

The codes and discrete codes were studied for common themes which recurred. I used a number of large boards to arrange and rearrange cluster diagrams in which similar themes and ideas were grouped around one central topic, for example, *response*. Discrete codes which appeared to be associated with this theme were then placed around this word, for example, emotion, resistance, spirituality, internalisation. They in turn were clustered with other codes; for example, emotion was clustered with discrete codes such as anger, tears, sadness. I noted the prevalence of striking codes and asked myself if they had been expressed by the majority of the participants, and if they had
recurred, constructed in different ways. This was done without reference to pre-existing analytic coding frames, by returning to the data and reading carefully. The Word Find facility was also used to search more generally throughout all interviews. Resistance was seen as a strong theme, with several subthemes. Particularly pertinent data excerpts were grouped with all of these, and studied again to check their relevance. I then moved below the semantics of the theme, to the latent level of the data to identify underlying conceptualizations: for example, 1) resistance is possible and 2) Pākehā will respond to it. Generated themes were also analysed for interaction, and their societal context, for example, how did they function within the framework and power structures of society in Aotearoa NZ? Results were decided on in a constant rechecking of between codes, data, and ideas.

Reflexivity: through a glass darkly

The aim was to better understand the underlying themes and discourses around racism and its effects, from the perspective of Māori and their partners. Even as I endeavoured to remain reflexively aware of my ‘outsider’s’ lack of personal, lived, embodied knowledge, and to discover instead how Māori and their partners self-reported racism in the specific context of Aotearoa NZ, I was also validating what I was reading as it echoed against accounts and ideas I had heard related and argued over the years, accounts I had believed because I knew the people concerned. But now I was being asked to sit down and look at it in academic detail with an analytical eye, rather than simply with an affirming listening ear. What was being said? Why did the participants think the incident took place, what were they trying to establish linguistically in the exchange? My endeavour was to read the data for what was there without moving into hegemonic reconstruction or universal generalisations. And yet inevitably I had to acknowledge the question: what were we constructing together? I concluded that my final analytical words, my three dimensional construction, would include their truth, my truth, and something in between.
Summary

In summary, this chapter has presented the methodology involved in data gathering and analysis, and shown how cultural considerations were addressed and included in all stages of the methodology. The analyses methodology was laid out and clear accounts given of the steps taken. Following the analyses, the findings were structured and presented in the following four results chapters: Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight.
Introduction to Results Chapters

The four chapters of results correspond to the three groups of questions asked of participants in the interview schedule (Appendix B). These open ended questions were grouped into three sections and provided blank canvases on which participants might construct their related thoughts. Section A attended to participants’ constructions of racism, and their responses to it. Responses to question one of this section are focused on in Chapter Five: what occurred during the incident, where it took place, and the participant’s emotional response. Participants’ accounts are analysed thematically and attention is given to positioning. Question two of section A asks, how did it affect you? Thematic analysis is again used to focus on the repeatedly constructed need for resistance to racism described variously by participants, and the findings laid out in Chapter Six: Resisting racism. In Section B, participants were asked why they thought the perpetrator acted in this way, with broad open ended questions that allowed them to explore why racism occurs against Māori, what motivated the perpetrator, what was being established, and whether or not participants thought Pākehā were aware of their racism. The participants’ constructions are analysed discursively, and the findings set out in Chapter Seven: Accounting for racism. In Section C participants were asked for their insights and perspectives regarding the solution, and their perspectives sought on how to reduce the problem. The responses to this question carries significance for those concerned with improving race relations in Aotearoa NZ, and the participants’ highly motivated responses and reasonings are analysed thematically in Chapter Eight: Reducing racism. The four chapters begin with participants’ accounts of racism, which provide background and contextualise the analyses.
Chapter Five

Participants’ accounts of racism in Aotearoa NZ

Introduction

In Chapter One, the impact of racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ was looked at in terms of the macro effect assessed in broad collective areas such as education, socio economic status and health. The overall detrimental nature of this negative influence was shown clearly in the statistics relating to Māori. None of these figures convey the weight and the force of everyday racism at a micro level where it impinges on and disrupts personal life, positioning and emotions. In Chapter Three, the lack of research investigating the effects of racism was mentioned, and two studies by Moewaka Barnes, Taiapa, Borell, and McCreanor (2013) and Webber, McKinley, and Hattie (2013) were looked at in detail. The current chapter focuses on participants’ accounts of particular episodes of interpersonal or personally mediated racism. Accounts of racism and associated feeling are documented. Key themes were: racist responses to Māori identity markers, negative stereotypes, sites of racist experiences, racism in the justice system, and tokenism. The feelings described by participants are analysed thematically and a single case study of one participant is looked at in greater depth. These findings are from Māori participants, and their Pākeha partners who witnessed racism directed at their partners and their children.

Racism in Aotearoa NZ?

Section A of the interview schedule (Appendix B) questions whether racism exists in Aotearoa NZ today. The participants’ dilemma of Pākehā disbelief in racism against Māori (Human Rights Commission, 2007) was attended to by the use of themes around universality and essentialism, which although unaligned with the researcher’s epistemology of social constructionism, were indicative of the participants’ rhetoric on this point. Racism was ‘everywhere’ throughout the world, it was ‘human nature to categorise’ and ‘any group of people will tend to band together because there’s
something that they recognise amongst and about themselves’. Constructed as universally present in the make up of humans, racism was evident in Aotearoa NZ. This was underscored with words such as definitely, certainly, institutionalised, and endorsed with phrasing such as ‘experienced it in almost all areas of my life’ ‘every institution I’ve ever been involved with’ ‘both in my personal life and also in my professional life’. Participants were asked to describe racist incidents encountered in a wide range of settings, and how it made them feel (Appendix B).

**Racist responses to Māori identity markers**

One of the advantages of interviewing an older group of participants was being provided with an historic progression behind modern day racist experiences. A continuing theme or pattern of racism and positioning became apparent in which Māori identity markers, particularly visual (Māori phenotype) and verbal (Māori accent) were seen to trigger undeserved racist responses including negative social positioning by the majority group. Some of these positionings were Foucauldian; being expected to stand up on buses or trains for Pākehā in the 1950s was a clear indication that Māori were being positioned as secondary. Similar restrictions reflected apartheid, for example not being allowed to drink in certain pubs or sit in ‘Pākehā’ parts of a movie theatre even in the 1960s. Another indication of the marginalisation of Māori were notices saying ‘Māori need not apply’ for various jobs or accommodation. Three things are notable: firstly, these acts of racism are not yet historically distanced, as they occurred as recently as the 1950s and 60s. Secondly, the incidents remain vivid in the memories of those who were targets of this kind of discrimination, which suggests that the impact of such discrimination is lifelong. Thirdly, no participants talked about these restrictions being maintained by force, although they may have begun this way. As in the interleaved self-monitored Foucaudian state racism (Foucault, 2006) the mores were abided by because it had become unspokenly the social norm expected as part of Aotearoa NZ’s colonial system. Although laws have removed these situations, the principles of colonial marginalisation and the irrational racism which degrades people according to their cultural affiliation or skin colour remain. The latter was a common theme in younger participants’ accounts of modern day racism. They showed that the terms ‘brown’ and ‘black’ were still linked to negative stereotypes today, as demonstrated in the following quotes:
Sophia: the phrase that I remember is black bitch
Hose: he said ‘it blew up and all this carbon went everywhere over everything and it was as black as you Hose!’ and I was like ‘well(.) I’m not actually black!
Inap: people not wanting to associate with you? because I’m big black and ugly?

In all three cases, the complexion colour is not mentioned appreciatively but in such a way as to reposition the Māori participant as lesser. ‘Brown’ skin also generated offensive disparagement without any interest in the person themself, as in Sophia’s excerpt below.

Sophia: you know it’s people who would yell things at you as they drive past and ah they don’t care and they know that and they’ll target anyone who fits the description(.) it’s not personal for them but it’s very(.) out there you know they don’t care who you are or what you’ve done to them(.) you could be any brown person↓ d’you know what I mean?

Similarly, Hose talks about a recent dinner party where a woman who was the host avoided getting to know him as a person, and greeted other guests with physical affection but refused skin contact with him.

Hose: I went to(.) you know(.) shake her hand
Sylvia: yeah
Hose: and she wouldn’t touch my hand(.) she wouldn’t touch me(.) you know I went to put my hand out and she was just like(.) nope↑

Poto, who is brown skinned but whose wife is a white skinned Māori, noted that she did not experience the racism he did when strangers assessed him on phenotype alone.

Poto: yeah well my wife is white yet she is Ngāti [tribe] yet she has [European nation] ancestry↑ so she’s very pale↓ but I know that if we go out somewhere(.) it is sometimes better to allow my wife to ask or to buy
ahm sometimes I get irritated when I stand in a shop and we’re looking at something↑

Sylvia        mm
Poto          I might ask a question↑(.) the answer will be directed back to my wife↓ but those are the sorts of things that I believe we do get confronted with as a husband and wife↑ ahm(1) it is sometimes better for the paler member ((laughs))

By encountering the ongoing preference of Pākeha to talk with his Pākeha looking wife rather than himself, Poto is continually made re-aware of racist reactions to a visual marker. However, verbal markers were considered by some participants an even more important signal for discrimination. Emma, who is married to a Māori and has ongoing contact with Māori, posits that one can be in a suit and tie, or look like a Pākehā, but to speak with a Māori accent will ‘totally destroy’ any credibility. She cites a university educated friend who met this problem recently.

Emma     people certainly associate it with being un-educated(.)and she found it really hard and she was really upset about this because and because people would actually sort of dismiss her? or disregard her? because of this she said ‘look it’s my voice’ and she’s worked really hard to do this …

Sylvia    d’you think that would apply even if they were(.) very white skinned
Emma    very much so(.) it’s amazing how easy it is to (1) for it to happen

The implication is that a Māori accent could affect one’s status and acceptability in, for example, work, phonecalls, or higher education. Jessica talks of her Māori partner who has a ‘heart of gold’ and is getting top marks in his class in a quantitative subject yet being dismissed as ‘hori’ when he speaks. The term hori needs definition: although it is the Māori translation of George, it is used scornfully ‘to describe the New Zealand equivalent to trailer trash’ (Urban Dictionary, 2016). This ethnophaulism carries negative connotations unnecessarily associated with Māori, and participants’ accounts of these are looked at next.
Negative stereotypes

Many negative stereotypes were associated with Māori. Older participants talked about being assumed to be dirty as children, and gave accounts of humiliating and unwarranted inspections for headlice and other bodily conditions from which Pākehā children were exempt. Poto noted that the assumption of Māori being dirty is still extant today. Most of the stereotypes mentioned indicated the active positioning of Māori in a colonial structure in a way which defined and limited the parameters of Māori experience and achievement. Māori were stereotyped as less intelligent, illiterate or inarticulate, unemployed, or criminal, all of which constructed them as lesser and relegated them to the sidelines of society. In the excerpt below, Bill, who is Māori but has a Pākehā phenotype, gives an example of how the identity markers worked when he was a teenager in a group of his Māori peers.

Bill if there was anything you know untoward happening they would use me because they would speak to me in a different way
Sylvia because you look Pākehā
Bill yeah! So they expected me to be above I guess my mates! You know? and yet I was the dumbest in the whole bunch of us you know! ((laughs))
Sylvia ((laughs))
Bill you know all my mates were pretty sharp characters!
Sylvia yeah
Bill but they weren’t perceived to be that way

Bill observes that the Pākehās who questioned the group would assume he was Pākehā, and therefore more intelligent and able to answer their questions. In a quite literal representation of colonial positioning, he says the Pākehā would assume him to be ‘above’ his friends who were phenotypically Māori. Other participant who were phenotypically Māori noted that they had been in situations where they were assumed to be ‘dumb’ and the expectation was that they would have had a low level of education, or only be interested in playing a guitar and singing. With this came the stereotype of Māori unemployment.
Hose you know when I was younger? Lots of people used to be always saying oh (.) Māoris(.) always on the dole! you can get a job on the dole! And I’ve never Gone on the dole(.) I never will↑

‘Lots of’ implies that this was a commonly accepted stereotype, reverted to simply on the basis of Hose’s phenotype without interest in his ability or achievements.

The stereotype of the Māori as inherently alcoholic or criminal was commonly cited as historic and enduring, and two examples are given below. Bill describes his experience as a school child playing at a Pākehā friend’s house in the 1950s.

Bill I went to school with ah my classmates who were predominantly English or of Scottish ancestry(.) besides Māori↓ .... and we’d bring them home and they would say they had a good time↓(.) you know enjoyed it(.) it was great and they would take us to their home and because of the parents’ attitude(.) we couldn’t come away and say we had had a good time

Sylvia what sort of attitude was that

Bill they were ahm the parents↑ not the school mates(.) the parents would be so often watching every move me and my [relatives] made

Sylvia mm

Bill as if they thought we were going to pinch the you know the jewellery

Bill’s memory is of himself as a child from a good family with no criminal record. However he senses that the Pākehā parents assume that he has an innate tendency to steal, and is aware of their surveillance of him. This stereotype was even noted by an adult participant who currently volunteers in prison ministry, a respected and qualified man whose experience is markedly different to that of the researcher who also volunteers with the same organisation in the same prison but who has fair hair and a pale skin tone.

Fred I often found visiting the prison there are some people some of the officers and they’ll always argue that they’re right↑ and say therefore they have to do it but they actually treat me like I’m a prisoner and they
are white(.) and then you find there are other guards who aren’t so so (.hh) for me a visit to the prison can range almost from a strip search to walk on through (. ) I know a strip search is a bit extreme but you know it is sometimes it is like that and I’m questioned about how why are you going to see them? you know why are you going? You know why

Sylvia I have never struck that(.)

Fred notes the automatic and tedious suspicion of some Pākehā officers, which is based on nothing more than their immediate perception that he is Māori, which arouses their suspicions. Possibly more sinister is the account from Hose, who lives in a small township. He talks about an incident a year previous where a spate of robberies had occurred, the town had collectively decided that it must be Māori who were the perpetrators, and an assumptive headline which tapped into the negative stereotype of the Māori criminal was printed in the local paper.

Hose this area’s a predominantly rich↑ white area↓ there is a Māori element there↑ a small Māori element↑ but it was on our main [newspaper] news ‘if you’re brown(.) and you’re in town(.) you’re a thief↓’ and that’s what one of the newspapers(.) it was printed

Hose and I was like(.hhh) what? How can they get away with printing that sort of stuff?

Hose It’s not everyone↓ but there is an ahm yeah a big group that(.)they say if you’re brown and you’re in town you’re a thief

Hose does not specify whether the racist statement was published as observation, query, or fact. This underscores the power of media (Rankine & McCreanor, 2004): regardless of context, headlines have the power to create, establish or re-establish racist stereotypes. Participants also cited political rhetoric as a powerful linguistic tool used to purvey and perpetuate negative stereotypes of Māori as violent and criminal. Below, Rauri explains how and why Māori are associated with crime and violence by politicians; using the analogy of a repeated dance step, he illustrates how easily identified the technique is, and how it positions politicians powerfully.
the best card to play to upset and disturb the largest number of people is usually the race card or the crime and violence and danger in your home and then you can get two for the price of one.....and that they’re bashing down the doors and they’re all Māori or they’re all gang related people all drug crazed all those sorts of things that’s the quickest way to win votes but I do think the politicians wield a lot of power and that for them keeping the power there is some standard steps and they’re going to keep making those standard steps if you’re a ballroom dancer you’d get bored really quickly with just how standard the dance is it’s just a little dance but it always works

Rauri describes the politicians’ moves with justifiable cynicism. He notes too that it ‘always works’ with Māori being scapegoated for political ends. The implication is that this works consistently because the voters are easily ‘played’ in terms of their prejudices. However other participants talked about one way in which Māori could guarantee to be considered ‘good’, a definition which aligned with McCreanor’s (1997) theme of ‘good’ Māori. Hoa sums up their observations succinctly.

Hoa GOOD MĀORI are brown Pākehā

As McCreanor (1997) notes, Māori who function as Pākehā in a Pākehā society will be considered ‘good’. The implication is that the fallacious negative stereotypes of Māori as dirty, inarticulate, unemployed, alcoholic and criminal, less intelligent, illiterate and uneducated, would no longer apply. A tension however exists between Hoa’s observation, and the implied need for Māori to be literate and educated ‘like Pākeha’; many participants experienced barriers to their education in the education system. This is looked at in the following section on sites of racism.

Sites of racist experiences

Participants were asked to talk about racism experienced at various sites, with some suggestions being made (Appendix B). Sites where racism had been frequently encountered and which could be shown to form a common theme in most participants’ accounts are listed below.
Racism in educational institutions

Historically, accounts of the treatment of Māori children in the education system are spine-chilling, for example as related by Ruihi who recalls her schooling in the 1950s. Corporal punishment was permitted in schools until the late 1980s (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2016), and her fingers became deformed after being broken by repeated hitting with a ruler.

Ruihi see how crooked my fingers are?
Sylvia yes
Ruihi I’m one of those who Māori was my first language(. ) I didn’t start school primmers until I was seven(. ) we’d come home crying you know I used to cross my fingers we used to go and sit up at the desk in front of the teacher and she’d have a little book and it’s got all these pictures and you’ve got to say what they are? the English words? And she’s got a picture of corn and I didn’t know what it’s called! I didn’t know the Pākehā word(.) and I said kānga BANG kānga BANG! she didn’t tell you what it was! she expected me to say it when I didn’t know what it was! yes she did! and that happened over weeks and months years! when the next teacher came and saw that she was absolutely horrified so she tied my fingers up with ahm she with so they’d separate(. )

Ruihi recites this with obvious distress: in her example, she is shown a picture of corn, and calls it by the Māori word kānga rather than the English word corn. Throughout her school days, despite her best efforts to stop speaking Māori and ‘crossing her fingers’, she is repeatedly and painfully penalised for not speaking English. Although these events took place sixty years ago, they were never forgotten. Ruihi and Hiair both talk of their difficulty in re-learning Māori language in later life, and the difficulty of overcoming the effect of not only the fear induced by the physical punishment but the inhibiting memory of the scorn and derision levelled at them for speaking te reo. This positioned them as intellectually inferior, and moved Māori language into a forbidden area.
Hiair: I think all those labels they stayed with me? I lost the *reo* and then in the late seventies maybe early eighties I lost the *nt* you know they took it from me and I had to *pay* them to get it back! I couldn’t get it I couldn’t get it.

Most participants noted that Māori language was no longer discriminated against in public today. However, Fred talks about an incident at his child’s school.

Fred: And so he told us that the funding was *there* .... to get those Māori children and remove them from their class and ah set them up in a like a *Kōhanga Reo* class and we set all that up in place just to see how it would go well it never ever got launched because the *day* that it was supposed to happen the teachers refused to allow those kids to be removed from the class and I think we were talking an *hour a week* or something.

School funding which had been given for Māori students to learn Māori culture and language was openly received, but the classes did not eventuate. The situation Fred describes indicates a positioning of unequal power in which Pākehā authority figures still have the perogative to decide the course of Māori language.

Participants talked about their children receiving different treatment at school if they were dark rather than fair; if they were also in the minority they were likely to experience some level of racist taunts or bullying. Again the historical precedence was marked, with some participants citing the 1950s and ongoing victimisation by Pākehā children who bullied them, called them ‘nigger’ or told teachers if they spoke *te reo* in the playground, which would result in physical punishment. The theme continues chronologically through accounts leading to the present day where there is some attempt at reducing it: for example, Felm talks about it as being particularly bad when she attended school in the ‘60s, and Sophia remembers being called ‘black bitch’ in the 80s. In the 90s, Mabel recounts her daughter’s distress at experiencing playground taunts that all Māori were gang members, and the teacher responding to Mabel’s complaint by teaching positive messages about Māori.
Many teachers, however, judged intellectual ability according to phenotype, and participants often noted there was no preliminary testing of academic skills before being allocated to a certain class.

Tu I moved here when I was [teenager] yeah all the Māori were kind of put into (..) when I started school down here they pretty much put me into what do you call the less(1) they called it ‘practical classes’ and when I asked them can I be taken out of this class? they said ‘oh well there’s no places anywhere else for you to go’ kind of thing

The era of Tu’s account is circa 2000. Hose cites a significant incident in which pupils also judge on phenotype alone, only a few years before this.

Hose Yeah I went to a big school but there were a lot of people who would (indistinct) you niggers you dumb niggers
Sylvia wow!
Hose dumb Māoris Māoris Māoris you know but just even not saying things properly you know† just to antagonise you
Sylvia [indistinct] yeah yeahup
Hose you’re too dumb you know? yeah guys are going what are you doing? often it would be like(.) what’re you doing in a class like I’d be doing science you know
Sylvia mm hm
Hose and it’d be what’s the point in you even trying mate
Sylvia really
Hose you know? ‘cause you’ll end up pushing a broom

This example of Foucauldian racism bears many of the hallmarks of colonial racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ. Firstly, the word ‘Māori’ is given an inflexion that turns it into what is tantamount to an obscenity, and positions it below Pākehā. The words ‘black’ and ‘nigger’ function to align Hose with negro slaves and again position him below ‘white’ Pākehā who are presumably likened to masters. ‘Dumb’ functions two ways: firstly to imply that Hose is intellectually challenged and will therefore be unable
to hold a position of authority, and also possibly as an implicit demand that he remain silent. The word ‘mate’ implies that this advice is being given as friendly informative advice by someone who knows society’s laws. ‘What’s the point in even trying’ outlines the supposed futility of trying to get qualifications and rise above his position in a colonial society, and the final destination ‘pushing a broom’ is assigned at the lowest end of the occupational hierarchy. This account of deliberate discouragement and pejorative positioning has significance for educationalists endeavouring to understand why Māori find themselves in the ‘long tail of underachievement’ in the education system (Clark, 2013).

Participants also talked about a type of cultural racism in the education system, an assumption that Māori must learn in the same individualised competitive way as Pākehā. Jessica, who graduated from a Kaupapa Māori secondary school to start university at age 16, struggled to explain the principles behind the need for a Māori style education for Māori, as did Poto and Rauri.

Jessica marae based learning is inclusive↑ .... working(.) together as a group it’s a lot of hands on stuff? .... it was just more involved? like I find mainstream very black and white? .... you might be given a text book and you’re told ‘do pages A to D’ in a Māori context(.) being more involved we .... worked sort of as a collective for the greater good I guess?

Poto a lot of it is also participating↓ being part of the learning

Rauri um and there’s there’s(2) a a(.) um a style of learning that might be (indistinct) or even co-operative ... that’s very different from the combative style of learning ....a different style of learning↑(.) it’s going to leave people out

The Pākehā education system was seen as suitable for Pākehā but unwittingly lacking the features which facilitated learning for Māori: inclusion, collective cooperative learning, and student involvement in the process.

As adults in tertiary educational institutions, some participants noted that racism was again overt and obvious.
Tu on courses that I’ve been on there’s. ahm been a person that I’ve dealt with who has been blatantly racist towards Māori ahm† basically saying all the Māori want land for is grow their weed and do whatever you know? (. ) he was just speaking his mind how he feels about it and we had an argument about it and the only person that stuck up for me was my tutor↓ he’s a Pākehā man but he’s really lovely man

Tu’s observation that the perpetrator was ‘just speaking his mind’ seemed at first to excuse the speaker. However, as the account continues it is seen more as an acknowledgment of the intent of the speaker: Tu is offended, argues the point, and is grateful for his tutor who supports him (Guerin, 2003). Blatant racism was also reported by participants as occurring in the workplace.

Racism in the workplace

Historically, a precedence of Māori being restricted to work in manual areas in the 50s and 60s was cited by Erana who recalled her teacher’s advice.

Erana and I remember her saying that it’s difficult for Māori↑ to get jobs and I remember her saying you’ll probably find it easy to get into factories or into ahm hotels where they work as maids and in the cooking area and(.) ahm(.) yes I found that to be so when we started looking for work!

Fifty to 60 years later, Fred, Tu and Hose also cite clear incidents of people expecting them to be in manual jobs, a social positioning necessary for the maintenance of a colonial hierarchy.

Hose I work for a government organisation↓ and there’s definitely racism in there↓ I’m working in [technical occupation] and predominantly it’s it’s a white(.) place(.) it’s a predominantly a white industry(.) now I’ve had people when I’ve been working there↑ I’ve been working (indistinct) I was actually there to fix up what they’d done wrong

Sylvia yeah
Hose and the smart comment was “what the hell’s a Māori doing in [occupation]” and that whole assumption of if you’re brown(.) then you’re going to be doing(.) this sort of job(.) You can tell they’re straight away thinking ‘you must be one of the [manual workers]’ you know? that’s their assumption straight away↓

Despite his demonstrable competence, he is still assumed by Pākeha to be better suited to manual labour. This attitude was also cited by participants with regard to being passed over for promotion when faced with a Pākehā applicant with the same qualifications, although this was hard to prove. Bill, who is Māori, highly qualified and pale skinned, and usually known by an English first name, tells of an incident when he was recommended for a position and applied for the job in person. He was given the job, then later received a mailed rejection after sending in the written application with his Māori first name.

Sometimes discrimination against Māori advancement took the form of discouraging participants from receiving professional qualifications. Sophia, who works in a training institution, cites her experience: there are eighteen staff members who give Māori the same chance as Pākehā, and two who do not.

Sophia I can attribute that directly↑ to those two people of that staff out of about say twenty? who would actively discourage(.) ahm Māori from achieving

Sylvia wo:::w(.) that’s huge!

Sophia yeah(.) it was(.) and ahm the dropout rate ahm for our Māori was quite high↓ because I supported those people through that process the ones who dropped out(.) it was subtle? ah they were the ones who were doing it deliberately one I know for sure she was doing it(.) but she’d never admit to it(.) she actively puts barriers in front of them to succeed ahm and I’ve seen first hand some of the things↓ she’s very smart and very cunning ahm she(.) has obviously decided they won’t be good in this profession↑ and it’s her job(.) to get them out(.) I think she genuinely believes(.) that they wouldn’t make good [profession identifier] like that’s her justification?
The question of why can possibly be partly answered in terms of social positioning in a colonial system. In this hierarchy, European control and superiority is taken for granted (McCreanor, 1997). This expectation was alluded to by participants currently working in today’s workplaces. If the participant had been promoted to a position of authority, often this would be subtly undermined by other workers’ surprise at the advancement.

Fred what tends to happen is people tend to arrive and ahm(.) they will approach and rather than asking me they will assume that(.) the white fellow in the group is the team supervisor or team leader and um(.) approach them

Fred is the manager for his area, yet his observation is that Pākehā will invariably assume that a Pākehā holds that position.

Racist comments often took the form of ethnophaulisms and racist slurs ranging from mild to extreme offensiveness. Tu talks of a worker joking that Fried Chicken was ‘Māori roast’ and Hose cites instances where his supervisor likens a Māori worker in another division to a black kunekune pig. He talks of the same supervisor being asked for tangi leave, and while allowing it shocking the worker by saying that ‘Hitler had the right idea of just dumping all the bodies in a hole’. Hose was realistic about the fact that his supervisor was racist, and sought intervention for it, but struggled with the irrationality of racism from a ‘mate’.

Hose a friend of mine who’s a Pākehā ahm he’s a good friend of mine but for some reason when he came down to Wellington I got him a job with us† and one day I don’t know why(.) I really don’t know why he he said to me ‘oh come on nigger let’s go and do this’

Sylvia and this is recent?

Hose oh yes very recent! and so I was ‘oh just a little less of that!’ And we’re working through til the end of the day and then [name] he’s like a senior guy they’re walking along and he said it again he said “come on nigger let’s get going”. I thought about afterwards and I thought(.) now why would he even be saying that to me(.) if he’s my mate.
To Hose, his friend’s use of the word ‘nigger’ is inexplicable. The concept of colonial political power structures is not mentioned in his deliberation, nor the notion of his Pākehā mate realising his part in this majority power structure and assuming impunity and entitlement. Because Hose rebukes him later in the incident, the friend stops using the ethnophaulism (Guerin 2003). However, the theme here is that racism can and does appear today in the workplace, another example of which follows.

Racism in the retail sector

Participants cited three racist incidents they commonly encountered while shopping, incidents which took place only with those who were phenotypically Māori. In the first, they would be treated rudely. In the second, they would be ignored at the counter or in a shop queue, and in the third, followed unnecessarily by store security.

In an example of the first, one participant noted that the shopkeeper at their local store was ‘nice and polite’ to Pākehā women but ‘really blunt’ with her. Another described going to the supermarket after it had been announced on the news that there were counterfeit twenty dollar notes in circulation, and finding the check out operator would allow Pākehā through without comment, but held his twenty dollar bill up to the light and examined it minutely. Being ignored or made to wait in queues at the counter while Pākehā behind them were served before them was cited by many participants. In some cases, Pākehā saw this happening and told the shop assistant to serve the Māori participant first. Being needlessly followed by store security while browsing was regarded as equally common. Sophia describes shopping with her Pākehā partner, and experiencing all three examples of racism in the same instance.

Sophia we’ll go into a shop together and they’ll ignore me and they’ll ask him↑ they’ll serve him↑ I might be standing in front of him and they’ll look right over me and they’ll ask him if they can help him↓ they’ll serve him↓ and they’ll follow me round the shop(,) but not him

These examples of discrimination were based on visual contact and therefore can be described as racism against Māori by phenotype. Similar discrimination was described in participants’ accounts of incidents with landlords and leasing agents.
Racism when seeking accommodation

Some participants talked freely about expected discrimination in the 50s and 60s, when they would successfully apply by phone to look at a flat then when giving a Māori surname, or meeting the landlord face to face, would be told it had already gone. Despite changes in the law preventing such racism, some participants described incidents which they felt indicated there was contemporary prejudice against Māori as tenants, albeit to a lesser degree. Their observations that those with a Māori phenotype are less likely to be granted leases or home ownership are supported by a recent study by Houkamau (2015) which found that looking Māori predicted decreased rates of home ownership, and the institutional racism involved was based on perceived appearance. Ropata, who is Māori but has a Pākehā phenotype, talks about a work experience which took him on a tour with a real estate manager to look at prospective flats.

Ropata

As we were driving down he was pointing out to me Māori who hadn’t paid their rent or had defaulted on their rent and you know saying things like ‘oh these bloody Māoris you know they never pay their bills’ and so forth and so on, and this went o:------:n you know and ahm(1) and then at the end he asked me who I worked for and I said ‘oh you know I’m the District [senior occupation] of [Māori government department]’ and he turned a whiter shade of pale

The generalisation ‘they never pay their bills’ takes the real estate manager’s observations from the factual into the area of negative racist stereotypes. Inherent in this statement is the notion that all Māori must be refused tenancy by a wise Pākehā agent.

Racism in the Banking sector

Participants gave accounts of situations where they found being Māori was a liability when dealing with banks and financial institutions, making it harder to get loans and mortgages. One told of being a young mother and trying to cash ‘Cash’ cheques her Pākehā partner made out for her, and being refused, and her partner having to ring the bank and vouch for her. Felm talked about the different reception received by a young
Pākehā relative, and a young Māori relative, when they both reached the age where credit at the bank can start.

Felm  [Pākehā relative] yeah she went in and she got it just like that (.) and then you know [Māori relative] she went in and tried it and she had to come up with all these IDs and stuff† you know they kept on her you know she needs this and this and this so yeahup↑ I think

Sylvia  and your [Pākehā relative]

Felm  she was alcoholic↑ and drug dependent

Sylvia  but was [Māori relative] alcohol and drug dependent?

Felm  no::::: they were the same! there was nothing different about it about the situation yeah because they both had they even had the same guarantor for the both of them

Felm treats this as a social experiment, judges the variables equal for both girls, and concludes that the only difference between the two applicants is their ethnicity.

These accounts of racism experienced by participants at commonly named sites have one strong similarity: the racism occurred during personal face to face encounters, and the accounts continually bear reference to the notion of racism based on phenotype. In Bill’s job application, he is accepted when they meet him and consider him to be Pākehā, then rejected after the disclosure of a Māori first name. Prejudice based on phenotype was a strong theme in all accounts, particularly in the area of justice which is looked at next.

**Racism in the justice system**

Participants commonly attested that the automatic assumption of criminality, or the active negative stereotype of Māori as criminal, was present throughout the justice system. Most believed that judges handed down heavier penalties for Māori, a view supported in the literature (Fergusson et al., 2003a; United Nations CERD, 2007; Workman, 2011) and that police assumed Pākehā to be probably innocent but Māori probably guilty before apprehending them. Rauri noted that if he catches the last train to walk home from he can expect to be apprehended by police, yet he observes that Pākehā
in the same situation are ignored. Participants gave accounts which suggest police over-
surveillance begins with incidents early in life which are remembered throughout
adulthood, as below.

Tu well I mean I’ve never been involved in a crime or anything but when I
was younger my parents bought me a bike…. and a police officer pulled
me over(.) well he didn’t pull me over we were just sitting down there(.)
and it was like ‘where’d you get your bike from?’ it was a nice bike and I
would have been(.) say fourteen? at the time because I was so young¶ I
was quite worried¶ like thinking they were going to take my bike off me!
for no reason you know and ahm I said ‘well my parents bought it for
me’ and they asked me all these questions asked me my name tipped
flipped the bike over and checked the ahm name tag and everything on
the bottom of it and I was just like you know it wasn’t a nice feeling
having him check my bike and pretty much accused me of stealing it

Tu is alarmed by the power of the police, whom he senses have the ability to take his
bike, however he can see no logical reason for their attitude. Later in life, he adds it to
other similar incidents in which the only factor distinguishing him from Pākeha is his
Māori appearance. Hoa, a mother, confirms the interest of the police in even younger
Māori who attend primary school.

Hoa they used to come home from school and of course this is a Poly Māori
area¶ and ah the police used to stop THEM(.) you know(.) and he’d
come home and I’d say what are you late home for? And he’d say oh the
police stopped me¶ What for? oh they didn’t even tell me¶ and then um
they had European friends too¶ and the European friends were allowed
to go(.)

Hoa’s attitude is significant: she expects that the police will patrol and apprehend her
son because he looks Māori, and that there will be police patrolling because ‘this is a
Poly Māori area’. She anticipates the majority categorisation in which Māori will be
positioned as the marginalised outgroup ‘THEM’. She notes that although her son was
detained, his Pākehā friends were allowed to go.
The racism noted in this instance and other accounts at specific sites is mainly based on phenotype. Participants talked also of prejudice based on accent, and also a more generalised cultural racism, sometimes evident in tokenism.

**Tokenism**

Tokenism is a less obvious area of racism, more abstract and less clearly discriminatory. In this symbolic effort at including Māori culture, a small number of Māori might be asked to join a Pākeha meeting to present a short karakia (prayer in Māori) pōwhiri (Māori welcome) a poroporoaki (farewell ceremony) or a haka (traditional dance). Participants were troubled by their experiences of what they felt were contrived occasions, and expressed their feeling that tokenistic representation of Māori culture was used only to satisfy the need for political correctness and protocol. Alongside this cursory presentation was reluctant and temporary toleration of te ao Māori (Māoridom) and waning government interest in its perseverance. Bill’s encounter is typical.

Bill I was called into a meeting got in there and as soon as the particular person who was chairing the meeting saw me come in(.) man he rushed around grabbed a hold of me took me to the head table and sat me down there(.hh) what for? they wanted karakia

The chairperson’s urgent need to have a politically correct karakia to grace the meeting meant that Bill felt used simply for that purpose, without there being any genuine interest in Māori culture. Bill explains further in the interview that it would have been more sincere had the karakia been translated into English and its significance explained to the Pākehā people present. The decreasing government interest in maintaining Māori culture alongside tokenistic activities was underscored by one participant who posited that since the Māori renaissance of the 1970s, Kura Kaupapa Māori (Schools with a Māori focus) and kohanga reo (total immersion in Māori language for children up to six years of age) had been receiving decreasing funding. The result was that only half the original number of Kohanga Reo schools were still open. Inap aptly describes an undercurrent of indifference to Māori culture and includes reference to her feelings.
Inap all these politicians ……it’s like they’ll pull(,) they’ll pull(1) pull the rent-
a-pōwhiri out of their pockets and …put it on display….. and let’s pull out the kapahaka group and let’s put on the pōwhiri and let’s do this and put it on display and oh yeah this is our culture! and yet the minute they go the minute the visitors and manuhiri go let’s put it back in the box! and put it back out of sight out of mind(.;) that’s what it feels like

Inap’s ‘that’s what it feels like’ speaks to the question about, how did the incident of racism you encountered make you feel. This is looked at in the section which follows.

Feelings

At times, participants hesitated in their recollections of the precise details of the incident. However as Inap said ‘I can’t remember what I said at the time I just remember how I was made to feel’. The feelings had been remembered to the present day, whether the incident had taken place in childhood, teenage or adult years. The main themes in these feelings were: initial shock and confusion, hurt, degradation, anger and alienation. This section looks at examples then concludes with a brief case study.

For many participants the initial feelings on encountering racism were a mixture of shock, amazement, emotional turmoil and confusion. One said she hadn’t been brought up with that sort of thing, so it came as a shock, and another talked about being ‘blown away’. Keto, who comes from a rural college where he was honoured as head boy and the best all round Māori student, is shocked when his Pākehā girlfriend’s parents turn him away.

Keto yeah so that was a big shock ((laughs)) my first big shock in my life ahm I realised that there were people who didn’t like me because of my ah(,) my colour↑ I guess my ah my heritage↑ my(;) ethnicity↓ yeah↓

Participants defined the immediate emotional turmoil as ‘not a nice feeling’ and spoke of feeling terrible, awful, or very upset. These difficult feelings functioned alongside amazement, and if the racist comment was from a friend, relative or fellow worker,
confusion. A Pākehā participant talking about racism from fellow workers who are against her proposed marriage to her Māori fiancée, says ‘I felt amazed and I didn’t understand’. Another says of school bullying and taunts at her Māori-ness ‘I thought we were nice people’. Hose expresses his bafflement at experiencing racism in a work situation.

Hose … and I think well does he not know that that’s insulting? Is he that ignorant that he doesn’t know that’s insulting? This is a guy who think he’s better than me! so he’s supposed to have a bit of intelligence! And yet he can’t see that that’s a ((laughs)) direct insult to me? To me it was like oh (indistinct) I was blown away

Hose feels perplexity that an intelligent person who is also a workmate, would make a racist remark in the first place.

In a manner analogous to physical injury, once the initial shock wore off, pain emerged, usually named by participants as ‘hurt’. Elaine remarks that her husband must have been hurt by his Pākehā in law-to-be refusing to shake his hand, because many years later he still remembers it clearly. Ruihi talks about ‘tears of hurt’. Sharlee, who is Māori but looks Pākeha due to having both Pākeha and Māori ancestry, recounts her reaction to a fellow worker’s hurtful comment.

Sharlee when she said ‘Māoris marry Māoris and Pākehās marry Pākehās’ that really hurt me and

Sylvia m:::::::m

Sharlee you know when people say that sort of thing(.) they most probably don’t even know how bad it’s hurting that person

A large number of participants said that the feeling was one of degradation. This was an insightful and apt choice of a word which referred to depriving or reducing one’s rank, a construction that describes the attempt of Pākehā to re-position Māori to an inferior role.
By far the most common emotion to be felt at the time of the incident was anger or irritation. Jessica talks of the sense of injustice fuelling her anger; she realised at once that the police apprehension was unnecessary, and her anger was ‘further exacerbated once he started actually talking’ because of his superior attitude, which she and others perceived to be a positioning technique. Poto echoes the irritating nature of the racism.

Poto ....when you’re addressed in this manner you feel so inferior\ it’s making you feel inferior(.) that there is someone who is superior to you that should be addressed rather than you the individual (. it is wrong!(2)

and it is a source of irritation

Poto clearly identifies the aim of the racism, which is again to reduce his position to one who should acknowledge the Pākehā’s right to his assumed superiority over him. Being irritated or angry inside, as Tu said, but unable to express the anger, was noted by others to lead to frustration. Some participants talked about ‘carrying a chip’ for an unspecified length of time instead of expressing anger at the time. This suggests that hypothetically, being able to talk the situation through with an intermediary might have brought resolution.

One disturbing aspect to the emotional reactions, from a social perspective, was participants’ recounting that the incidents made them feel alienated from Aotearoa NZ society. Sophia talks about feeling alienated after school incidents pinpointing her ethnicity, and Poto talks about it making him feel, albeit temporarily, like a stranger in the ‘system’. The attacks were also aimed at reducing self esteem and self confidence, a feeling familiar to older participants such as Ruihi who as recounted, had suffered daily physical punishment from Pākehā teachers for speaking Māori.

Ruihi WHAT THAT DID it gave me an inferiority complex lack of self esteem lack of confidence it took me yea:::rs to work that through↓(.) to me that was the outcome of that blatant of that sort of blatant treatment

Like other participants, her strong feeling of injustice and unfairness energised her to succeed in regaining her confidence and moving forward later in life, despite the childhood abuse. Sharlee and Hoa note that it is easy for young Māori today to feel
intimidated by police, which again has societal repercussions: if police are overly
zealous in apprehending young Māori, they could become not only intimidated but also
averse to the police system from an early age.

Significantly, hopelessness and other associated feelings such as despondency and
despair were not mentioned by participants. Once the initial shock and pain of the
incident was over but not forgotten, most decided that the racism was undeserved,
unmerited and intolerable. They did not accept the situation, and their micro-level
resistance is the subject of Chapter Six.

Sometimes Māori participants would urge me to ask their Pākeha partner about a certain
point when I interviewed them, in order to underscore their story, which was not
possible given the methodology and the importance placed on unsolicited comments in
the interviews. However, notably in these cases the Pākeha partner had been sufficiently
impressed by the encounter to voluntarily reiterate it, or it had become a part of their
combined narrative, as for example when Bill and Elaine were interviewed separately
yet both related the account of Pākeha relatives’ initial refusal to shake his hand. This
underscores the emotional connection between the partners in this study. The emotion
reaction of the Pākeha partners was at times even stronger than their partners’; having
witnessed the racism they were indignant and angry on their Māori partner’s behalf,
particularly at the fact that most of these incidents would remain unknown and probably
unimagined by most Pākeha (Human Rights Commission, 2007).

A case study

This chapter concludes with an example which shows both the pernicious impact on
feelings and the long reach of racist trauma experienced in childhood, and the courage
and determination to overcome racism typically displayed throughout participants’
accounts. The account is taken from Hiair, whose childhood involved being verbally
abused and beaten by her teachers on an almost daily basis, from the age of six to
fifteen, for not knowing the English language. This involved being repeatedly hit with a
large ruler, strapped or caned in front of the class. Although the horrifying memories
stayed with her, she managed to move on in life and became qualified and successful in
a profession, while marrying and having children and grandchildren and taking part in
the community. She was happy with her life. She then had to leave her home and enter hospital for a medical procedure which would take up to a week. Worried about her snoring, she explained how loud it was and asked if she could have a room away from the ward after the operation so as not to disturb the other patients. The morning after surgery she woke in pain to find herself in a ward with other patients irritable that she had indeed kept them awake all night. She asked again for a bed away from the ward but was ignored by the nurse, who also did not bring her anything to eat or drink, and left her on a bedpan unable to move for an hour. Alone, she tried ringing the bell for attention but got no response, until around dinner time when a nurse came in, accompanied by another angry nurse.

Hiair yes she came stomping in and JUST WHO DO YOU THINK YOU ARE! (hhh) DEMANDING A SINGLE ROOM! You know and I said I’ve been sitting on this for an hour WELL I’VE BEEN BUSY! YOU’RE NOT THE ONLY PERSON IN THIS WARD! This kind of thing and then I was called surly and I was called ahm arrogant and all sorts of labels! just who do I think I am? and anyway she hurled all this stuff at me and during that time another nurse came in\^ and she because she could hear this other nurse yelling at me you see(\_) shouting and ahm(\_)she came in to try and stop her she didn’t say anything she asked me if I was alright?! And I said no not really\^ and she said ahm(1) ah::: what can I do? and I said well(hhh) I said something about I’d like a phone so I could ring my family to come and take me away and take me out of here\^ ‘oh you can’t leave! You can’t leave’ she didn’t apologise\^ I didn’t get my sponge\^\^ I didn’t get my clothes changed I didn’t get my soup\^ and by then it was really late and all the patients were asleep\^  

Hiair rings her family, who come and collect her. She goes home and the physical pain gradually subsides, but she continues to feel undefinedly ‘unwell’ and cannot function.

Hiair for a long time and I couldn’t identify why? I couldn’t place my finger on the reason why I was crying for no reason\^ (hhh) and someone asked me what’s why are you what’s wrong? and I’d say I don’t know!
this went on for days and it wasn’t until months later it finally hit me; it was all those labels.

Hiair talks at length about how the hospital stay took her back to her schooldays, and she began getting sudden, unwanted vivid recollections of school episodes such as her first day at school, the heavy ruler, and being made to stand alone in the corner in pain and unable to go home. She could not understand why she had returned to the memories she had deliberately moved away from, but was unable to stop the flashbacks for some time.

Hiair but I mean after all those years! and I(1) my family all came around and asked me what’s wrong and I explained to them because one time I was in bed and I wouldn’t get up and I wouldn’t get up for a couple of days and they kept asking me what’s wrong?

Hiair thanked me for the chance to tell her story in full, and said she had wanted to tell it to someone, but never had the chance. Her account illustrates the lifelong nature of the effects of racism, which is also noted in that participants of all ages could still clearly recall racist incidents that had happened throughout their lives, whether in childhood or adulthood.

**Summary**

This chapter has looked at the most common racist incidents participants recounted, and provided a thematic analysis which included attention to positioning and the context of Aotearoa NZ. Key themes in participants’ accounts were perpetrator response to visual and verbal markers, their encounters with negative stereotypes, places or sites where they had experienced racism, racism in the justice system, and their experience of cultural racism expressed in tokenism. The analysis concludes with a single case study which emphasises the long-lasting effects of racism. Notably, although the majority of participants attributed blame to the media for creating and regenerating racism, it was not included as a separate theme as experience of media per se was not considered a micro-level interpersonal encounter. Participants’ comments on media are looked at more closely in the analysis presented in Chapter Seven. Finally, the depressing
number of incidents cited here give the impression that racism is endemic throughout Aotearoa NZ. However all participants expressed the view that not all Pākehā were racist, things had greatly improved and should continue to do so, for reasons explored in Chapter Eight. In the interim, they would resist racism, and their accounts of this are analysed in the next chapter.
Chapter Six

Resisting racism

Chapter introduction

The following chapter sets forth the main finding around participants’ responses to question two of Section A, which asked, how did it affect you? Their emotional response, which was vividly remembered but in most cases restrained to the time of the incident itself, is detailed at the end of the previous chapter. Their proactive and enduring reaction to the racism was to practice and demonstrate resistance, and this chapter provides a thematic analysis of their accounts related to this dominant theme. The data excerpts in this chapter have been ‘tidied’ from the original verbatim transcripts, for example with the removal of arrows, and given instead appropriate common punctuation at the request of the Journal Editor.

Resisting racism: Māori experiences of interpersonal racism in Aotearoa NZ

Abstract

Previous studies on racism in the field of discursive and critical social psychology have focused mainly on perpetrator talk and text, perpetrator personality and cognition, in-group psychology, and systemic racism. Research examining targets’ perspectives and responses to racism is rare. The current study, one of the first of its kind in Aotearoa NZ, explores indigenous Māori accounts of their resistance to everyday racism. Nineteen Māori men and women were interviewed regarding their experiences and reactions to racist incidents. Thematic analysis informed by social constructionism was used to examine interview transcripts and identify three key themes: 1) difficulties in

---

verbally expressing resistance to racism 2) silent or non-vocalised resistance, and 3) vocalised resistance. Comparing and contrasting findings with previous research highlighted participants’ agentic management of resistance and a unique desire to inform perpetrators about their racism.

**Introduction**

The oppression that is racism, its sinuous and enduring chameleon like presence and negative outcomes, have been well documented. Whether interpersonal or institutional, subtle, unspoken (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005) or blatant (Halliday-Hardie & Tyson, 2013) it has been located internationally in areas such as justice (Glover, 2009), employment (Feagin, 2014) public establishments (Broman et al., 2000), health (Feagin & Bennefield, 2014) and education (e.g., Troyna & Williams, 2012). Studies of indigenous peoples show racism is compounded by a history of colonisation in which indigenous political and economic systems, cultural and societal norms are overrun by the new dominant culture. Resistance is met with at worst genocide (Moses, 2004), and at least an enduring marginalisation (Chakma & Jensen, 2002). Research documents modern day racism directed at indigenous peoples, for example, Native Americans (Mihesuah, 1996), Native Hawaiians (Keawe‘aimoku Kaholokula et al, 2012), the Mapuche of Chile (Merino, Mellor, Saiz, & Quilaqueo, 2009) First Nation Canadians (Wieman, 2006) and Aboriginal Australians (Mellor, 2004). The current study focuses on the indigenous Māori people who constitute 14.9% of the population of Aotearoa NZ (Statistics New Zealand, 2014), where the majority are European, known as Pākehā.

Each country’s backdrop for racism is unique, and in Aotearoa NZ, the Treaty of Waitangi, signed by Māori tribal leaders and representatives of the Crown in 1840, provides an ongoing foundational document which in theory, affords equal merit and consideration to both parties in all negotiations. History shows, however, that the marginalisation originally justified by evolutionary theories of White superiority (Johnston & Pihama, 1994) and established with military might and land seizure, endures to the present day. Contemporary research indicates that Māori are more than twice as likely as Europeans to be incarcerated for similar crimes (Workman, 2011), are subject to employment discrimination (Robson, 2008) and lowered educational achievement (Robson et al., 2007) which is linked to institutional racism, racist
bullying, and lower mainstream teacher expectation for Māori students (Hynds et al., 2011). Possibly the greatest gap is evidenced in the area of health, where the detrimental effects of lowered SES, poor housing, institutional racism, interpersonal discrimination and unfair treatment from health professionals (Harris et al., 2006a) combine with chronic stress. Chronic stress brought about by ongoing racism has been crucially linked to lowered mental and physical health for Māori (Harris, Cormack & Stanley, 2013). The Māori mortality rate for cardiovascular disease, a condition profoundly exacerbated by chronic stress (Esler et al., 2003) is more than 2.5 times higher than that of Pākehā (Ministry of Health, 2015a). Chronic stress is also implicated in cancer, diabetes and infection (Hubbard & Workman, 1998; Sapolsky, 1998). The age-standardised cancer mortality rate for Māori is almost double that of non-Māori, notification of Meningococcal disease is three times higher, and rheumatic fever five times. Complications from diabetes rates are four to nine times higher for Māori than for Pākehā. The high suicide rate for Māori, which for those aged 15 to 24 years is more than 2.5 times higher than that of non-Māori (Ministry of Health, 2015b) has also been linked to racism.

Racism against Māori is none the less denied by most Pākehā (Human Rights Commission, 2007), and the challenge of exposing racism has been addressed by critical and discursive social psychologists. Wetherell and Potter’s early study of discursive, subtle, and systemic racism, was followed by a corpus of work (for a review see Tuffin, 2013) spotlighting influential and marginalising historical discourses (McCreanor, 1997), Māori being constructed as physical rather than intellectual (Hokowhitu, 2004), and blamed for lowered socio-economic status while ignoring systemic racism. The media were charged with upholding negative discourses (Lehrman, 2007) and trivialising or vilifying Māori (Wall, 1997). All such perpetrator studies were criticised, however (Jones, 1997) for failing to address the lived reality of the targets (Feagin & Sikes, 1994) and thus providing only limited understanding of racism (Gaines & Reed 1995). Researchers attempted to redress the imbalance by studying targets’ responses (for reviews, see Brondolo et al, 2009; Mellor, 2004). Feagin’s (1991) study with African Americans distinguished between assertive responses communicating displeasure, and non-assertive responses such as placatory humour or appeasement, or seeking personal social support. Mellor’s (2004) study with Australian Aboriginals outlined self-protection or defence, ignoring the event, and
contesting or confronting racism. In Aotearoa NZ, Moewaka Barnes et al. (2013) found Māori targets of racism described associated anxiety, coping by avoidance, internalisation, and the subjugation of Māori cultural markers to Pākehā norms. With this exception, there is little published research regarding Māori responses to racism. The current study was designed to explore Māori targets’ perceptions and responses in order to further psychological understanding of racism from the targets’ perspectives.

Research approach

The theoretical stance which informs this work is critical social psychology underpinned by a social constructionist epistemology. This highlights history, politics, culture and other contextual factors (Gergen, 1985) behind the hybrid compositum of political leanings, societal discourses, and stereotypical beliefs unique to racism in Aotearoa NZ. The action orientation of words is acknowledged, as participants uniquely construct their own and others’ lived realities. This theoretical approach brings to the forefront and acknowledges with equal importance the perceptions of marginalised targets. Thematic analysis was employed in a data-driven, ‘bottom up’ analysis, allowing the researchers to highlight key features and present accessible findings representative of the participant’s own experiences and perceptions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researchers aimed specifically to adhere to the maxim that the participants were the expert knowers.

Pākehā research with Māori is culturally viable if the researchers have an empathetic understanding of tikanga Māori, and more importantly, if the study is focussed on improving the lives of Māori (Carpenter & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2008). Prior discussion and approval were obtained from a Māori cultural adviser, the University’s Human Ethics Committee, and a representative from a local marae. The study took place in Wellington, the capital city, with the interviews conducted by the first author, a Pākehā with many years’ experience working with Māori and a Bachelor’s degree in Māori studies. Trust from Māori participants is essential (Tolich, 2002) before interviewing. Accordingly, initial recruitment took place among Māori to whom the main researcher was well known, followed by snowballing with mutual trust. Kanohi ki te kanohi, face to face contact, was used wherever possible. Participants were shown
information sheets, interview questions, consent forms, and confidentiality agreements before being interviewed. Questions were invited and answered.

Interview questions included: Does racism against Māori take place in Aotearoa NZ, and if so, can you describe your experience? The interviewer deliberately avoided agentic guiding of the participants’ responses, which were treated as the final authority. Interviews were digitally audio-recorded at participants’ homes or places of work, with participants choosing their own pseudonyms. Nineteen Māori aged 30 -74 (m = 53) participated, nine women and 10 men, mainly skilled and employed, with several retirees in volunteer work. Interview collection ended at the point of data saturation. The interviews were between 60 to 120 minutes in length and transcribed verbatim. Continued transparency was practised through openness to questions, opportunity to review transcripts, offers of continued person to person contact, assurance of access and a copy of preliminary and final results.

**Analytic procedure**

Transcription provided immersion and important familiarisation with the data (Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999), and analysis proceeded with the noting of initial thematic ideas. Participants stated categorically that racism against Māori occurs in some form in everyday life throughout Aotearoa NZ today. Common words and phrases were comprehensively collated, generating semantic codes to which all relevant data was referenced. During frequent re-readings of associated data new understandings were gained, and codings merged or renamed. Interesting features and potential themes were then commented on, mapped and discussed. Ongoing analytic discussion and checking took place throughout a recursive process of moving between data and codes to re-define, verify and finalise three main themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

**Findings**

In the first theme, participants constructed their difficulty in expressing resistance to racism; for some, vocalising resistance was confrontational and stressful, or inadvisable in the circumstances. The second theme was non-vocalised resistance involving two sub-themes: 1) participants built self-strength, pride, confidence, and positioned the
perpetrator as lesser, processes which provided psychological fortification against the
effects of racism; 2) participants used either body language to demonstrate disapproval,
or actions which demonstrated that they did not fit the negative racist stereotype. In a
third theme of vocalised resistance, participants constructed both learning to vocalise
resistance, and their experiences of successful verbal resistance. The strategies of
vocalised resistance were perceptive, varied, creative, and at times humorous. A key
factor in all themes was that implicitly, participant decisions on how to resist, manage,
control or end the racist incident, were made agentically, thereby transferring control
from the perpetrator to the target. At times the themes were used in combination; for
example, silence before confounding the perpetrator. Each theme is unpacked in detail
and illustrated with data extracts, analysis and discussion.

Difficulty in expressing resistance

Although participants implicitly constructed themselves as the undeserving targets of
racism, the moral advantage of this positioning did not automatically facilitate
successful verbal response to racist incidents. Participants clearly objected to and
wanted to stop racism, but also acknowledged barriers and problems associated with
vocalising resistance. Some were silenced by a dislike of confrontation, others by power
imbalances in the workplace and lacklustre systems of redress, others by a dislike of
being constructed as ‘protesters’. In the first extract, vocalised resistance is cast as
stressful due to confrontation.

Jessica I’m not I’m not really a confrontational person. And so when I
have…ahm… there was quite a substantial period where I wouldn’t say
anything. I’d sit on it, because I hate confrontation.

Jessica constructs her dislike of confrontation as previously rendering her unwilling to
verbally resist racist comments. She positions herself as having had to learn how to
manage these difficult interpersonal situations. For others, the dislike of confrontation
was associated with a fear of losing emotional control, and saying too much; Tu, who
relates the common problem of being unnecessarily followed around a store by security,
constructs himself as someone whose desire to respond is hampered by his emotional
reaction.
Tu I’m not really one for conflict. Because if I do say something I’ve got a short wick, I won’t hit somebody, but I don’t want to make a scene in front of everybody who’re just trying to do their daily shopping.

Power imbalances in relationships were frequently cited as contributing to the difficulties in responding verbally. Kahu, an office worker, recounts a boss making racist comments during a staff meeting.

Kahu He’d say things like ahm a nigger in the woodpile? (laughs) Yeah he used to say that and ahm back then we’d go and have a talk, us three ethnic people, and we were all frozen stiff you know? With - what sort of reactions should we have

Linguistic expression of resistance is made difficult by social positioning; the targets are ‘frozen stiff’ and seek consensual support on how to react. The balance of power is held by the boss, whose remark might also be defended as a casual comment. Implicitly, job security could be threatened by vocalised resistance to the racial slur. Racial harassment redress procedures in the workplace were regarded as ineffective, as in the following.

Zoe There’s no equal footing really, in it. To have the courage and to come forth and say ‘look this is happening’ in the first place takes a lot of courage. And then for it to be turned around and say ‘well look they didn’t know’ or ‘no they didn’t say that’ when it’s like they did say that, and who are you to say that they didn’t say that! It becomes hearsay and then ‘oh you can have a few days off because you’re obviously a bit mentally unstable’.

Zoe constructs a linguistic battlefield in which alleged racism could be contested, the target constructed as the cause of the problem through misrepresentation, misunderstanding, or mental instability. Targets also talked about the risk of being labelled as undesirable ‘protesters’ if they spoke on behalf of Māori. The following demonstrates the active power of language, both to constrain, and attribute blame:
Rauri: They’re automatically named activists. They’re called...they’re immediately given a negative - you know, you’re either a terrorist, or an activist, or or something like that, you’re not a person that just disagrees.

The construction of Māori as terrorists or protesters, reduces Māori rhetoric to insurrection or unwanted dissidence. This construction, a common discursive perpetrator response (McClearn, 1993b), changes the public image of Māori from a legitimate to an illegitimate speaker, and constrains their right to be heard.

Fear of confrontation, power imbalances or being labelled as an untrustworthy aggressor inspired silent demonstrations of internal resistance, as described next.

Non-vocalised resistance

The first of two sub themes of non-vocalised resistance involves internal fortification against the power, impact and marginalising implications of racism, as a precursor to action. Specific self-empowering strategies were mentioned, such as utilising strength, pride, confidence, and positioning the perpetrator as lesser:

Sharlee: You know it hurt me then but you know we had to be strong to overcome. I had to overcome it.

Ruihi: Blatant, blatant, yeah that was the outcome. It didn’t happen only to me it happened to many others, and for me, I used the strength the courage and the strength that I had to get over it.

Sharlee and Ruihi acknowledge the pain of their encounter, and summon inner strength to resist. The context implicitly constructed is an unavoidable social battle which affects many people, and needs a resistant stand. Participants spoke of fostering a sense of pride:

Fred: It really revolves around - around self esteem um from a personal viewpoint and then once people have that they’re be able to feel good about who they are, what they do, what they achieve, and you know you’re able to rise above that subjugative barrier.
The demeaning and discouraging effects of racism were countered by calling on both personal and ethnic pride which provided the inner resilience needed to resist racist disparagement. Confidence to resist was likewise addressed.

They have the opportunity to ahm build their own confidence, you know? and then it’s up to them to find their own resolutions

Confidence was constructed as empowering, enabling resistance, and a deliberate personal choice. One participant talked about ‘psyching herself up’ and another, about ‘developing an attitude’. Confidence could also be increased by constructing the perpetrator as lesser in terms of mental well-being, knowledge and ethics. One participant constructing a perpetrator who used the obscene word ‘nigger’ stated ‘maybe he had Tourette Syndrome’. Another termed the perpetrator ‘ignorant’ and another denied the perpetrator the podium of moral high ground, in an evaluative character construction of fundamental dishonesty:

…and they lie. They lie themselves in their teeth you know!

This followed an account in which the participant had been told a rental property was available, but when she met the landlord in person, she was told it had already been let. Mentally positioning the perpetrator as less morally credible affirmed targets’ decisions to resist racism.

In the second subtheme of non-vocalised resistance, participants described exhibiting resistance by using silence, body language or actions, to show either disapproval, or indicate that the racist stereotype assumed was incorrect. Silence has been widely researched as a powerful force for change (Baudrillard, 1999; Foucault, 2002) and resistance (Wagner, 2012). For participants, it allowed a strategically safe response which demonstrated resistance without confrontation. In the example below, Sophia describes her handling of an incident commonly described by targets, in which she was ignored by store personnel:
Sophia: I’d buy something so that I could stand at the counter and you know (strikes a dignified, aloof, disdainful pose) show them that I didn’t care for them. Yeah I think I was brought up not to be abusive towards people but I certainly found ways of demonstrating my umbrage, mm, my upsetness.

Sophia constructs her stand as a dignified demonstration of resistance to being ignored, which allowed her the moral high ground of showing displeasure without becoming ‘abusive’. Participants also spoke of ignoring racist comments; treating it as unworthy of attention rendered it ineffectual. Participants also observed that when racism was subtle, framed in such a way as to be indefinable and deniable, there was no verbal way to retaliate. In the example below, Jessica describes driving to university and being pulled over by a police officer who expressed doubt she was a university student:

Jessica: He said ‘I find that hard to believe’ and he didn’t come out and say openly that it was because I was Māori, but that was the feeling that I got ahm it was that ‘surely a little Māori girl is not capable’ and it was just his attitude, the tone of voice, his language and that made me feel that he made that assumption based on race.

Instead of verbally challenging his statement, which could possibly have been defended as non-racist, she silently displayed her student ID card to resist his stereotypical racist positioning.

Pākehā assumptions that Māori were inherently unintelligent or uneducable, inarticulate, lazy, fat, dirty, drinkers, violent, unemployed, or criminal, were constructed as ongoing, expressed explicitly or implicitly, and supported at a macro-level by media and societal discourses. They were subject to resistance on an incident by incident basis, particularly by irrefutable evidence to the contrary. In the example below, Fred talks about people surprised to find he is in a position of authority at work.
Fred: People tend to put you in a box and unfortunately it’s a pretty low sort of box and so therefore to get out of that box you’ve actually got to prove yourself. You’re always going to think that until I prove you different.

Fred’s strategy is to debunk the stereotype by providing contrasting evidence, demonstrating his ability and work ethic, his experiential finding being that Pākehā then change their attitude. Having to be better than Pākehā in order to be accepted as equal, was frequently cited by participants.

Hoa: Māori folks have to be better than Pākehā folks to be on the same level. You’ve gotta be you have to be that much better, you know?

In these ways non-vocalised resistance filled a gap where spoken resistance would cause confrontation, or where racism was subtle and deniable. Coming closer to vocalisation, one participant talked about not using words, but instead crying openly at a racist incident.

Ruihi: I cried once, but I’m not going to go down. I don’t mind them seeing me crying you know because they are tears of hurt. You’ve hurt me but I’m coming back. That doesn’t get me down, is the message I give.

She deliberately resisted the perpetrator’s notion that it was acceptable, by making those watching aware the remark was racist and hurtful. The strategy relied to some extent on appealing to the onlooker’s better nature, as it was attributional and implicit in her letting them know that they hurt her. To render the message unambiguous to the perpetrator, however, required the target to surmount the difficulties constructed and produce a clear verbal response, as in the next theme.

Vocalised resistance

Resistance was required, as one said: ‘Māori are going to have to fight’ but a verbal response or challenge was constructed as a combative skill to be learned gradually:
Ruihi I had to learn to do that. I had to learn how to express myself, I had to learn how to respond to these sort of comments because this is not just going to happen *now*, this is going to happen *often*.

Ruihi constructs racism as endemic and sustained, an integral part of the lives of Māori, and therefore it behoves Māori to acquire the linguistic skills necessary for resistance. Others stressed the importance of not backing down, of expressing resistance to racism more assertively.

Bill You have to be able to go it *against* it and you learned I guess not to put up with any nonsense. I learned to get a bit of a smart mouth (laughs).

Fred Now I’m a bit older and some would say wiser but (laughs) you know you get more agro about it.

Using terms such as ‘against’ and ‘agro’ indicated the combative nature of vocalised response, and terms like ‘learned’ ‘older’ ‘wiser’ underscored the accompanying need for maturity.

Vocalising resistance was however also constrained by participants’ implicit understanding that using the word ‘racist’ itself was considered undesirable and inflammatory (Tuffin, 2008). Vocalised resistance was easier when the target did not mention racism, and injected humour into the situation, as in the following example:

Rauri I quite like the idea of conforming to the stereotypes and sometimes just *waiting* to see how people will be. I think they’re not expecting that I might, *might* be able to mount a *cogent* response to what they’re saying.

The well-educated target rightly anticipated that for many Pākehā, his phenotypically Māori appearance and casual attire triggered stereotypical assumptions, which could then be used amusingly to his advantage. He could listen, then confound and embarrass the perpetrator simply by replying in intelligent speech. Participants also talked about perpetrators deliberately using pidgin English which offensively ‘dumbed down’ the English language.
I think there is this, when a person wants to get on the same *level* as you they’ll *perceive* that that level needs that type of broken English to enable them to - for you to accept them on your level. And then you listen to them talking to somebody else, and suddenly the way they give a salutation to that person, or the way they address them, is quite different. Yet when *you* walk up it’s as though your brown skin *gives them the right to lower your mana.*

Poto constructs such talk as blatantly racist, depending as it does on the perpetrator’s perception that a Māori phenotype indicates poor English skills. The pidgin English overtures were insulting, but participants recounted that responding in correct English embarrassed the perpetrator, repositioned themselves, and was a successful non-confrontational solution.

A particularly useful linguistic skill in challenging racism was the art of turning the argument back to the perpetrator, or reversing it, again without mentioning ‘racism’. One participant recounted how he had danced with a Māori culture group onstage, then been told by his boss it wasn’t seemly for someone in his position to be ‘publicly cavorting in a grass skirt’. The participant replied he would desist if the company’s Scottish pipe band would also desist from wearing ‘kilts and sporrans’. In the excerpt below, Rauri uses this technique with workmates who assume he will be voting for the (disliked) Māori political party:

> **Rauri** When the first person says ‘you gonna join the Māori party?’ I say well, are *you* thinking of joining up with [disliked right wing Pākehā leader]!?! He’s a bit *old!* And have you been thinking how nice it would be to go into *his* Party? And then it’s the same questions being asked on different sides to the fence so we’re both pointing a little bit and saying you know there’s *idiots* on both sides.

By turning the argument back on his workmates, and pointing out that it could work both ways, he neutralises racism and resists its power. Some participants found that challenging workplace perpetrators to explain their racial slurs, was also successful.
Hose cites a fellow worker who found it humorous to make unflattering jokes about Māori people. Other workers said nothing, so Hose expressed apparently genuine interest in understanding the perpetrator’s remarks more fully. The undesirability of appearing racist (Tuffin, 2008) and possible embarrassment silenced the perpetrator and prevented future racist comments.

More overtly, participants also talked of expressing resistance in such a way that racist comments or behaviour were retracted. Some strands of this response technique were educating, rebuking, and challenging. In the excerpt below, the target was pointedly ignored when waiting to be served at a store counter.

Hiair I said excuse me, am I invisible? (laughs) and then they’d come running over to serve me but you had to make a noise and sometimes you’d you just need to remind them, and I think it does make a difference, ah, to them, their performance. And they’re very careful after that.

‘They’ are the store workers and here the target is prepared to ‘make a noise’ ‘to remind them’ she is waiting. The educative strategy is constructed as successful because she is hurriedly served, and on future occasions, they are careful not to ignore her. The idea of needing to inform or educate the perpetrators was reinforced across many accounts, as in the extract below.

Sophia I think some people actually respond quite well to that and they’re actually quite horrified. I’ve challenged a couple of people and they’ve cried and been very upset because they didn’t think they were like that.

Some participants rebuked perpetrators while explaining explicitly the effect that their racism was having, as in the example below.
Sharlee …and I says to her ‘you don’t know how it hurts people so you’ve got to be very careful on how you talk to people’ you know? I says ‘because it’s it’s racist I said. You just don’t talk like that’. You know? I say ‘you just stop and think.’

The attributional nature of the participant’s talk assigns blame to the perpetrator, and in doing so resists notions that racism is permissible or inconsequential. Again the notion that the perpetrator may be unaware and need educating, is the latent driver, in this case to the unusual point of openly labelling the behaviour as racist.

**Discussion**

In each of the three themes, participants displayed agency by constructing their resistance as independently self-determined. Difficulties in resisting racism were addressed through personal emotional and psychological fortification to promote inner strength, pride and confidence. Pride in racial and cultural identity were also mentioned (Bennett, 2002). Silent actions were chosen to declare resistance without becoming confrontational. Verbal resistance, although constructed as the most problematic, resulted in successful stands being taken against interpersonal racism and racist stereotyping. These findings demonstrate a uniquely Māori perspective, and contribute to a nascent field of research on the targets of racism, in which Māori voices and experiences are mostly absent. Collectively, they highlight the extent to which participants possessed the psychological resources to manage the interpersonal dynamics involved in resisting racism, and as Mallett and Swim (2009) suggest, exercise control over an undeservedly bad situation. Other studies which utilise the psychosocial stress paradigm by linking targets’ responses to existing theories of stress and coping, such as problem focussed, emotion focussed or avoidant coping (Brondolo et al 2009) contrast with participants’ constructions of resistance, expressed silently or vocally. Such interpersonal resistance can reduce the escalation of racism and shift social norms towards intolerance of racism (Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies, 2011).

Although it is important not to make definitive comparisons between Māori and other racialised groups based on a relatively small study, international findings are of some
relevance here. Indigenous Australians have a contextually similar background of colonisation and marginalisation, and a study by Mellor (2004) showed three main response themes: protecting the self (withdrawing, escaping, avoiding contact, or resignation), controlled response, and confrontation. The participants in the current study did not discuss self protection, but like the Aboriginal Australians, did construct inferior traits in the perpetrator. The theme of controlled resistance first mirrored by participants was the agentic decision not to respond, on occasions, but this was constructed without acceptance or hopelessness. Secondly, Aboriginal Australians’ controlled responses of silent resistance, and the delivery of strategically planned verbal response, were shared by the participants, but they did not discuss ‘imagined responses’. The overall Māori participants’ combination of self control with resistant thought and behaviour led to a strong alignment with Mellor’s third theme: confronting racism, which is underscored in another Australian study (Zierschet al., 2011). Aboriginal Australian participants also described sometimes utilising external controls such as work supervisors or police; Māori participants however constructed boss/worker power imbalances, and police as invariably prejudicial against Māori (Fergusson et al., 2003a).

The participants’ response of resistance implies that they believed they could be successful. A unique feature of the findings of this study is that many of the strategies used by participants confidently constructed most Pākehā as ignorant of their racism, on some level wanting to get on with Māori, not wanting to be racist, and therefore being teachable and correctable. Research supports a modern day desire to appear non-racist (Tuffin, 2008), and the notion of ignorance (Pack, Tuffin, & Lyons 2015a), is echoed by findings that Pākehā believe racism against Māori is virtually non-existent (Human Rights Commission, 2007). Pākehā constructions of a non-racist society are supported with reference to the fact that approximately half of partnered Māori have Pākeha or non-Māori partners, suggesting a continuing growth in intermarriage (Callister et al., 2007). Nonetheless, participants related experiences of both subtle and overt personally mediated racism, and the urgent need to have this acknowledged and addressed by Pākeha.

Some research findings were not apparent in this study, for example, the use of social support (Brondolo et al, 2009) to counter the experience of racism. Responses such as feelings of disempowerment and lower levels of mastery (Broman, Mavadatt, & Hsu,
engaging in fantasy, being preoccupied with oneself, withdrawing, engaging in ‘maladaptive’ coping (Endler & Parker, 1990; Nowack, 1989), feeling distress, attack, violence, disengagement and abandonment of expectations for fairness (Baker, Varma, & Tanaka, 2001) were seldom mentioned. The results of this study showed an emphasis on agentic and active ways to resist racism rather than discussing feelings or emotions. This could have been due to the older average age of the participants (53) providing the experience and confidence to denounce and resist racism; several participants constructed verbal resistance as a skill learned with age and time. It is also possible that these participants’ high level of resistance could be a result of participant self-selection due to interest in the topic of racism. It is also important to acknowledge the Pākehā researchers’ theoretical positions and values, or their desire to give equal voice to the perspectives of the targets of racism, which could have increased both what and how much participants divulged.

Given the grim backdrop of racism in health, justice, and other areas, any resistance is extraordinary, requiring a unique and determined resilience deserving of academic attention. Participants claimed that despite the difficulties involved, their strategies provided satisfactorily resistant responses to racism. However, while this study spotlights the participants’ successes, determination and resistance, it does not address the unequal burden of the experience of racism nor the overarching oppressive effects of structural racism, which urgently need addressing. The resistances expressed are positive mitigating micro strategies, and as such, complement existing studies; most of the models in the coping literature do not indicate or clearly identify specific strategies employed to confront racism, and more studies are needed in this area (Brondolo et al., 2009). This study has implications for informing researchers and targets regarding ways in which racism can be confronted, resisted, and silenced at a micro-level. Further studies are needed to spotlight successful strategies used by targets to counter interpersonal racism, to expand current understandings of racism in Aotearoa NZ, and also to determine whether or not such resistance at a micro-level can finally contribute to wider positive changes in society.
Chapter Seven

Accounting for racism

Chapter introduction

The previous chapter on *resisting* racism detailed the participants’ ongoing response to the racism described in Chapter Five. Many of these incidents were shockingly overt, in contrast to the expected subtle modern day racism which has been well documented (Tuffin, 2013). Why such racism should take place at all against Māori in Aotearoa NZ was a question which seemed to follow automatically, and participants answered it at length when it was posed to them in Section B of the interview schedule (Appendix B). Why did they think the perpetrator acted this way? What was being established? What motivated the ethnophaulisms and the disparagement? Were Pākehā unaware of the racist element in their actions and speech, and if so, why? This question tapped into a rich well of years of careful consideration and coming to conclusions about the determinants and goals behind the incidents. This supports the thesis that targets are more strongly motivated to analyse the reasons for the perpetrators’ actions or words than members of the unaffected majority (Swim & Stangor, 1998). Their valuable and uniquely positioned insights were analysed discursively and are detailed in the following chapter, Accounting for racism.
Abstract

Previous discursive studies on the construction, reproduction and justification of racism have focussed on the accounts of perpetrators, to the exclusion of the targets of racist talk. The current study redresses this imbalance by exploring the talk of targets of racism in Aotearoa NZ. Interviews were conducted with 24 participants, 19 Māori and five Pākehā partners. Our social constructionist discourse analysis identifies four primary discourses that participants drew on to account for racism, two of which resonated strongly with the literature and two which spotlighted new areas of interest. A discourse of ignorance functioned to allow participants to account for racism by highlighting Pākehā ignorance of Māori people and culture, and of racism itself. The second discourse implicated the media for emphasising negative Māori news, avoiding positive Māori achievements, and promoting negative stereotypes. A third discourse constructed Pākehā as possessing an innate sense of superiority which contributed to racism, and fourthly, institutionalised racism was used by participants to construct a colonial society which continued to marginalise Māori. Finally we consider the implications of these findings with respect to existing literature, some implications around the intersectionality and relationship between these discourses, and the importance of potential gains in understanding made possible through the study of targets’ perspectives.

Introduction

Aotearoa NZ was settled by Māori in the thirteenth century following long exploratory voyages from the islands of the central South Pacific (King, 2003). Occupying the country along tribal lines (which claim descent from one of the original canoes), these first inhabitants developed a comprehensive system of communal living based on
whānau (close family ties) iwi (tribal groups) and a holistic connection to the land. Stimulated by the commercial activities of sealing and whaling Pākehā (White) settlement began in the early 1800’s. The colonisation of Aotearoa NZ was consistent with a pattern of global colonisation where Indigenous peoples were humbled, marginalised, and downtrodden (Power, 2003). Colonisation saw ‘new’ countries formed on the basis of migration and the subjugation of Indigenous rights in favour of the pioneering spirit whereby Indigenous land was seized by newly established authorities who marginalised native customs and social practices and imposed new cultures, technologies and languages.

In 1840 the colonisation of Aotearoa NZ took a unique turn with the establishment of a constitutional document: the Treaty of Waitangi. This foundational document was signed by Governor Hobson on behalf of the Queen of England and the ‘Confederation of the United Chiefs of New Zealand’. While the Treaty sought to capture the broad principle of ‘two people sharing one land’, promises of equal partnership have been thwarted by policies of the British Crown (Ward, 1973) which have undermined traditional indigenous authority with Māori becoming subject to the sovereignty of the Crown and their rights to self-governance largely ignored. Nevertheless, Aotearoa NZ remains a distinctly bicultural country with, for example, both English and Māori recognised as official languages. The Treaty serves as the cornerstone of biculturalism with most New Zealanders valuing, at least the symbolism, of Māori contributions to national identity (Sibley & Liu, 2004). In Aotearoa NZ race relations can be regarded as an ongoing political and psychological dynamic between colonised and coloniser (Kendall et al., 2005). This dynamic continues to unfold against a distinctly bicultural backdrop involving political debates over issues of access and ownership of land, fisheries, and foreshore and seabed (Kirkwood, Liu, & Weatherall, 2005).

In modern day Aotearoa NZ, 14.9% of New Zealanders identify as indigenous Māori (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a), and researchers have demonstrated a number of adverse outcomes of racism for Māori including mental and physical ill-health (Statistics New Zealand, 2013b) unsatisfactory progress in housing and health intervention measures (Flynn, Carne, & Soa-Lafoa’i, 2010) and lowered educational achievement (Ford, 2013). Low socio-economic status (SES), an exacerbator of disparities in education and health, has contributed to Māori being underpaid relative to
Pākehā (New Zealanders of largely European descent). This is alleged to be a product of systemic racism in which Pākehā hold a disproportionate number of executive positions (Robson, 2008). Within the criminal justice system, Māori are twice as likely to be convicted as charged than Pākehā, after other factors such as age, educational status and socio-economic status were accounted for (Fergusson et al., 2003a; Workman, 2011).

While such studies provide a bleak picture, they tell us little about the causes, dynamics, or contemporary processes of modern racism. Social science research on racism has taken a discursive turn in the past two decades, allowing in-depth examinations of how racism is achieved through everyday talk and text in evolving, modern, and at times subtle ways. Billig et al. (1988) assert that rather than being a measurable trait, racism is ideological, neither static nor uniform, but variable and contradictory. Discursive research has demonstrated that racism can be accounted for by contextual rather than essential factors, and is a changing social process constituted by and constructed in discourse, talk and text (Tuffin, 2013).

Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) foundational study of racism in Aotearoa NZ demonstrated how racism operates socially and discursively, and can be regarded as politically and contextually sensitive. Wetherell and Potter analysed the discursive means by which Pākehā deflected the threat of Māori attempts at governance by constructing Māori culture either as ancient heritage, or a therapeutic connection by which Māori might function more positively in European society. They also explored how participants managed to dispel the appearance of racism by constructing Māori as deservedly marginalised while simultaneously sanctioning their argument as non-racist. This was achieved by utilising rhetorically self-sufficient phrases such as ‘everyone is equal here’, or ‘everyone gets a fair go’. Such phrases constructed society as egalitarian, ignored systemic racism, and positioned under-achievers negatively by implying lack of individual effort or motivation.

Studies exploring racism in Aotearoa NZ (e.g., McCreanor, 1997; Tuffin, 2008), and Australia (e.g., Paradies, Harris, & Anderson, 2008) underscore the findings that modern racism is subtly stated, rather than overt. They also demonstrate how colonial power structures are discursively produced and maintained in a variety of ways. Racist
talk avoids direct reference to race, instead employing neoliberal rhetoric. Society is constructed as democratic, egalitarian, free of systemic racism, and rewarding of individual effort. Such rhetoric deflects charges of prejudice while simultaneously justifying society’s status quo of Māori underachievement. Media research also suggests the over employment of negative representations positioning Māori as deservedly lower in a societal hierarchy (Rankine & McCreanor, 2004). Other discursive studies reveal a discourse in which New Zealanders are constructed as ‘one people’ of largely European culture; ‘good’ if they fit into this culture, and ‘bad’ if they raise objection (McCreanor, 1997). The talk of perpetrators of racism is no longer considered overt, visible and quantifiable, but covert, subtle, aimed at maintaining a power imbalance, and couched as acceptable argument (Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

Such studies have been valuable for detailed examination of the language involved in maintaining everyday racism, by highlighting the linguistic construction of racism, and its involvement in reproducing colonial power structures. However, in the extensive analytic examination of perpetrator talk, the perspectives of the targets of racism remain largely unexplored, with inattention to these accounts allegedly producing results divorced from the lived reality of the target (Feagin & Sikes, 1994). In an attempt to redress this imbalance some studies have considered racism from the targets’ perspectives. Mellor (2003) and Paradies and Cunningham (2009) noted that indigenous Aboriginal Australians constructed racism as interpersonal and overt. Webber et al. (2013) found that 62% of Aotearoa NZ Māori adolescents reported negative stereotyping and overt mockery from perpetrators, including assumptions of lower intelligence and gang or criminal association. Yancey (2007) explored the perspectives of White partners in 21 interracial marriages of Afro-American and American European in the USA, and found it was important to include interviews with White women partners since they experienced more racism than White males, due to their central childcare role which exposed them to racism directed against their children. Given the scant literature attending to the views of targets of racism, the current study sought to explore the ways in which Māori and also female Pākehā partners of Māori account for their experiences of racism.
Method

The study took place in Wellington, the capital city of Aotearoa NZ. The interviews were conducted in 2011 by the senior author, a Pākehā with many years’ experience working with Māori. Pākehā research with Māori has been advocated providing there is an empathetic understanding of Māori culture and language, and the project is for the betterment of Māori (Carpenter & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2008). Discussion and subsequent approval from a Māori cultural adviser overseeing the project, the University’s Human Ethics Committee, and a representative from a local marae, were sought. The researcher maintained transparency and connection with participants throughout the research in order to avoid the hegemony historically located in agentic Pākehā research which has framed Māori negatively (Cram, 1997).

Recruitment initially took place among Māori and partners known to the researcher. This established credibility and allowed snowballing. Twenty-four participants aged 30-74 (M = 53) took part, including 19 Māori (10 women, 9 men), and five Pākehā women partners. All participants had been or were currently in heterosexual relationships. Participants’ occupations included home maker, teacher, counsellor, electrician, communications manager, accountant, bus driver, financial advisor, author, foreman, cook, lecturer, company director, and retirees.

Individual interviews took place in participants’ homes or places of work outside working hours, and were digitally audio-recorded. Trust from Māori participants is even more important than the researcher’s bicultural skills (Tolich, 2002) and accordingly, cordiality, rapport and trust were established prior to the interviews. Participants chose their own pseudonyms.

During the interview, three primary open ended questions were asked, namely: Does racism against Māori take place in Aotearoa NZ, and if so can you describe your experience of it? Why do you think it occurs? What are the solutions? The question as to ‘why’ sought to encourage an exploration of the dynamics of racism. The interviews were transcribed verbatim using a transcription notation based on Atkinson and Heritage (1984).
The analytic focus was on how participants accounted for racism, in response to the question ‘Why do you think it occurs’. Preliminary coding involved dividing the corpus into broad thematic areas. Discrete coding was then conducted; the texts were examined, read and reread, compared and contrasted, and grouped according to codes that defined a single idea (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). The broad area of accounting for racism was laid out in separate but at times overlapping codes representing constructs discussed by the participants, such as power, superiority, Whiteness, essential traits, and media.

The method was partly informed by Parker’s (1992) critical discourse analytic approach which focussed on greater analysis of macro-level factors such as power issues, colonial discourses, and structural or systemic racism. This contextualised the micro-level analysis of participants’ accounting for racism, which drew on the discourse analytic tradition of Potter and Wetherell (1987). Our theoretical claim is that discourse does not merely reflect reality but is critically involved in creating it. Repeatedly used themes and phrases were therefore noted, and compared in contrasting texts to find emerging discourses. The functions of discursive constructions were investigated, along with participants’ explanations, accounts and attributions.

Analysis and findings

Most participants began their interviews by attending emphatically to the widespread Pākehā denial of racism against Māori (Human Rights Commission, 2007). Racism was reified as universal, endogenic, and unavoidable; phrases such as ‘it’s everywhere’ ‘the human condition’ ‘it’s natural’ were used to support the notion of localised racism. These claims were then backed up by accounts of experiences that ranged from the better known ‘subtle’ racism to the overt and highly offensive. Four main discourses were drawn on to account for racism: ‘ignorance’, ‘media’, ‘superiority’, and ‘institutional racism’.

Ignorance

More than half of the participants linguistically constructed Pākehā perpetrators as acting in ignorance, as in ‘ignorant’ and ‘don’t know/realise/understand’. The others at
times exonerated them by implication, for example, by constructing the media as deliberately slanting stories of Māori which would be believed by the general population. The former’s examples of ignorance were specific. Pākehā were ignorant of societal racism (Dyer 1997). They were unaware of more subtle daily personal behaviours which might be construed as racist, such as their expecting to be served first at a shop counter, or Pākehā men expecting to go through a doorway after Pākehā women but before Māori women. One participant, Hoa, describing her experience of the latter, said ‘I don’t think he knew(.) because it was ingrained’. She elaborated, ‘That’s the culture they’ve (Pākehā) been brought up in’. Ignorance accounted for the perpetration of racism, because it allowed the behaviour to continue unchecked.

Participants also constructed neoliberal rhetoric as racism in the form of judgement levelled at Māori, constructing it as issuing from ignorance, as in the example below from Mabel, a middle aged Pākehā professional married to her Māori husband Fred, and mother of their three children whom she positions as Māori.

Mabel racism definitely comes from ignorance† yeah uneducated people ah and yeah very ignorant yeah very ignorant people ..... they say ‘just get a job its easy I can get one†’(.) regardless↓ they seem to think that everybody is born on a level playing field but they don’t(hh) understand the racism and the institutional racism that Māori children have to grow up in and through↑ and then to try and ahm pull it all together in adult life(.) because they don’t experience it they don’t understand it

Mabel opens with the notion that racism comes from ignorance ‘definitely’ then further defines this: ‘it comes from ‘very ignorant people’. The ignorance she refers to is based on the assumption that there exists a level socio economic playing field of opportunity (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). It is therefore morally justifiable for individual achievement to be praised (Augoustinos et al., 2005), a lack of it, deplored, and consequent failure to succeed attributed to the individual. Mabel constructs such arguments as superficial rather than informed ‘uneducated’ ‘they come up with ideas’ and in so doing debunks their notions of ‘a level playing field’ with equal job opportunities for both ethnicities. Although Pākehā, she positions herself alongside Māori, both by constructing ignorant Pākehā as a separate ‘they’ rather than ‘we’ and by her construction of experiential awareness of this institutional racism, presumably with her children ‘because they don’t
experience it they don’t understand it’. Other participants also expressed their feeling of being targeted by arguments devoid of societal context, which included rhetorical questions assigning blame, such as ‘Why can’t they (Māori) just sort themselves out?’ This comment was also cited by a Pākehā, Freya, who similarly positioned herself with Māori.

Participants also talked about Pākehā ignorance of Māori through lack of social contact, as in the following example, where Keto, accounts for racism encountered from the father of a Pākehā girl, who refused to let him date her.

Keto yeah yeah he lived in [predominantly middle class Pākehā area] he probably didn’t know any Māori apart from the workers who used to ah you know work on the roads etcetera(...) .... he wouldn’t have been close to any Māori at all probably so he just didn’t know any Māori or that some of us were(,) getting university degrees

Keto constructs this Pākehā as having no Māori friends or relatives ‘he wouldn’t have been close to any Māori at all’ ignorant of who Māori are and what they can achieve, beyond working on the roads. ‘Didn’t know’ is used twice to indicate ignorance. The implication is that closer relationships and ‘knowing’ Māori would have given him a less prejudicial view; for example, knowing that some were serious students ‘getting university degrees’. Participants’ construction of Pākehā ignorance was linked to a discourse in which knowledge gaps relating to both Māori people and interleaved societal racism, were informed by negative media stereotypes.

Media

In this discourse, media were charged with a negative bias and a preponderance of negative news stories about Māori. For example, crime involving Māori included ethnic descriptions which were absent in reporting crimes committed by Pākehā. The following example exemplifies this negativity.
Kahu says ‘oh Māori are most likely to get pregnant’ and all this sort of stuff you know and ‘there’s a lot of Māori in jail for stealing’ all this sort of thing you know?

Interviewer mm

Kahu and while that’s a little proportion of the whole it sort it sort of stereotypes into what you could expect from all Māori?

Interviewer right

Kahu yeah(,) and they don’t(,) you know like in(,) the arts Māori they’re highly skilled? and ah you know there’s a lot of lawyers around a lot of ahm(,) people who are running businesses and chief executives or whatever† but they don’t they don’t get a mention

Kahu is himself a ‘highly skilled’ accountant, which may contribute to his strong awareness of the lack of acknowledgement. He first positions media personnel outside the general population by constructing a distinct group ‘they’ then rather than constructing them as ignorant, attributes them with agency for purveying negative news regarding Māori. He then argues a serious imbalance in reporting which focuses on the small proportion of Māori who offend, and ignores successful Māori role models, rendering the substantial achievements of Māori invisible in mainstream media. Participants also described how the media employed the word ‘Māori’ in their description of criminal activity.

Fred and of course you get the media’ a Māori person was arrested’ and you know a Māori person did this and so at work I mean I’d have to wear that a lot of vitriol a lot of hate for all Māori

Interviewer wo:::w

Fred oh you could sense that some people questioned it† some people didn’t† I actually thought at one stage there(.) it was getting that if you were a Māori you could get attacked that was the feeling! that all Māori were like that

Fred, who is head of a small team in a large government department, refers to the media practise of pinpointing ethnicity in stories of Māori anti-social behaviour, creating a ‘them and us’ Pākehā perspective (Stuart, 2002). Such reporting stimulates negative
stereotypes and generalisations. At his workplace, some gain the impression that ‘all Māori were like that’. The far reaching consequence for him is a sense of feeling threatened by association.

Next Fred describes how media slants can foster negative impressions. The press had run a story on the fact that more than half of prisoners were of Māori descent. Studies show that Māori fare worse in the justice system, for example, Māori are two to five times more likely than Pākehā to receive custodial sentences for the same crime (Fergusson et al, 2003). Such causality was ignored, with the article instead focussing on the resultant prison numbers.

Fred the way that ah it was written we had some people at work who ahm(.) interpreted that as meaning that over half the Māori population had been in prison!

Interviewer o::::::h!

Fred half the Māori population(.) that was what they understood from it(.) yeah so what I did I had to take one guy in particular around(.) our work environment↑ and every Māori person that we saw I asked him whether he’d been in prison (. ) of course he hadn’t been and after talking to twenty odd Māori people with this guy ah::m I was able to say to him well by these figures(.) ten of those should have been in prison

Fred is clear about his construction of the journalist as agentic in the process ‘the way that ah it was written’. This allowed for ambiguity and misinterpretation, with some concluding that half the Māori population had been in prison. This sensationalist scenario had been arrived at because the reporting had not clearly separated inmates and ‘all Māori’, giving Fred a negative positioning. Fred used the practical application of personal experience of Māori to bridge the gap of ignorance which had been filled by erroneous conclusions drawn from media contact.

This discourse functioned to account for racism by positioning media as agentic in producing and reproducing negative constructions of Māori. Participants drew on this discourse when emphasising an imbalance of negative Māori news, over-use of the word ‘Māori’ in association with crime, and a negative reporting bias. Such reporting
reproduced a societal positioning in which Māori were less deserving of power than Pākehā, by virtue of being less skilled or qualified, or as more likely to offend against society. Reasons that such positioning might be agreeable for Pākehā are taken up in the next discourse, superiority.

Superiority

In this discourse, racism is constructed as the product of a sense of superiority. The majority of participants constructed this implicitly in terms of the unspoken Pākehā assumption that Māori were inferior as a ‘race’, either intellectually, morally, or culturally. Some referred metaphorically to being ‘put in a box’ if they had brown skin, and categorised in less deserving terms, as an inferior person would be ‘it’s this perception thing’. Poto describes the notion of a ‘superiority complex’.

Poto I mean you can take the White man and put the White man as the minority in the midst of a perceived lesser people group and they will still ‘rise above the masses’ it’s something inbred! that says ‘I am superior’ you know ‘they need me more than I need them’ ah:mm ‘I can teach them better ways to live and behave than they can teach me’ and strange as that is I think that’s part of the racism that goes on

Poto, who holds a position of responsibility in a national firm, constructs White people as believing in their own superiority due to an inherited trait ‘it’s something inbred’. ‘They’ assess those around them, regard them as ‘lesser’ in living skills and behaviour, and conclude that they need to be taught to live ‘the White man’s’ way. This alludes to colonisation, when European settlers pronounced Māori inferior, their culture and lifestyle ‘lesser’ and Māori in need of Europeanisation (Te Hiwi, 2008). Cultural racism is explained ‘I can teach them better ways to live’ which alludes to the ongoing marginalisation of Māori culture. Superiority was also drawn on to explain other behaviours. Below, Emma talks about the response when the government reissued Community Services Cards to the public, with new pictures on them. The cards are widely used for discounts in sales and services.

Emma on the card they put a picture of an older you know White lady(,) ah a
young ah Polynesian child and a Māori middle aged man? and we had so many people(,) Pākehā ringing up complaining!

Interviewer no way!

Emma yes(,) they did↓ they complained I don’t know how many but we had a lot of calls complaining that there was a Māori(,) man or a Brown person on that card (,) and that was not them and it did not represent them↓

Interviewer and yet you had both(,) Pākehā and Māori on the card

Emma yeah! That’s right and yeah↓ but we did get these calls I mean I certainly wasn’t the only one getting these calls we a::ll talked about it and we all thought that it was terrible what people did but so in some way they thought that was being quite derogatory(,) to them↑ (,) because really they were saying ‘I’m not Brown’ ↓ you know I’m much better than that! I mean they might not say that but this is this was their understanding otherwise you know it wouldn’t be a problem would it?

Emma’s first person account and use of a neutral reporting style, together with consensus from others, build credibility for her report of racism. ‘We a::ll talked about it’ tells us the matter was discussed, and a conclusion reached ‘we all thought it was terrible’ that the callers’ protests were racist. She makes sense of the protest by reasoning that the callers must have considered their association (via the card) with Māori, was somehow derogatory ‘I’m much better than that’, or they would not have protested about it. Emma was among participants who felt that Pākehā still backed their notions of superiority with Darwinian classification theories which constructed Europeans as more evolved than Māori (Te Hiwi, 2008).

The linguistic reproduction of the superiority of Pākehā, constructed by individuals and the media, alludes again to Foucault’s state racism, in which interleaved racism works on many levels to maintain a specific societal structure. The discourse of superiority also legitimises subtle but powerful marginalisation by individuals working within structures, which is considered next.
Institutionalised racism

Cultural superiority is closely linked to the institutional aspects of colonisation (Awatere, 1984) whereby new technology, language, customs and practices become accepted as hallmarks of a superior civilisation (Robertson 2004). Participants drew on the discourse of institutionalised racism to account for the marginalisation of Māori. Ruihi, a retired health care adviser, draws on this discourse.

Ruihi I believe racism here is about power and control
Interviewer m:::m
Ruihi I mean racism is still about that that culture↑ that group of people who always always wants to have the upper hand over another race↓ it means you have the power over another race↓(.) the power of decision↓(.) you know over another race and to me that’s what racism really is↓ the power over people who do not have the resources↑ to stand up for themselves in a lot of cases
Interviewer okay(.) so::: where
Ruihi mostly in government eh and in those big corporate you know where they have the rights of control? you know that’s where you see it

Ruihi constructs racism as the power of one ‘culture’ over another ‘race’, in terms of decision making ability and influence. She claims this is evident in government and big business, where by implication jobs are allocated or laws made, and those in authority have the ‘rights of control’. Her emphasis is on the agentic power imbalance involving ‘the power over people’ and the marginalisation of Māori. The theme is taken up by Hose, who talks about the Pākehā hierarchy in his workplace.

Hose they don’t like it↓ they don’t want a Māori to be in charge↓ you look at the whole infrastructure of it and there’s not too many Māori people in high powered jobs↓ yeah

Hose alleges that executive positions are retained for Pākehā. Pākehā are constructed as resisting the notion of Māori in power ‘they don’t want a Māori to be in charge’ and the situation constructed as systemic and institutional. Other Māori participants who were
in positions of authority, constructed a societal expectation that a Pākehā would be chosen as boss, by giving accounts of work visitors asking ‘where’s the boss’ as in Kahu’s account below.

Kahu       And ahm yeah at the end of it I said well I’m just about to leave and this person he’d come later like he ((laughs)) he said I’ll give my key back to the person next door? And I said oh you can give it to me and I’ll look after it (.h) he said o:::h n::o I think I’d better go and give it to the boss? you know?

Interviewer   Oh! like you weren’t the boss!

Kahu     Yeah! ((laughs)) He didn’t know who the boss was you know? and he didn’t expect ((laughs)) you know a Māori

This construction of Pākehā expectations of Pākehā authority also draws on the discourse of superiority. Kahu refers to keys, a symbol of trust and security, and notes the visitor did not expect to trust himself, a Māori, with these. Other participants used the phrase ‘a White man’s world’ alluding colloquially to themes of Pākehā power and privilege. In the following Erana, a retiree reflecting on racist incidents occurring throughout her life, draws on institutional racism as a continuing means by which Māori are disempowered.

Erana     I always find that they always want to keep them(.)(hh) Māori down ah a level(.) yes(.) you don’t rise up too much↓ it may be that they feel it will cause trouble↑.

Her initial double use of the extreme case formulation ‘always’, attempts to circumvent any denial of her construction of a society in which Māori are to be kept in the lower place which they currently occupy, as in her phrase ‘you don’t rise up’. ‘They always want to’ demonstrates her belief that the agentic desire of Pākehā is to position Māori lower in the colonial hierarchy ‘down a level’ at all times. She qualifies this by adding ‘too much’ which by implication constructs a socio-political context in which Māori are allowed to have their say, and rise up to a certain degree, but not enough to change the existing Pākehā power structure ‘cause trouble’. This contributes more clarity to a picture of a country in which the dominant culture maintains a colonial structure.
Discussion and conclusions

This study explicitly addresses a gap in the literature which has focussed largely on the one-sided study of Pākehā perpetrator talk. Māori account for racism using discourses which at times concur with, and at other times diverge sharply from such findings. The media discourse, in which participants claim a reporting bias which minimises Māori achievement and sensationalises negative Māori stereotypes, is well known (McGregor & Te Awa, 1996). Notions of institutional racism were also drawn on by participants, and this has also been acknowledged elsewhere by others across various sectors, including: in the work place (Robson, 2008) health system (Ministry of Health, 2006, 2010) housing (Harris et al, 2006a) education (Robson et al, 2007) and justice (Fergusson et al, 2003). However, the discourses of ignorance and superiority provide new areas for understanding racism in Aotearoa NZ, particularly when discourses are considered in combination.

The discourse of Pākehā ignorance works in conjunction with the media discourse to account for why Pākehā adopt negative stereotypes of Māori; their ignorance is erroneously informed and reinforced by media misrepresentation. This lenient assessment of Pākehā as racist only through ignorance and subsequent misinformation, positions Māori as generous of spirit, and Pākehā with the potential to behave in a nonracist fashion if better educated. The discourse of ignorance has also been noted as safely used by minorities when they feel that they are part of the larger group (Sammut & Sartawi, 2012) , in this case ‘New Zealanders’; the non-accusatory assertion of ignorance preserves their identity and knowledge while pointing out the lack of a shared perspective on this matter. Other research supports the notion that White people are ignorant of racism, unless they are partnered with a member of the targeted minority (Dalton, 2002; Yancey, 2007). Perpetrator studies however have shown that Pākehā deliberately and advantageously position themselves as ignorant of racism and Māori people or culture, because such positioning allows them to behave in a racist manner with impunity (McCreanor, 1993b). In this way egalitarian neoliberal rhetoric, denying institutional racism and justifying marginalization of ‘those’ who do not rise to a higher socio-economic status (Wetherell and Potter, 1992), is linguistically constructed from a position of self-justification and the deniability of racist sentiment. If the participants’ discourse of ignorance is accepted as valid, the findings have implications for attempts
to combat racism, such as creating relevant educational measures to both draw attention
to and remedy ignorance regarding Māori and racism.

The discourse of superiority in accounting for racism has not been identified previously
in discursive research. Arguably, this may be due to the trend towards identifying
increasingly subtle forms of racism (Tuffin, 2013) and this particular discourse bluntly
attributes one source of racism as traceable to assumptions of superiority. The analysis
suggests these assumptions relate to both cultural and eugenic domains. On the surface
it would seem assumptions of superiority are inconsistent with an attribution of racism
as a result of ignorance. Ignorance is, for example, open to educational remediation.
However looking at this positively, it is also possible to argue that assumptions of
superiority stem from beliefs which are open to educational intervention, and such
beliefs are not obviously shrouded in the same deniability which is often associated with
ignorance. Interestingly, often the same participants employed the ‘ignorance’ and
‘innate superiority’ discourses, at different times during the interview. This would seem
to suggest a ‘cognitive polyphasia’, as correctable ignorance could not be said to
account for an innate trait; to the participant however, both were valid ways to account
for racism.

Positioning the superiority discourse within a social constructionist paradigm, Māori
and their culture are marginalised in institutions (Awatere, 1984), and mainstream
media reproduces negative stereotypes of Māori, producing a Foucauldian state racism
This functions to create and maintain a specific societal structure to bring power and
material benefit to the mainstream (Roets et al., 2006) through the systemic privileging
of Pākehā and Pākehā culture (Consedine & Consedine, 2005). Participants’ use of an
essentialist discourse of superiority construct the White man as innately expecting to
‘rise above the masses’, regardless of social context, to the extent of assuming agentic
control of society. A discourse in which Pākehā are innately or genetically imbued with
a belief in their own superiority constructs a situation in which Māori have little hope of
Pākehā acknowledging equality, or understanding the injustice of racism. This in turn
could reduce Māori resolve to seek equal treatment and ‘close the gap’ in the
employment, education, health and justice sectors. This highlights the immense
significance of how Māori account for racism. These four discourses not only inform,
but work together in a powerful and all-encompassing way to construct a negative
positionality. Daily media highlights negative stereotypes, there is little prospect of equal treatment in employment, health and education, Pākehā are ignorant of the situation, and Pākehā also assume their privilege is innately deserved. When these discourses are considered alongside lower SES, and the historical and current holding of power by Pākehā, the intersectional effects could include a limiting of Māori aspirations in all areas of life. Consequences may include acceptance of lower status employment, not contesting unspokenly race based justice outcomes or health care decisions, and a counter-productive suspicion of Pākehā.

The participants in this study subjectively positioned themselves as rational rather than reactionary, and were thoughtful and intelligent in presenting an accounting for racism which included broader matters such as media, historical factors, and systemic issues. In accounting for racism through constructing Pākehā as ignorant of racism, imbued with a sense of superiority, falsely informed by media these accounts provide a generous analysis of the attributional agency involved. While involved in the institution aspects of racism, Pākehā are not constructed as malevolent or sinister. Rather these discourses position them as unaware, victims of negative reporting and caught up in a history of colonialism which carries with it deep seated assumptions of superiority which they may not even be conscious of. Together these discourses simultaneously function to position the participants as sympathetic, understanding, thoughtful and rational citizens of Aotearoa NZ. At the same time, however, participants’ knowledge was also constructed as sufficient to warrant self-protective awareness of Pākehā.

As a case in point, the context in which the data was produced included historic Māori mistrust of self-serving Pākehā research, with a potential reluctance for participants to disclose as the interviewer was Pākehā. The interviewer used longstanding Māori connections to establish personal credibility, and attempted to remove the threat of hegemony by giving participants open access to review and revise transcripts and conclusions. She also evidenced empathetic interest and agreement. The interviewer is part of these interactive, jointly constructed interviews, raising some issues worthy of consideration. The interviewer’s response to participants’ drawing on the two well-known discourses, media and systemic racism, might have contributed to their prominence in the data. Likewise, although the discourses of superiority and ignorance were new to the interviewer, she supported their construction, and welcomed further...
elaboration. For the interviewer, participants’ talk appeared to be motivated by the opportunity to create a bridge of awareness with Pākehā who were open to hearing about racism, and therefore in-depth disclosure occurred. The influence of the interviewer’s ethnicity in possibly limiting these disclosures cannot be discounted, but if these were suppressed by the influence of the interviewer, this also speaks to the robustness of the constructions since they still managed to emerge with distinction.

The importance of the targets’ perspectives in terms of bringing new findings to a set of studies based largely on majority group interpretation of perpetrator talk, cannot be overstated. Current understandings of race have moved beyond erroneous notions of biological differences, and are informed by and embedded in social constructionist approaches which theorise ‘race’ as the product of societal forces and social discourses. It is suggested that in so doing, the way in which ‘race’ continues to be a ‘real’ category for many in the White majority may have been ignored (Riggs & Augoustinos, 2005), and with it, its effects at a micro-level. An example, as stated, is that modern Pākehā perpetrator talk is said to rely on subtlety, ambivalence and plausible deniability (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), yet participants’ interviews included overt and offensive racism, with ethnophaulisms and obvious racist intent. This is consistent with other research exploring the accounts of indigenous targets of racism in other countries (Mellor, 2003, Paradies & Cunningham, 2009). There is an urgent need to hear targets’ perspectives regarding how to negotiate and respond to racist incidents, and their suggestions as to how to reduce the problem, perspectives which may shed new light and differ from the findings of the dominant group. Attention should also be given to the social context in which racist encounters take place (Guerin, 2003) so that research can then be conducted into how to best combat it. The four discourses identified in the present study, and the ways in which they work together, provide a starting point for future research to investigate and give academic credence to the discursive rhetoric of the Māori targets. In conclusion, these findings provide increased understanding to studies of race talk, and offer insight that go beyond much of the research in this field, studies which have tended to be dominated by the limitations of a purely European understanding, ontology and perspective.
Reflexivity: Superiority and ignorance

As I considered the discourses in this paper, I remembered a distant incident some years ago when I was a classical guitarist, and would give concerts with my friend who was a flamenco guitarist who had trained overseas and who was also phenotypically Māori. Both of us were recording artists, and we wanted to give a concert in a cathedral. My friend approached the custodian, explained our programme and was refused hire. She was flustered by the incident, but said I would be better to go. I found an austere, elderly woman with an English accent and a superior manner, who said disparagingly that my Māori friend had wanted the venue for a guitar concert. Having an English father, I produced my own accented voice, re-introduced the same programme and explained that we were both guitarists. As she agreed, the undefined but disturbing notion that the custodian might have refused my friend because she was Māori occurred to me briefly and unpleasantly; but as it was not something I had ever knowingly encountered, I thought maybe I had just misunderstood something. The concert went ahead, my friend made no comment and to my shame, I totally forgot the incident. Until writing this paper.
Chapter Eight

Reducing racism

Chapter introduction

In the conversational flow of the interviews, information given by participants about disturbing accounts of racism in Chapters Five and Six led to the natural response of asking why does this happen, which was attended to in Chapter Seven. This in turn led naturally to talking about how to end or at least reduce such racism. This chapter is devoted to the latter topic, and analyses participants’ responses to the questions in Section C (Appendix B), which asked: What is the solution? What do you think? Participants’ discourses around accounting for racism in Chapter Seven provided natural continuation points for ideas on how to reduce racism, and although some ideas did align with those in existing studies, in the course of the inductive analytic process it became clear that the patterns in participants’ thoughts and meaning making extended well beyond these and were uniquely their own. For example, I mentioned political parties as a probe to stimulate discussion (Appendix B), yet although politicians had been mentioned in Chapter Five as promoters of racist attitudes, they did not appear in the data related to solutions. The participants’ distinctive insights, perceptions and vision are analysed thematically here and structured in a paper, Reducing racism, which forms the concluding chapter of the findings. In this chapter, as in Chapter Six, for publication considerations the original verbatim transcription has been given equivalent typographical symbols which are in common usage.
Reducing racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ.  

Abstract

Although an increasing corpus of work presents findings on how racism may be reduced, few studies examine the perspectives of the targets themselves. The current study examines data from interviews conducted with nineteen indigenous Māori men and women and five Pākehā (New Zealand European) female partners, who were asked how racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ might be reduced. Thematic analysis informed by social constructionism was used to examine participants’ constructions, with attention to the action orientation of words and the inclusion of context. Four main themes were identified, namely: reducing structural racism, educational strategies, interaction between Māori and Pākehā, and being Kiwi. These are discussed in the light of extant literature. The suggestions discussed contribute to understandings of racism and ways in which it may be constrained, and include: power imbalances in the workplace, bias in the justice system, and the teaching of Aotearoa NZ history. Positive steps involved teaching history the Treaty and anti-racism, cultural expectations, and encouraging greater integration. These understandings are of particular relevance for social scientists and those working in human services.

Introduction

Historically, racism has resulted in slavery, extinction, and marginalisation, particularly of indigenous peoples, and has been justified by a belief in the superiority of the dominant race. Over the past century, psychological research has established a rich tradition of analysing and challenging racism, with a view to its reduction or elimination. Initially racism was believed to be intrapsychically determined (Duckitt, 2001), and later understood as a product of personality and environment (Lewin, 1936). With the emergence of group theory, ways were sought in which to reduce intergroup conflict. The Contact Theory (Allport, 1958) developed at a time of racial segregation in the USA, suggested reducing conflict was more likely when four criteria were met: the merging groups were of similar status, had common goals, time available to spend in

---

3 This paper which forms the basis for this chapter has been submitted to the New Zealand Journal of Psychology and is currently under review. Pack, S., Tuffin, K., & Lyons, A. Reducing racism against Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. August, 2015. (Refer DRC16 in Appendix I).
group activity, and the support of local authorities. Sample groups from different factions brought together under these specific criteria were shown to form empathetic and productive relationships. Pro-in-group and anti-out-group biases were later examined (Tajfel, 1978; Turner, 1985), and researchers posited the Common In-group Identity Model (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2007) to encourage unity under a collective name.

The modern shift from overt to subtle racism was also occurring (Kinder & Sears, 1981; Pettigrew & Meertens, 2001). This led to difficulties in constructing valid psychometric tools that were capable of separating racism from other confounding variables (Roets et al., 2006). Scholars challenged the premise that any personality tests could provide accurate means to measure racism (Bernal et al., 2002) amid an increasing awareness that the perpetration of racism arose from social, situational and contextual features. Guerin (2003) suggested verbal resistance by bystanders at a micro-level as a means to reduce racism. Fewer studies have attended to the views and perspectives of minorities, for example, their recounted coping strategies (Brondolo et al, 2009; Mellor, 2004) and micro-level resistance (Major, Quinton, McCoy & Schmader, 2000).

In Aotearoa NZ, understandings of racism against indigenous Māori were expanded using alternative methodologies (Tuffin, 2013). Discursive studies contributed to perpetrator theory by analysing contextualised perpetrator talk and text, which showed that racism was a subtle, social process constructed, generated and re-created in everyday language. Influential research by Wetherell and Potter (1988, 1992) and Potter and Wetherell (1987) investigated subtle linguistic marginalisation where people avoided direct reference to race, and drew on neoliberal rhetoric to construct Aotearoa NZ as free of systemic racism. Simultaneously they positioned Māori who did not achieve in contemporary society as blameworthy. McCreanor (1997) analysed early nineteenth century writings of the colonists to explore the historical beginnings of the discursive reproduction of colonial power structures, and the marginalising negativisation and trivialisation of Māori. This analysis demonstrated the use of the word ‘savage’ coupled with ‘ignorant’ or ‘noble’ to construct Māori as bestial, yet also innocent, and capable of rising to British ways. These constructions were shown to persevere in contemporary language with Māori labelled ‘good’ if they accepted acculturation and fitted into the standard story of harmonious race relations (McCreanor, 1993b; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991), and bad, or ‘stirrers’ if they objected.
Researchers have also explored the role of media in producing and reproducing these discourses (Abel, 2013; Lehrman, 2007). This research highlights that in Aotearoa NZ media, Māori are trivialised, vilified, and their positive achievements under-represented, representations which subtly support Pākehā right to rule (Nairn et al., 2006). These constructions have contributed to erroneous assumptions among the public, such as the view that Māori are innately physical rather than intelligent (Hokowhitu, 2004) and that they have criminal tendencies (McGregor & Te Awa, 1996). Similar negative representations have also been found more recently in social media (Johns & McCosker, 2014).

Much of this literature has considered racism from the perspective of perpetrators and consequently the views of the ethnic minority have been relatively ignored (Swim & Stangor, 1998). This imbalance is problematic in Aotearoa NZ, where psychologists have a responsibility to investigate unjust societal norms (principle 4, New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002) and honour Treaty principles of equal partnership (1.3.1, New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002). The Treaty, regarded as the founding document of Aotearoa NZ, contains three articles: the first article describes a bicultural partnership, the second protection for Māori and their initiatives, and the third, equal citizenship, equal respect (Herbert, 2002) and mutually shared knowledge (Evans & Paewai, 1999). The current lack of research on Māori targets’ perspectives may be attributed to a number of factors, including Pākehā disbelief in the existence and importance of racism against Māori (Human Rights Commission, 2007) and inaccessibility of Māori participants (Major et al., 2000). Māori resistance to Pākehā research may be traced to studies which have framed Māori negatively, or provided imperialistic reconstruction of Māori ideas (Cram, 1997) with loss or invalidation of their alternative understandings (Blundell, Gibbons, & Lillis, 2010). These factors coupled with the need for cultural sensitivity are said to have contributed to a ‘Pākehā paralysis’ in which interviewing Māori is mainly avoided (Tolich, 2002) and an imbalance in academic understanding created and perpetuated.

Nevertheless some studies have examined accounts from Māori participants. Webber et al. (2013) found that Māori adolescents experienced racism, including negative stereotyping involving criminality, lesser intelligence, and lower educational ability. Moewaka Barnes et al. (2013) analysed Māori focus group interviews and found four
primary levels of impact: internalised racism, interpersonal racism, institutional racism and societal racism. Participants reported the negative impact of hegemonic representation of Māori in the media, in the form of racist stereotyping, and the over-surveillance of Māori by police. Internalisation of racist abuse, and anxiety, was coupled with coping by avoidance or the sacrifice of Māori cultural markers. Dew et al (2015) interviewed Māori who had undergone cancer treatment and found that the classic patient role did not adequately benefit many Māori who had culturally specific family influences and a need to include alternative healthcare approaches. Pack et al., 2015a) sought Māori accounts of why racism occurred. Findings reinforced previous work on media representation and systemic racism, and also highlighted issues around Pākehā ignorance and assumptions of superiority. Māori responses to racism included micro-level verbal resistance strategies which were seen as successful (Pack, Tuffin, & Lyons, 2015b). These accounts revealed Māori participants’ agentic control of their response, and their belief in the ability of Pākehā to understand and respond positively if educated in this area. The present paper aims to add to local understandings by researching and exploring Māori adults’ and their partners’ views on how to provide solutions for and reduce the racism evident in their accounts.

Method

To negotiate the issues regarding research with Māori, approval was sought from an independent Māori cultural advisor, a respected representative of a local marae, and the University’s Human Ethics Committee. Interviews were conducted by the first author and participants who knew her volunteered on the basis of trust (Tolich, 2002). Twenty-four participants took part, 19 Māori (10 women, 9 men), and five Pākehā women partners, with an average age of 53. The Pākehā partners were endorsed by their Māori partners as having equally strong views, and this was borne out in the interviews. Participants’ occupations included counsellor, communications manager, bus driver, electrician, author, foreman, cook, financial advisor, lecturer, accountant, company director, home maker, teacher, and retirees. Participants chose their own pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. The study was conducted in Wellington, Aotearoa NZ, with individual interviews taking place in locations of the participant’s choice, either their homes or places of work. To prevent biased or slanted interpretations participants were given their transcripts to read, make further comment, change, and the chance to engage
in further discussion, before signing off, then offered continued contact with the researcher throughout the project. The aim of the interviews was to learn what participants had to say about racism against Māori, and interview questions were open ended and non-directive. The focus for this study was their perspectives on the reduction of racism, and the topic offered in a broad question ‘what do you think is the solution?’

**Research approach and analytic procedure**

A social constructionist epistemology allowed the acknowledgement of the underpinnings of history, politics, culture and other contextual factors. These importantly inform the stereotypical beliefs and barriers to eliminating racism which may be unique to racism in Aotearoa NZ. This epistemology acknowledges the functional, action orientation of the constructed responses of the participants, and allows in depth analysis of the language employed as the participants construct and communicate their embodied and lived realities. A data driven inductive approach was chosen to spotlight participants’ experiences and perceptions (Luborsky, 1994), and avoid ‘top down’ deduction which could have limited the findings. Thematic analysis of the data was undertaken to enable the presentation of clear and accessible results (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The interviews were transcribed verbatim. Following preliminary coding of the corpus into broad concepts, discreet coding began. Associated common words or phrases representing a single idea were chosen to generate semantic codes to which all data was referenced. In an iterative process, re-readings of the data were conducted, and re-referenced back to the codes which were merged or re-named. Continual checking between data and code names to ascertain the connection strengthened the reliability of the findings and retrievability of all coded data (Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis & Dillon, 2003). The researchers then discussed the potential themes emerging from these codes, checking between data and codes for verification in a recursive manner until the four most compelling themes were established (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These are presented below.
Analysis and findings

Participants began by categorically constructing racism as pervasive and universal, claims that were supported by accounts of subtle and overt racism, and clear recollections of the emotions and feelings experienced. Many of the accounts that follow are of racist incidents, and it is from these that suggestions for intervention arise. Participants suggested possible solutions in four main themes: reducing structural racism, education, interaction, and being *Kiwi*. The first of these expressed the need for intervention in institutional structures where racist practices function.

Reducing structural racism

Legislation against racism is clearly laid out in the Race Relations Act 1971 and the Human Rights Act 1993 (Human Rights Commission, 2006). However the justice system, the health system, and the workplace, were constructed by participants as contexts within which these laws were ineffective either because of power imbalances, or because of the daunting nature of the complaints system. Within the justice system, Māori were constructed as over-polic ed, and more harshly sentenced. In the excerpt below, Hoa talks of her son’s experience when out with friends.

Hoa The police used to stop them you know, and he’d come home and he’d say to me oh Mum! you know and I’d say what are you late home for? And he’d say oh the police stopped me. What for? oh they didn’t even tell me. And then um they had European friends too, and the European friends were allowed to go.

Hoa’s description is typical of many accounts recounting how phenotypically Māori features increased the likelihood of being stopped and detained by police. Pākehā friends who were with them would be ignored or released. Others recounted young Māori being interrogated without a lawyer present, and intimidated into a ‘confession’. The different treatment of Māori was constructed as racism, and the solution put forward by participants was having greater numbers of Māori in the judicial and justice workforces.
Sharlee  It would be different if it was a Māori, like say if a Māori policeman came to us and talked.

Sharlee implies a different positioning: Māori police would talk, implying a lack of bullying or intimidation, and the possibility of an opportunity for a fair hearing. Participants also constructed judges as prejudiced.

Poto  I think that some judges have a pre-conceived idea; when one who is deemed to be Māori steps before them, they deal with it in a totally different manner.

Poto and others alleged that the disproportionately high number of Māori in prisons was due to racism in sentencing, rather than essential criminality, a view supported by the literature (e.g., Fergusson et al., 2003a; United Nations CERD 2007, arts. 2 and 5; Workman, 2011). Participants noted that this needed addressing, but the power imbalance within the Pākehā dominated justice system provided a closed system in which Māori were unlikely to obtain a voice.

With regard to the health system, participants underscored the importance of Māori driven initiatives with Māori executives and independent government funding. Ruihi gives one example of the need for bicultural options.

Ruihi  ...and then then this is another thing. Their reporting system is ticking boxes - ticking boxes! Oh! oh I said oh I refuse! It got sent back! It’s a Pākehā thing! It doesn’t clarify, it doesn’t explain what I want to say! Ah - right or wrong, is this right or wrong. It says this should be done: yes, or no. Oh gosh, it doesn’t say anything! It’s just like from one to ten, how would you rate a person? Same thing! You know I said this is not the Māori way of doing things! They said what is the Māori way of doing things? I said face to face!

Ruihi feels that her life cannot be expressed in ticks or numbers, because it limits her responses to the options a Pākehā mind has presented on a prescribed form, which may not include aspects of her world and all she wants to say. She applauded the
methodology used for the current study, in which her words and ideas were privileged in a *kanohi ki te kanohi* or person to person encounter, where she gave a full verbal account without Pākehā baseline or parameters. Her account highlights a Eurocentric bias in work and health assessments, despite allegedly bicultural practices (Campbell, 2005), and raises strong concerns around the need to assess in a way that acknowledges Māori and Pākehā differences of approach.

Sophia talks of being passed over for recognition in the workplace.

Sophia  We all have the same perspective on that. If you’re Māori, you’ve got to do it twice as hard, *twice* as well to get the same amount of recognition. And we do, we work *extremely* hard to get the same ahm the same amount of - yeah, kudos as anyone else.

Sophia’s contention is that Pākehā are preferred over more capable Māori. In this example of aversive racism on the part of employers (Hodson, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Samuel, 2010), racism in promotion is strongly implied. This was underscored by other participants with phrases such as ‘you’ve gotta be that much better’ and ‘better than Pākehā folks to be on the same level’. Power imbalance precludes action to reduce this form of systemic racism, as it does in the example below.

Hose  He called my worker a *dumb, black, nigger*.

Sylvia  Wo:>:>:>ow!

Hose  The young fellow just wanted to fight, but I said no, no, because you’ll just get into trouble. Let’s just *do it their way*, you know through the appropriate channels? So we had letters and we had the witnesses, and *nothing happened*. We went into a meeting with ahm [Hose’s boss’s name], he pulled us into the office and he says ‘look, ah:::m Hose, we try to think of our group of guys as like a rugby team! And what *happens* in a rugby team *stays* in the rugby team and what goes on on the rugby field stays on the rugby field. And I was shy of going to the Labour Department to get it sorted out. ….. he said it’s just too much writing *letters* and so on to get anything *done*. But they wouldn’t go through it that little bit further you know? And it was like the guy was still
Hose works in a large company and is in charge of a group of younger workers, one of whom has been targeted by an older worker not under Hose’s authority. Hose thinks to prevent a violent outburst by taking the matter to his boss who invokes his authority to shut down the complaint. Hose considers utilising the legally backed Labour Department complaints system, but is ‘shy’ of the process, and the younger worker tells Hose he has no faith in the ongoing paperwork which would be involved. The knowledge that the perpetrator has not been ‘slapped down’ increases the power imbalance; the boss and the perpetrator have colluded in structural racism.

Participants did not construct anti-racism legislation as being effective against systemic racism, but consistently referred to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as a means of ensuring Māori were given equal treatment and respect. Participants suggested that in depth study of the Treaty be made mandatory for all, the theory being that if Pākehā understood it and acknowledged it as their national heritage, they would not behave in a racist manner.

Education

Education contained four sub themes: Teaching the Treaty, teaching history, teaching cultural differences, and teachers’ roles. Teaching the Treaty was constructed as a means of eliminating racism.

Bill It’s not the guy that that reads the Treaty, understands the Treaty and reads other documents that relate to that document (who is racist)

Bill there’s a difference between reading, and studying, and so if you’re studying something then you get a word and you get to really understand its meaning.

Bill and other participants dispensed with what was seen as tokenistic inclusion of the Treaty; for them, a cursory reading would not suffice. They posited that people would not act in a racist manner toward Māori if they had been taught an in depth understanding of the Treaty and its history. Teaching the history of the Treaty included teaching an accurate historical account including the invasion of the land by Europeans.
Poto  You know there are a *lot* of students who have *never heard* about the Taranaki wars, and have *never heard* about why they wear these three white feathers in their hair. Have never heard about passive resistance similar to Ghandi, have *never heard* about the rape and the atrocities that have taken part in the land wars, have never….and can’t understand why Māori get *upset* about land that has been taken off them

Poto draws attention to cultural racism inherent in the current history curriculum, which by leaving out the things he mentions, implicitly perpetuates the standard ideology (McCreanor, 1993b). In this, Pākehā are constructed as the honourable winners of a fair fight, the Māori as savages rightfully subdued. Poto seeks to give equal weight to both sides’ perspectives, and this move is constructed as having potential to create understanding between Māori and Pākehā.

Failure to teach cultural differences was constructed as unspokenly racist, and to exacerbate the sense of agentic racism in societal encounters. Ruihi describes a meeting she attended, in which differing cultural expectations surfaced.

Ruihi  I said I’ve come here, on my own, and none of you looked up, none of you greeted me, none of you said hello, you know, so I think you’re cold hearted. And you call yourselves [professional occupation]! And at the end of the meeting one person whom I had met and did know well came up to me and she said Ruihi? all you need is a good hug. And I said you’re right. I arrived and no-one gave it to me, and she smiled at me. And so she came up and gave me a real good hug. Now she understood what Māoris needed. She understood what I needed.

Ruihi’s account is typical of participants’ accounts in which they were hurt by the Pākehā expectation that one Pākehā culture would fit all, or cultural racism. Māori were expected to learn Pākehā cultural norms, but Pākehā did not learn Māori culture. In this example, Ruihi lists what some Māori might expect when arriving alone at a strange place: to be looked at, greeted with a smile, to be physically hugged. Only one person present has the knowledge to bridge the gap.
Although participants agreed that teaching children to be non-racist began in the home, they also constructed this as something that needed to be in the curriculum.

\[ \text{Inap} \quad \text{I think the only way it’s going to happen or will happen is through education.} \]
\[ \text{Inap} \quad \text{An environment of acceptance and that yes we have our points of difference and yes we do things differently but that doesn’t make me any more frightening or violent or intimidating or better than you.} \]

\[ \text{Inap} \quad \text{advocates a school environment where acknowledgement and respectful acceptance of ethnic and cultural differences is openly discussed, and children are taught not to associate phenotypical pointers with negative stereotypes. This would necessitate open discussion of race, appearance, and assumptions of, for example, inherent criminality. No participant suggested ignoring the issue. This position can emerge from a supposedly egalitarian but erroneously colour-blind approach, in which drawing attention to race or differences is itself considered racist and unhelpful (Brown et al., 2003). Instead, participants underscored openness. ‘Let’s talk about it \textit{all}’ said Zoe, a Pākehā teacher.} \]

Others talked about the need for teachers to engage over racist incidents or ethnophaulisms they encountered in school. Mabel, a Pākehā with a Māori husband, recounted a time when their phenotypically Māori child had been targeted in racist bullying. The teacher had successfully countered this by teaching lessons that accented positive aspects of Māori culture. Tu talked about a racist incident in his trades class, where his tutor had spoken up for him and denouncing verbal slurs and eliminating racism in the classroom. Tu’s two fold response to his tutor was significant ‘he’s a Pākehā man but he’s really lovely’ indicating that Tu’s growing disillusionment with Pākehā had found an exception. These are both examples of commendable teaching practices, but they also highlight the power of role models to reduce racism by taking positive action whenever racism occurs.
Interaction

Most participants talked about the need for ongoing daily interaction between Pākehā and Māori if racism was to be defeated. This theme included three sub themes: integration, working together, and relationships.

Māori make up 14.9% of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a) and participants indicated that in schools or towns where there was a higher proportion of Māori, and correspondingly higher rates of integration, racism was constrained. Some cited a lack of bullying in their previous high schools of equal Māori and Pākehā students. Erana stated that three quarters of the people in their (non-racist) town were Māori; Zoe said an acquaintance was prejudiced against Māori, and would probably never change because the acquaintance’s township elsewhere was largely Pākehā, with no chance of interaction with Māori. Integration of Māori and Pākehā houses was considered important.

Zoe it was never ever ‘we’ve got a Pākehā here and we’ve got Māori there’ we were all living together, we were all immersed.

Zoe’s excerpt is from her account of a district she grew up in where Pākehā and Māori lived as neighbours in close proximity, and there was mutual cultural interaction and no racism. Elaine, a Pākehā who lives on Māori land with her husband who is Māori, pointed out that there Pākehā households and Māori households lived adjacently, with no pocketing of ethnicities, and therefore meeting in everyday activities.

Working together as a group for a common goal was constructed by participants as conducive to reducing racism, as in Inap’s account below.

Inap I think I started to learn about appreciating other peoples’ points of difference…sometimes we didn’t always agree but yeah, cause when you’re in a team you know you have to be able to put aside those differences for the greater good
Inap notes that when working together and having to ignore personal complaints, the differences between Māori and Pākehā become subordinate to a common team goal which fostered mutual appreciation. Another participant, Sophia, pointed out that Māori and Pākehā had worked together historically, for example in the first building of roads and railways, and other participants cited working with Pākehā today on church or volunteer projects without prejudice or racist incidents.

Ongoing relationships, especially if close or personal, were possibly the most cited way to put an end to prejudice, as explained by Freya, a Pākehā with a Māori partner.

Freya I think if you have a basic belief that Māori are inferior, you could have all sorts of stuff coming and it would just bounce off unless something’s happening to actually change you at a real…micro-level. I believe personally in a relationship probably with other Māori who affect you and touch you in some way not just like another person - or there’s too much of ‘us and them’ and it’s too easy to separate.

Freya constructs negative racist stereotyping as an unyielding belief resistant to conflicting evidence or anti-racist attempts to restrain or unpack it; as she concludes ‘it would just bounce off’. She constructs the separation caused by discriminating group categorisation as becoming an indomitable ‘them and us’, and notes the cognitive ease of continuing the mental separation of the two groups. An interpersonal relationship, however, is constructed as having the power to bridge preconceptions and change prejudice. Ropata describes other ways a positive relationship may counter stereotypes.

Ropata If I took my mate who was from a Pākehā home to you know, to a celebration or something, they were blown away and they’d say ‘oh I didn’t realise Māori behaved like this’ because there was no alcohol you know and it was - everything was sort of spiritually sanctioned and so on, so it was a totally different experience.

Ropata already has a positive relationship with a Pākehā ‘my mate’ and enjoys further breaking down prejudice by introducing him to a Māori community which defies the negative stereotypes (Tausch & Hewstone, 2010). His mate responds immediately, but
others noted that this could be a long or gradual process. Elaine, a Pākehā, talked about a relative’s waning prejudice against her Māori husband, Bill. Initially there was a marked prejudice, however as the relationship grew, and Bill defied their negative stereotypes, prejudice broke down to the extent the relative lived with them at times. These accounts suggested the realisation of a common humanity, which is explored in the next theme.

Being Kiwi, Ngāti Kiwi

Being Kiwi has three subthemes: Ngāti Kiwi, intermarriage, and mutual respect. Ngāti denotes a tribe comprised of sub tribes who are descended from, and align under, the name of that tribe. Kiwi is the generic colloquial term used for all citizens of Aotearoa NZ. The phrase Ngāti Kiwi therefore constructs an image of New Zealanders of different ethnicities and cultures uniting and functioning as one tribe, without inter-racial prejudice, as in Sharlee’s excerpt below.

Sharlee me I think that you just have to say look why the racism against people you know? you know we’re all one people, Kiwis. Just because we’ve got different colour doesn’t mean nothing at least that’s the way I look at it.

Sharlee reasons that if New Zealanders see themselves as Kiwi, phenotype will become irrelevant, and racism will be dismissed as illogical. Hose reiterates the construction of Kiwi as a unifying force.

Hose we’re all Kiwis. And I find sometimes that the whole Māori thing sometimes with Hone Harawira ‘we’re Māori and not Pākehā’ that creates a divide as well. I think we need to be...going together you know?

Hose refers to a Māori leader whom he feels leans towards separatism and division based on ethnicity. Separatism was commonly implied by participants to be racist, and Hose, although proud of his Māori heritage, here constructs Kiwi as the term which will remind New Zealanders that they are not racially opposed, but one nation.
When asked how to reduce racism Rauri amplifies this by specifying the inclusion of all ethnicities, a matter he constructs as achievable through resolving the need to belong. In the excerpt below he recounts explaining Ngāti Kiwi to a relative of English descent who had expressed a lack of belonging.

Rauri I think ahm that he was quite upset about that side of it and I said well brother! What we are, what we can do if you feel you haven’t got a tribe and you’d like one, how about Ngāti Kiwi? That will do. And in the end, I think we’ll move towards that. It’s not going to be smooth, it hasn’t been smooth so far, a smooth and bumpy free ride…but I think we will get to the point when we don’t sort of think ‘oh I only come from England’ or China or something, I don’t truly belong here.

Ngāti Kiwi is constructed here as a means by which all ethnicities can feel part of the in-group. The English relative is compelled to rethink his allegiance to England ‘I only come from England’ and to make a conscious decision to become a Kiwi, if he wishes to have a sense of belonging. It is a construction which takes agentic charge of a situation in which Māori may currently be considered a minority, and targeted for this reason; Māori position themselves as offering the chance to become part of a united team, in which people are not separated by ethnic backgrounds. Notably, Rauri goes beyond biculturalism to implicitly define Ngāti Kiwi as inclusive and multicultural.

Racist separatism was particularly denounced by those participants with Pākehā partners, a situation common in Aotearoa NZ, where approximately half of Māori have Pākehā partners (Callister et al., 2007). Hose, whose wife is Pākehā, contested the biological or genetic basis of racism by saying there were no pure blooded Māori left, and talking about a melting pot. Rauri, whose partner is Pākehā, warrants voice on the topic by quoting Whina Cooper, a highly respected Māori leader (1895-1994).

Rauri Well Whina Cooper she said the quickest way to get rid of the divisions is by marrying um marrying the dividers, or something like that, and getting as many children as possible, because then the divisions have to drop because then they’re your own damn family ((laughs))
Rauri’s assumption is that the children of such unions will not be discriminated against because they belong to both groups. Others such as Kahu construct the children of such unions as ‘interracial’ and ‘not easily influenced’ or targeted by racism. Inap talks about prejudice being confounded by a ‘watering down’ of differences, with intermarriage ‘breaking down prejudice’ because of the interculturality and unique hybridism.

Mutual respect was constructed as a proviso against a tension voiced alongside Ngāti Kiwi, the fear that under this umbrella, Māori culture would become increasingly marginalised. Mutual respect involved each group’s continued culture, acknowledged equality of cultures, parallel regard for differences, shared experience, and resultant mutual benefit. Pania’s excerpt establishes Māori expectation that in a non-racist society, this should be automatic.

Pania  The solution for New Zealand…it’s to stop being negative ((laughs)) to have some respect and appreciate one another, instead of just trying to be the dominant person.

Pania’s reference to not being ‘the dominant person’ is a reference to what she perceives as Pākehā assumptions of superiority (Pack et al, 2015a). Coming from a Māori perspective, this is contrary to the respected Māori value whakaiti or, ‘be humble so that your message can be heard’ (Waitemata District Health Board, 2007). The message to be heard is not only mutual respect but also mutual benefit, as below.

Inap  I learnt a lot living with Pākehā people they taught us things about blue cheese
Sylvia ((laughs))
nap  and beef stroganoff
Sylvia  oh yes yum
Inap  and we taught them things about(.) pork bones and pūhā ((laughs))

In the atmosphere of mutual respect and exchange constructed here, ideally Māori and Pākehā live interactively, retaining and sharing aspects of their culture which are
capable of increasing the quality of life for both. Although acculturation frequently refers to the process by which a marginalised culture absorbs mainstream values and customs, some participants constructed a reverse acculturation they had observed in which non-Māori acquired Māori tattoos, performed the haka, and used common Māori words.

When asked their perspective on racism in the future, participants were without exception optimistic. Although they talked of racist incidents and structural racism as still occurring today, the past was seen as worse than the present and this in turn was constructed as a trend of ongoing improvement in race relations. Older participants recalled being beaten in school for speaking the Māori language in the 1940s, denied permission to drink in certain pubs or sit in buses and certain parts of theatres in the 1950s, openly turned down for accommodation or employment in the 1960s and 70s, and having fewer Māori news presenters and no Māori television before the 21st century, but these things have changed. There was an assumption that most Pākehā wanted to get on with Māori (Pack et al, 2015b) and things would continue to improve. Rauri sums up:

Rauri I think it’s going to come about naturally anyhow. I think we’re just going to we’re going to soak in being New Zealanders.

Discussion and conclusions

This study explored suggestions for reducing racism against Māori by focusing on the views of Mori targets of racism and their partners. It contributes to a growing area of research that has the potential to shed new light on current understandings due to the exceptional motivation of targets to analyse and contextualise their experiences (Swim & Stangor, 1998). In the first of the themes discussed, participants constructed institutional or structural racism as highly prevalent (Pack et al, 2015a) a view consistent with other research (Came, 2014). Participants did not see any easy or direct solutions. They noted that power imbalances in the workplace allowed Pākehā in positions of authority to minimise complaints and circumvent recourse to an apparently complex and stressful redress system, which suggests the need for its revision. Racism evident in the over-policing and unjustifiably high rate of incarceration of Māori led to
participants calling for greater numbers of Māori police, judges and justice workers. This echoes the concerns and solutions voiced by Māori currently working within the justice system (Thomas, 2014, Bootham, 2015). Participants did not discuss the possibility of a Māori justice system running parallel to the existing system, a solution proposed by the Green Party (2009) and the subject of ongoing discussion and debate (Perrett, 2013; Quince, 2007).

Participants emphasised the importance of anti-racism teaching and Treaty training (Simmons et al., 2008), noting there was no in-depth study of the Treaty, and the omission of accounts showing Māori perspectives in history curricula. Thus the educational system is constructed as a post-colonial Pākehā power structure wherein the equality inherent in the Treaty is sidelined, and Māori histories marginalised. Participants also suggested that teachers dedicate time to discuss racism against Māori openly with a view to its reduction. Their belief in the power of teachers to challenge racism is backed by studies which provide evidence that teaching non-racist concepts to students can be successful (Husband, 2012; Santas, 2000). Participants also called for the need to teach cultural expectations in a way which allowed Māori and Pākehā to intermingle with mutual appreciation, empathy and understanding. This attention to cultural norms has relevance for all professionals, particularly those working in the human services.

The participants’ view that greater integration could contribute to addressing racism resonate with the four criteria required for Allport’s (1958) contact hypothesis: equal status, common goals or cooperative activity, acquaintance potential in terms of time and availability, and the support of local authorities or institutions. These criteria were all mentioned by participants. In terms of equal status, the participants’ demand for mutual respect, particularly under the Treaty, confers equal status. Participants also cited working together for common goals in successful cooperative activities with Pākehā. Acquaintance potential in terms of time and availability was evident in accounts given of Pākehā and Māori living adjacently in more or less equal numbers. The support of local authorities or institutions was noted in several ways. Some participants lived on Māori land which was under the authority of local elders, and others talked of working together in organised groups. The successful relationships engendered in these groups indicated the success of the participants’ integration theme.
There are however structural and top down difficulties to implementation: the smaller percentage of Māori in the community means their acquaintance will not be available to all, and the integrated housing advocated by participants cannot be imposed. The bleak and negative statistics in areas such as education, housing, health and employment also need to be addressed before overall equality can be realised.

The participants construction of Ngāti Kiwi as a solution was analogous to Dovidio and Gaertner’s (2007) Common In-group Identity Model, in which induced re-categorisation of two groups as one new in-group caused former out-group members to be welcomed and valued as part of the in-group. An advantage of this re-categorisation is that it eliminates the spectre of Māori being positioned as the ‘other’, (Hokowhitu, 2004), a positioning participants recounted as undesirable, and which increases prejudice (Tajfel, 1978). Countering this is the subtle racism noted in studies which show that the neoliberal Pākehā phrase ‘we’re all one people’ can lead to the labelling of Māori as ‘good’ if they then take on the majority culture and thinking, and ‘bad’ if they do not (McCrenor, 1997). Participants’ desire for mutual respect, in terms of acknowledging and honouring the separate cultures, was proposed to prevent this. Awareness and mutual regard would ensure the separate protection of Māori culture, needs and abilities, and promote interaction in the style of parallel partnership (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002). Some studies however have indicated that this separation can re-emphasise the power of the majority culture and remarginalise the minority (Johnson, 1996). There is also the question as to whether the theme of bicultural Ngāti Kiwi can survive an increasingly multicultural Aotearoa NZ, where a quarter of residents are overseas born, and Asians make up 11.8% of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2013c). Consistent with Ward and Liu (2012), participants suggest that if all cultures are maintained and respected while participating in and contributing to the wider society, the core philosophical and historical concept of bicultural partnership can still be maintained.

In conclusion, the views of participants on reducing the problem of racism were aligned with the research literature in this area. Attention was drawn to the need for change in institutions to prevent aversive and deliberate racism affecting the redress system and the decisions of those in power. Calls were also made for Māori police and judges to work with Māori. Educators were asked to teach the Treaty, race ethics, and a balanced
historical viewpoint. Participants’ constructions of groups in which Pākehā and Māori interacted closely without prejudice strongly echoed Allport’s contact hypothesis, and the inclusive recategorisation Ngāti Kiwi spoke to the Common In-group Identity Model. Participants also alluded to the importance of Pākehā speaking out when witnessing racist behaviour, underscoring the power of action oriented bystander language to reduce racism (Guerin, 2003), particularly in the classroom. Where their perspectives diverge from existing studies is in the optimistic hypothesis that if the right conditions are met, all Pākehā and Māori will learn to live harmoniously, and racism rather than the targets will become marginalised.

This study was conducted by Pākehā researchers, and it is possible that their ethnicity and their desire to give voice to Māori might have influenced the participants, for example in the optimism shown, or the failure to mention alternative justice systems. More qualitative studies by Pākehā and Māori are needed to further investigate the views of Māori, whose embodied experience and perspectives have the potential to create new insights into the unique cultural context Aotearoa NZ context.

This concludes the four chapters of the thesis which attend to the findings. The participants’ accounts of the racist incidents themselves, their response to them, their thoughts on why they occurred, and their suggestions for reducing the racism, have been covered specifically in these chapters. The next chapter, Chapter Nine, returns to a conceptual level to provide an interconnected overview of the findings and integrate them into the broader field of knowledge.
Chapter Nine

Discussion and conclusions

Introduction

In this chapter I return to the original objectives and research aims, and the major themes and discourses arising from this study. I synthesise the results, set them in the literature, and examine possible contributions they make to the knowledge of racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ. Recommendations for the implementation of the research findings in theory and in praxis are suggested. I consider limitations of the research and problems arising during research, and make suggestions for future research. Reflexivity regarding my personal journey is provided in a final autobiographical reflection, and conclusions are drawn for the completed project.

A recap of research, a fusion of findings

The primary objectives of this research were to explore how Māori participants and their partners constructed racism against Māori. This was undertaken with three main questions: what form did the racism take, how did they account for it, and how did they suggest it might be reduced? The four sets of findings from analyses of data grouped around these questions were attended to individually in Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight. In summary, racist incidents were cited and their main response was resistance, participants accounted for it in terms of media, systems, superiority, and ignorance, and they offered solutions based around integration, education, and attention to systemic issues.

Considering these findings as a synthesised conceptual whole underscored the interconnectedness of the themes and discourses, the interactive nature of racism, and the notion that regardless of the construction of racism, it is never a single entity. Whether considered at a macro or micro-level, it is socially constructed in language,
interleaved and interconnected, and woven through the actions and positionings of individuals moving within the political systems and cultural mores of society.

How participants constructed and positioned themselves and Pākehā within this framework gave an indication as to stake (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). If they had constructed themselves as retributinal, preoccupied mainly with the process of blame and accountability, this would have closed down avenues to exploring improved interaction. Instead, they constructed themselves as resistant to racism and also willing to teach Pākehā about racism itself, and about how to reduce it, in the hope of producing stronger alliances. Pākehā were constructed as ignorant of Māori and racism, but also wanting to ‘get on’ with Māori, to bridge gaps and achieve productive and harmonious relationships. This was consistent with participants’ desire for increased integration, which they suggested would result in beneficial interaction, positive relationships, intermarriage and the ability to work together. Ignorance could be addressed by educational strategies such as teaching Māori history, the Treaty, and the intrinsic value of Māori culture leading to a reduction in cultural racism. Open teaching of anti-racism or ‘naming the elephant in the room’ (Myers, 2005) could negate the denial of racism against Māori in the classroom and elsewhere. As a result of increased integration, and educational measures which openly discouraged racism and promoted mutual respect for people and culture, society would then evolve into an inclusive bi-cultural community, under the descriptor Ngāti Kīwi.

Pākehā are constructed as believing themselves to be innately superior but deny this in keeping with the desire to be considered anti-racist (Tuffin, 2013). A sense of superiority encourages and perpetuates the generation of negative stereotypes, which feedback to justify the illusion. The media is a strong driver of these stereotypes, with coverage of Māori news which focusses on unfavourable representation such as Māori as criminals or political stirrers, which in turn discredits legitimate protest. The belief in superiority also conceptually supports cultural racism and a system in which colonial power structures remain intact and highly regarded by Pākehā.

What the participants and their partners have to say about racism against Māori is found to revolve around their constructions of Māori and Pākehā. Māori are constructed as resistant to racism, but tolerant of Pākehā ignorance and willing to teach. Pākehā are
constructed as often ignorant of racism against Māori, Māori people and Māori culture, but not as consciously utilising this ignorance to justify racist behaviour (McCreanor, 1993a). They are constructed as wanting to interact with Māori in a non-racist manner, yet also believing in their innate superiority. The latter justifies a colonial power structure in which Māori are marginalised and positioned below leadership in the social hierarchy, and the former constructs racism as reducible by education and integration. A circular tension in this is that an innate belief in superiority would be resistant to counter-education. However if education against racism and its intrinsic power positionings and destructive generalisations were effective, adherence to colonial power structures and negative stereotypes might gradually erode. If that were the case, possibly media would then follow society’s new awareness and dislike of negative stereotyping and focus on more positive aspects of Māori achievement.

Perhaps the most unusual and unexpected finding in this study has been the theme of a Pākehā sense of innate superiority as a driver for racist activity including the sense of having a right, as one participant put it, to ‘lower the mana’ (power, influence, prestige) of someone who is phenotypically Māori. The literature instead largely conceptualises racism against Māori as part of a socio-political process whereby Pākehā marginalise Māori in order to maintain their positioning of privilege in a colonial power system. The sense of innate superiority was evident in early settlers’ writings (McCreanor, 1997) but is now largely regarded as antiquated. D'Andrea and Daniels (1999) provide an exception to the majority of studies by suggesting that the sense of superiority whether conscious or unconscious, remains problematic in that it continues to motivate perpetrators of racism in Western society. If this is so, participants may be spotlighting an important and deliberate omission in Pākehā thinking, as the notion of innate superiority is unpleasant, difficult to handle, and unlikely to be willingly discussed (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1999). The theme of superiority is however further supported by links to materialism as a driver, when integrated with possession, status and privilege (Goldsmith & Clark, 2012), and considered an entitlement through superiority. Materialism as a means of status has been conjoined with other strong predictors of racism (Roets, Van Hiel, & Cornelis, 2006). The theme of superiority therefore cannot be discounted.
Modern Pākehā perpetrator talk relies on subtlety, ambivalence and plausible deniability (Wetherell & Potter, 1992) but this was countered by participants citing overt and offensive incidents. Their accounts are however in line with research exploring the accounts of indigenous targets elsewhere (Mellor, 2003, Paradies & Cunningham, 2009) and in Aotearoa NZ (Moewaka Barnes et al., 2013; Webber, McKinley, & Hattie, 2013). The experiences some participants shared included incidents that had occurred from and since the 1950s, and this allowed a historical progression to emerge. Their progression of racism began with public acceptance of the offensive and the overt in the 1950s (segregated seating in cinemas, Pākehā pubs, standing up on buses for Pākehā) and moved through gradually diminishing discrimination in employment and accommodation, to modern day denial of racism (Tuffin, 2013). The participants however also recounted many recent incidents that testified to racism as extant in the modern day. They have contributed significantly to a small pool of findings by adding their accounts which have the potential to increase awareness of overt perpetrator racism still functioning alongside the subtle in Aotearoa NZ.

The participants’ construction of racism as international and pervasive, when put alongside their optimistic theme of greater integration and a movement towards Ngāti Kīwi, seemed contradictory as well as being unusual in the literature. Presumably, universal racism cannot exist alongside a genuine desire for mutual community. However their theme of Ngāti Kīwi finds support in Huygen’s (2001) ‘Journeys away from dominance’ in which she talks about the strong desire Māori and Pākehā have to achieve a ‘right relationship’ and their joy in achieving it, including mutual appreciation of their cultural differences. Her suggestion for accompanying dual authority echoes the well researched Treaty requirements for biculturalism and equal partnership (Cram, 1997; NZPS, 2002). This was alluded to tangentially but not specifically by participants who talked instead of the need to honour the Treaty, the troubling Pākehā expectation that a Pākehā be in authority, and the need for mutual respect.

Pākehā discourses compared with Māori themes and discourses

A compelling and intriguing question was continually present while conducting this research, accompanying the need to produce findings regarding the discourses and
themes of Māori targets’ perspectives and meaning making. How did these understandings compare with existing findings in research on Pākehā perpetrators’ discourses? What theory could be offered, after the research was complete, in terms of the relationships among target and perpetrator discourses?

Participants’ focus on media and institutionalised racism as purveyors of racism, and their focus on the need for education, echo the themes of existing studies (Came, 2014; Hodgetts, Masters & Robertson, 2004; McCleanor et al, 2011; Sayers, 2014; Wetherell et al, 2015). In McCleanor’s ‘standard story’ (Nairn & McCleanor, 1991) he includes findings of discourses and themes employed by Pākehā when linguistically accomplishing the continued marginalisation of Māori, particularly when deflecting attempts at control. Some of these were echoed in participants’ talk. For example, the discourse of Māori as violent was noted by participants as a negative stereotype, and the invoking of the discourse ‘Māori stirrers’ recognised as a means by which any disagreement was discounted. McCleanor’s discourse of ignorance, in which Pākehā consciously claim ignorance as an excuse for any noticeably racist behaviour, had an interesting parallel in the participants’ accounts; they instead constructed Pākehā as genuinely ignorant, a construction which opened avenues for correction of racism through education and training.

Looking at Wetherell and Potter’s two main themes in their work in Pākehā discursive attempts to preserve colonisation (1992), in the first, Pākehā are constructed as more worthy of rule, and Māori culture as outdated and insufficient, with Māori undeserving of power. This finding is reflected in the participants’ reports of institutional racism, in which Māori are passed over for promotion unless indisputably better qualified for the job, and a Pākehā hierarchy and sense of ‘order’ thus maintained. The second theme, in which Pākehā address the ‘prejudice problematic’ of how to invisibly and subtly express racist and marginalising principles with ‘plausible deniability’ or without being able to be accused of racism, entered little into the participants’ responses. Their constructions of racism focussed almost entirely on more overt demonstrations such as those chanced upon in daily activities: personally mediated racist comments or jokes, police or judicial bias against Māori, or the media’s preoccupation with negative Māori news to the exclusion of the positive. It is possible that the ‘subtle racism’ used to solve the prejudice problematic was employed by Pākehā only with other Pākehā in order to
reaffirm the status quo in a manner that could be said to be acceptably egalitarian, and
thus the theme of subtlety was not often encountered by Māori. In general, the
participants tended to spotlight areas of clearly racist intent, as did those interviewed in
the other studies mentioned (Moewaka Barnes, Taiapa, Borell & McCreanor, 2013;
Webber, McKinley & Hattie, 2013).

Agreement with Mellor (2003) who states that contemporary subtle or symbolic racism
has not subsumed overt racism could be the major theorisation that compares
perpetrators’ and targets’ themes and discourses in this study. Mellor states strongly that
social psychologists’ suggestion that overt racism is unacceptable and therefore
unpractised in modern society (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), could be a dangerous
myth sustaining an ontological blindness to the fact that targets today encounter blatant,
old-fashioned racism as part of their everyday life. I would agree with his thesis that the
theory of non-specific, subtle symbolic racism can usefully be added to psycho-social
understandings on racism but must not become a closed circle which shuts down the
urgent need to study and learn from targets’ contrasting experiences.

This raises research questions such as, how does one theorise Māori discourse, when it
clear that not all Māori targets throughout Aotearoa NZ share the same perspectives?
Similarly, not all Pākehā perpetrators could be said share the same discourses; there can
be no generalisation or universalization of results in an analysis informed by social
constructionism. Discourse comes from society, and Māori live in a society which
draws on their own localised discourses as well as Pākehā ‘perpetrator’ discourses,
which may become internalised with continued everyday exposure, and then re-
expressed by the target themselves. However the overlaps between perpetrator and
target theory in this study, as shown in the last section, did not arise from internalisation
but some shared theorising, for example, around the significance of media as an
influence. The differing Māori themes and discourse on racism found in this sample can
best be described as subordinated or marginalised knowledge, sitting at the edges of a
currently much larger body of research which is from Pākehā and about Pākehā. The
chance for findings regarding Māori target theory to become counter-hegemonic rests in
the possibility of further studies being conducted into Māori targets’ perspectives, their
finding of similar themes, and these eventually being positioned alongside existing
studies.
Implications

This study was based on the rationale of the need to consider the voice of Māori as equally important in the study of racism against Māori. One striking finding is that their voice in this study carries strong pedagogical implications. Pākehā are constructed as ignorant, and teachers as capable of correcting this by teaching a balanced history, the Treaty, cultural appreciation, and anti-racism. A challenge to implementing this is that Aotearoa NZ students are less interested in Aotearoa NZ history than in learning about other countries (Levstik, 2001). Such study is constructed as more important and safer than learning local perspectives (Liu, Wilson, McClure, & Higgins, 1999), which in itself indicates resistance to broaching the subject of racism. Sayers (2014) stresses the need for fresh approaches, citing strong reaction in anti-racism workshops in which participants were told that the modern plight of the Māori was ‘their fault’. Possibly history syllabi could acknowledge the wrongs of the past without attributing blame to modern students to encourage a positive move forward. Henderson (2013) cites many cases of racist attitudes from teachers themselves, increasing the need for but creating barriers to the setting up of programmes for teaching anti-racism and appreciation of Māori perspectives and culture in the classroom. When I searched through the literature on teaching anti-racism and cultural awareness it seemed that more attention was given to cultural safety in the field of nursing, where it was accorded praxis and the status of being unique to Aotearoa NZ (Richardson, 2005). Yet according to this study, the implications for education are broader, for example, participants mentioned the repetitive occurrence of being ignored in shop queues or unnecessarily followed by store security, and possibly brief education of store workers could alleviate this. They also gave accounts of a common problem of indigenous people being over policed, and possibly this also could be addressed by training programmes. However the notion of racism is unwelcome, resisted and challenged (New Zealand Police, 2011). In the clinical implications from this study mental health professionals could be trained in cultural expectations, which would lead to feelings of acceptance and more productive health care. In line with this, there is a call for Māori to be assessed holistically rather than with isolated psychometrics (Durie, 1985).
The implications for policy are that changes be made in the curricula for schools and training institutions to provide resources and the means to implement the teaching programmes mentioned. Mental health providers and police could be provided with funding allocated to teaching cultural considerations and anti-racism.

The theoretical implications arising from this study emerge from the fact that new findings have been delivered, and for this reason, further focus needs to be brought to bear not only to exploring the perspectives of perpetrators and Pākehā understanding, but equally to exploring the accounts of targets. This shift in emphasis can only bring new insight and balance to existing understandings (Swim & Stangor, 1998).

**Limitations, and problems discovered in the methodology**

This average age of participants was 53. The maturity of participants meant they were able to look back and observe patterns and changes in racism during their lifetime. In the current study age and themes and discourses seemed unrelated, as also noted in studies by Paradies (2006) and Sigelman and Welch (1991); however other studies have shown younger targets are more likely to perceive discrimination (Broman, Mavadatt & Hsu, 2000). Such increased sensitivity to racism suggests younger participants could have produced different findings.

I would also, if I did this study again, avoid using as detailed a transcription notation (Appendix F) for two reasons. I had forgotten that the ‘Kiwi’ way of speaking includes a rising intonation at the end of a sentence. When marked with an upwards arrow, this misleadingly indicates a questioning tone. Secondly, participants were offended by their unedited verbatim scripts, and slow to sign them off. I would now keep a verbatim copy for myself for reference, and ask the participants to sign an edited copy with minimisers and repetitions removed and correct punctuation added.

I would also at the outset ask them to be available for some formal collaboration during the analytic process. When I needed confirmation or ideas on points, I phoned participants I knew, and gained further elaboration, however they did not contact me regarding the research despite being invited to during sign up, interviews, and the mid-analysis summary which was sent out to all.
I later wondered also, if I had drawn the participants out enough on the subject of the emotions that they experienced as a result of racist incidents, and whether or not these recurred. One participant who had experienced constant physical abuse from a Pākehā teacher for speaking Māori as a child, experienced Post Traumatic Stress Disorder symptoms with the unexpected, forceful and debilitating re-emergence of these childhood emotions when meeting lesser racist abuse much later in adult life, and this sat outside the main themes and discourses of this study.

Aspirational reflections on this research and methodology

It is worth noting that the last of the above points would have been covered if my methodology had not been merely ‘aligned’ with Kaupapa Māori, but operating from within its framework. For this to happen, it would have to be Māori researching Māori; as Māori understand other Māori better than a Pākehā would, therefore Māori the disclosure would have atleast been able to be regarded as unrestricted (Durie, 1985). I reflect that if I were doing this research again, I would either relinquish it to Māori, or ask a Māori researcher on board and do a fully collaborative project, hopefully in the spirit of Vicki Carpenter (Pākehā) and Colleen McMurchy (Māori) (Carpenter & McMurchy-Pilkington, 2008) who successfully conducted research together using Māori centred qualitative research methods (2008). I also felt that focus groups would have produced even greater responses, as this is the Māori way, to work with collaborative effort rather than produce a single interview. I would have liked to have been able to take up the marae on their instant offer of group interviews but was unable to because this occurred after I had obtained approval for my proposal from the University Ethics Committee and my Cultural Supervisor, and this detailed what I had previously used, individual interviews.

How much did my Pākehā ethnicity influence my findings, how much did it restrain the responses of the participants who knew me well? I remind myself that their accounts of racism and their rhetoric were clearly stated, and I endeavoured to honour them. Hopefully the position of trust I earned over many years of working with some of them, and my efforts to appreciate and understand their approaches and constructions had allowed them to speak with a degree of reedom. The trust in fact brought a problem:
during interviews, mutually understood meanings (Nicholson, 2003) allowed participants who knew me well to leave some sentences unfinished, as they knew that I knew what they were talking about, and for the same reason, they didn’t always spell out or complete their rhetoric. This meant that when I came to the analysis, the fact that the assumed implicit knowledge was unrecorded made some themes harder to reference, even though I understood them. If I did these interviews again, I would explain to the participants at the start that I might need to ask them to elaborate apparently unnecessarily on some points they brought up, despite the conversational style flow of the interview.

When reflecting on this research, I ask myself a broader question: what other ways might I have ‘given voice’ to these Māori participants within a constructionist frame, is there a way in which I could have extended the results of my study? One possible way could be to conduct an analysis of media discourses to identify media trends and stereotypes mentioned by the participants, to analyse where those discourses and themes came from, the stake of the media outlet concerned, and how these media expressions of racism aligned and intersected with participants’ themes. This triangulation could lend strength to their arguments, and the results published. Meta-analysis of policy documents could reveal racist institutional discourses in the fields of education, where the ‘tail end’ of Māori non-achievement is concerning but not necessarily, as participants say, a reflection of lower intelligence, which is itself another erroneous and negative discourse. Ideally, Police officers who resent the notion of bias in policing (New Zealand Police, 2011) could be encouraged to read participant accounts of over surveillance and give comment, and their collective answers discursively analysed and again related back to the participants’ accounts and theorising.

**Future research**

There are very few other studies exploring the micro-level perspectives of Māori targets, and fewer if any which acknowledge how they account for racism or suggest it might be reduced. Further research could involve Māori interviewing Māori (Dorie, 1985), or younger participants. Sigelman and Welch also found that targets of lower socioeconomic status who had difficulty paying monthly bills, perceived greater discrimination. In the current study, neither the waged majority nor the retirees appeared
to be in this category, which indicates the importance of interviewing participants with lower SES. The number of participants is also something that could be increased, as the sample was restricted in this study when data saturation was achieved. With a wider range, different insights could be explored, due to the considerable heterogeneity of the Māori people (Durie et al, 1995).

There is a strong tension between participants’ construction of New Zealanders as uniting under the common in-group identity of Ngāti Kīwi, and existing studies which show that this is more likely result in acculturation and assimilation (McCreanor, 1997). Participants wove into this theme the subthemes of mutual respect and the preservation of individual cultures (Ward & Liu 2012) however further research is needed to add to, complement or challenge their construction, before exploring the practical possibilities of encouraging the theme of Ngāti Kīwi, for example, in education.

My decision to include Pākehā partners of Māori because of their knowledge of racial issues was supported in the literature (Yancey, 2007) and their accounts did parallel the themes and discourses of the Māori participants. There is additional importance to conducting specific research into the accounts of Pākehā partners of Māori targets. In general, majority group members are more ignorant of racism than minority group members (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993) and reluctant to grant legitimacy to minority accounts of racism (Sigleman & Welch, 1991). However, they are likely to listen to the accounts of other majority group members (Yancey, 2007). Therefore findings from Pākehā accounts of racism against their Māori partners and children become a significant means by which to inform Pākehā of the reality of the problem, and counteract denial. It is possible that some Pākehā partners would be willing to talk on media or to local groups. Only five Pākehā partners were interviewed for this study, therefore this is a research field that could be enlarged. Confidential research in the workplace could be conducted to find out the extent of distressing and unreported accounts of racism, with clear aggregated results used to inform workplace policy on anti-racism measures.

Participants’ accent on the importance of education, the role of teachers and the need to address Pākehā ignorance, suggests the importance of research exploring the racism encountered by Māori students at all levels, from primary through to adult tertiary
education and universities. This has been visited by researchers (Bennett, 2002; Moewaka Barnes et al, 2013; Webber et al, 2013) but needs further investigation to determine how much racist incidents and stereotypically racist expectations from other students and/or teachers are affecting student progress. This is particularly important as Māori are over-represented in the bottom 20% of achievers and increasingly falling behind (Maxim Institute, 2006). Such research could be used to determine areas where the incidents are most prevalent, and more research conducted with Māori pupils and parents, in meetings away from those considered likely to inhibit disclosure, to determine how best to address the problem. Anti-racism programmes could be designed including these suggestions which, as in the present study, would come from participant targets who are highly motivated and perceptive (Swim & Stangor, 1998).

Micro-level research could importantly take place with Māori families involved in the justice system. Some excellent work is being currently conducted by Kiritapu Allan, a Wellington-based lawyer, who is using everyday language to ask Ngāti Kahungunu focus groups about their experience: ‘What do you think works well, what do you think sucks?’ (White, 2014). This open-to-all-comments approach avoids exhibiting a position of power which might inhibit interviewee responses (Millen, 1997; Riger, 1992).

Finally, four key points for Pākehā conducting any research with Māori, which I also observed in this project, should be considered (Furness, Waimarie-Nikora, Hodgetts, & Robertson, 2015). These are: building relationships with Māori before beginning research, employing expert guidance, practising an ethic of caring, and making the research available to and accountable to the community and people involved. The research is prefaced not only by reading widely in the field, but also by knowing and appreciating the research context and more importantly, the people with whom the researcher seeks to engage.
Final author reflexivity: empathy and enlightenment

This project was of quite intense bicultural interest for me, and two things in particular registered at a personal level. The first was that my empathy was acceptable. When listening to the accounts, I was at times shocked, and moved to mutual tears as well as mutual laughter, but inwardly worried that this lack of neutrality might somehow damage the scientific process. At the same time I knew the participants wanted open assurance that I ‘got it’. Later I read that a lack of empathy may be one of the most compelling reason racism endures (Myers, 2005). The other important message for me was that although I had known these friends for many years, I hadn’t heard these stories before. That sent me a clear message that this research was important because it was giving voice to something I was ignorant of, and if I was, then many other Pākehā were as well. This was confirmed when after the interviews participants expressed thanks and encouraged me, some stating that it was good that a Pākehā was ‘finally’ doing this, good that a Pākehā actually wanted to know about racism, which implied that mainly, they didn’t.

I left the project sobered by my previous ignorance regarding the seriousness of this silent, denied subject, warmed by the response, and also thoughtful regarding the fact that although during my studies I had read a good deal about the ongoing struggle for decolonization ‘ka whahai tonu matou’ and been prepared to hear about it, few of my participants had mentioned the political aspect of their struggle. They were ahead of me in their assumption that this project was about how Māori and Pākehā relate, this was about how can we create understanding. It seems a fitting note to end on, this Māori belief in the importance of respect and regard for relationships, for interconnectedness, for people.

He aha te mea nui o te ao?
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

What is the most important thing in life?
It is people, people, people.
Conclusion

In conclusion, this study set out to explore the views and perspectives of Māori targets and their Pākehā partners, regarding racism against Māori in Aotearoa NZ. Some of the findings, such as the significance of media and institutionalised racism as driving forces, and the importance of education in ameliorating the problem, are broadly in line with existing research. However in several areas participants’ talk produced unexpected results. Participants’ constructions of Pākehā as ignorant and imbued with a false sense of superiority created new drivers to consider. Their confidence in reducing racism through education and by encouraging an integrated Ngāti Kiwi society in which mutual respect enabled bicultural recognition, offered positive perspectives for further study. This work does not contradict current understandings, but extends them by contributing to a neglected area of study in which the voice of Māori targets has been largely unheard. In attempting and completing this study, Tolich’s (2002) Pākehā paralysis has been avoided, and an attempt been made to honour academically the perceptions of the minority. For myself as researcher, coming face to face with the implications of racism against Māori and their partners has been an incredibly educative and at times humbling experience. For the Māori participants and for their partners and whānau, it will remain an issue that undeservedly continues to affect every area of their lives, in both subtle and overt ways.
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Appendix A

Information Sheet

Talking racism in Aotearoa

He aha te mea nui? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

Who is the researcher?

My name is Sylvia Pack. I have worked continuously in the three Wellington prisons on prison chaplaincy teams for fourteen years, on a voluntary basis, and have a strong interest in social justice, particularly as it relates to Māori. I am also a doctoral candidate with the School of Psychology at Massey University, under the supervision of Associate Professor Dr Keith Tuffin, and co-supervisor Associate Professor Dr Antonia Lyons.

What is this study about?

Racism is known to be the cause of many societal problems. In Aotearoa, it is thought that such racism occurs on a daily basis, often in things that are said or racial slurs, which are racist to Māori but are unnoticed by Pākehā. Lack of awareness, or ignorance on the part of Pākehā, keeps the problem invisible, and does not offer solution or resolution.

The researcher will be asking Māori who are known to herself or friends, and their Pākehā partners, what they think is happening everyday situations. Does racism against
Māori take place in Aotearoa? Stories and opinions will be invited. Are there practical solutions to the problem?

What will the research be used for?

The research will be used in the researcher’s doctoral thesis, and may be offered for publication in academic journals. It may be presented to an audience. It is also hoped that the recommendations of participants can be brought before relevant authorities to increase awareness of discrimination and racism in Aotearoa, help in its elimination and bring about positive change.

What will I have to do if I participate?

You will be interviewed at a time and place of your choosing. This could take up to an hour, but time is not of the essence, and the interview will be as short or as long as you want. You will be asked if you have experienced discrimination or racism of any sort, and in what circumstances. You will be given the questions before the interview, but these are mainly to stimulate discussion. You may answer these questions, and feel free to add any other information you think is relevant but not mentioned in the question. You will be asked about experiences with schools, libraries, work, doctors and hospitals, dentists, the police, banks, shops, sports clubs, churches, casual acquaintances, restaurants, motels, travel, rental accommodation, housing. You will be encouraged to feel free to be candid and outspoken, to “tell it like it is”. The interview will be recorded.

Confidentiality

The researcher will make every effort to maintain total confidentiality and anonymity of every participant. After the interview, the researcher will transcribe your recording. At this point she will assign a code name to replace your name, and all identifying words such as names, locations and work place names will be removed. The edited script will then be checked by yourself to ensure that it is accurate, and totally anonymous. When this is complete, the audio recording of your voice will be erased. No research record will be kept of details which could identify you, for example name, address, phone
numbers. The consent form, and the authority for release of recording transcript form, which will have your name on them, will be kept in a locked cabinet at the researcher’s home.

Your rights

You will be given a copy of the questions before the interview.
You may refuse to answer any question.
You may add whatever you wish to the questions.
You may turn off the dictaphone at any time during the interview.
You may withdraw from the research at any time.
You may ask questions regarding the research at any time.
You will be shown the transcription of your interview, and given the opportunity to change any part you feel is incorrect.
You will be given a summary of the research.

Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have any questions:
Phone (H) 939 7810 (Mob) 029 939 7810 Email: sylviapack@netscape.net
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Interview Schedule

Talking racism in Aotearoa

He aha te mea nui? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

Section A

Does racism exist in New Zealand today? Racism against Māori? What do you think?
Take time to consider this, in the settings mentioned below.

Schools - Libraries - Doctors, hospitals, referrals, dentists
The Justice System: Police, courts, the department of Corrections
Politics and government - Banks and lending institutions
Tourism - Rental accommodation, housing
Motels & travel - Shops and retail - Restaurants
the workplace - television and the media - the movie Boy
Sports clubs - Churches - non- Māori whānau
Strangers or casual acquaintances - public places
Any other situation or setting?

Questions
1. Can you recall a time when you felt you, or your whānau or friends were treated in a way that showed racism or discrimination, in any of these settings?
2. How did it affect you?

Section B
What is really going on?
1. a) Why do you think the person acted this way?
   b) What was being established?
2. Do you think they were aware of what was happening?

Section C
Solutions and the bigger picture
What is the solution? What do you think? What changes are needed to bring about positive change for Aotearoa? Examples might be Tino Rangatiratanga, Māori in positions of power, The Māori Party, Māori land, the Māori renaissance, te reo in schools, education?

Are there any questions regarding this research?
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Consent Form

Talking racism in Aotearoa

*He aha te mea nui? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.*

- I have read the information sheet for this Study. I have had my questions answered satisfactorily and understand my right to ask further questions throughout the study.
- I understand my right to decline any question, or to withdraw from the study at any time.
- I agree to the interview being recorded and I understand my right to ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.
- I agree to take part on the condition that the interview is confidential and my real name, and anything else that could identify me, will not be used in the data.
- I agree to parts of the interview being used in the researcher’s thesis, articles based on the thesis, and public seminars, provided I cannot be identified by these.
- I wish to participate in the study under the conditions set out in the information sheet.

Participant’s name ____________________________________________________________

Participant’s signature _______________________________________________________

Participant’s email or postal address, which will be used for the return of the edited transcript, and research results summary:
Date ______________________________________________________

Researcher _________________________________________________

(Consent forms will be stored securely and separately to the research)
Confidentiality Agreement

Talking racism in Aotearoa

He aha te mea nui? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

I Sylvia Pack, agree to keep confidential all identifiable information supplied in interviews for the project Talking racism in Aotearoa. I will personally transcribe all interviews. At the time of transcription, all identifying data regarding the participants will be eliminated from the transcripts. The edited transcript will then be checked by yourself to ensure that it is accurate, and totally anonymous. When this is complete, the digital recording of your voice will be erased. The edited interview transcript will be viewed only by the participant who provided it, the researcher and her supervisors.

Name.........Sylvia Pack

Signature.........................................................Date........................
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Authority for release of recording transcripts

Talking racism in Aotearoa

*He aha te mea nui? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.*

I confirm that I have been given the opportunity to read and amend the transcript of my audio interview.

I understand that in the interests of confidentiality I may change my pseudonym.

I am satisfied that all identifiers, such as names and locations, have been edited out.

I agree that the edited transcripts may be used by the researcher, Sylvia Pack, in her current project and in reports or publications arising from the research.

Name (printed) ______________________________________________________

Signature_____________________________________________________________

Date_________________________________________________________________
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Transcription Notation

Overlapping speech
Extended square brackets mark overlap between utterances, e.g.:
A: To show respect, I believe is the important thing

[                   ]
B: Ae ae he tika tau

Continuous speech
An equals sign at the end of one utterance and at the start of the next indicates continued speech without pause, e.g.:
A: When you take into account the history of=

[   ]
B: mm
A: =Aotearoa

Pauses
Pause lengths are shown by numbers in brackets.

(.) indicates a pause <1 second,
(1) indicates a pause >1 second and <2 seconds
(2) indicates a pause >2 seconds and <3 seconds
(3) indicates a pause >3 seconds and <4 seconds
E.g.:
A: That’s a hard question to answer (3) yes (.) I think on the whole I would agree

Extended words
One or more colons indicate an extension of the preceding vowel or consonant sound, e.g.:
A: Ye:::s::: but with certain exceptions
Emphasis
Underlining indicates that words are uttered with emphasis, e.g.:
A: I do think it’s a good idea.

Volume
Capitals indicate the volume is louder than surrounding text.
Smaller font size indicates the volume is quieter than surrounding text, e.g.:
A: He just yelled it out HEY BOY
B: how rude

Rising intonation
A question mark indicates rising pitch or intonation, e.g.:
A: I’ve seen it for many years now you know?

An animated tone
An animated tone is indicated by an exclamation mark, e.g.:
A: How could they do such a thing!

Tone which expresses feeling
Curly brackets indicate tone in the manner of speaking, e.g.:
A: He knows everything {sarcasm}

Audible breaths:
(.hh) indicates audible inhalation
(hhh) indicates an audible exhalation
E.g.:
A: (.hh) That’s shocking and unbelievable
B: (hhh) I wish it was

Indistinct utterances
Speech that is too quiet to hear is indicated thus: (inaudible)
Speech where the words are indistinct is indicated thus: (indistinct)
A question mark in the bracket indicates that because of low volume, or the indistinct nature of the utterance, there is uncertainty about its accuracy.
E.g.:
A:  I’ve thought about it a lot but this is unusually (inaudible)
B:  I wonder if it’s (doable?) When you consider (dynamic? indistinct) forces

Paralinguistic features
Double parentheses indicate nonverbal activity which inevitably expresses the speaker’s state or emotion, paralinguistic features such as laughter, e.g.:
A:  He should be Prime Minister ((laughs))

Identifiers
In the interests of confidentiality, square brackets indicate that identifying data has been removed from the transcript. The word “identifier” or “relative” can be used rather than more definitive terms such as ‘brother in law’ or ‘boss’, e.g.:
A:  I was working at [location] back in [year] when [name] was still there(.) He was my [identifier].
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