UNDERSTANDINGS OF BEING PĀKEHĀ:

EXPLORING THE PERSPECTIVES OF SIX PĀKEHĀ WHO HAVE STUDIED IN MĀORI CULTURAL LEARNING CONTEXTS

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management: Communication Management at Massey University, Turitea campus, Aotearoa – New Zealand.

Margaret Ann Mitcalfe

2 0 0 8

TRIPLE DEDICATION

To the six participants: you gave so generously of your time, of your selves and of your stories to this research. Your words were so appreciated.

To Sally Pearce, my enduring thanks: you have been the most steadfast of companions, through the beginning, the many middles, and now the final end of this character building, self-disciplining, self-growing, creative process.

To all my nephews and nieces:

Alex

Asher (1978 – 2003)

Ben   (1975 – 2008)

Bess

Carraldo

Georgia

Hosanna

Jeray

Manawa

Matilda

Michael

Miha

Rita

and my great-niece

Juliette,

taonga of the past, of the present and of the future.

ABSTRACT

This research studies Pākehā who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts. Within a social constructionist theoretical framework, and with a combination of the critical and communicative approaches to cultural identity, the research explores the meaning these Pākehā bring to being Pākehā. Discourse analysis tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources are used to analyse data from semi-structured interviews with six Pāhehā participants. Participants have experienced Māori cultural learning contexts before or during the research, through learning te reo, tikanga Māori and about nga ao o nga iwi Māori. The research found that, largely, meanings participants brought to being Pākehā were in contrast to stereotypical notions of what it means to be Pākehā. Participants demonstrated that for them being Pākehā meant being connected to nga ao o nga iwi Māori; being aware of Pākehā privilege; mediating and negotiating being Pākehā with dominant notions of Pākehāness; valuing the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand, along with valuing te reo me ona tikanga. Furthermore, the research also found that the consistently postcolonial identity participants brought to being Pākehā shifted according to context, troubling the meanings of Pākehā also.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you, kia ora, to all the Mitcalfe and Fougère family, present and departed, for the inspiration you provide about ways to be Pākehā.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In the last thirty years in Aotearoa-New Zealand, Pākehā have been confronted by the widespread assertion, largely from Māori, that Pākehā need to wake up to history. Pākehā have been urged to recognise the impacts of colonisation and to acknowledge Māori as equal partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. During this time, the Waitangi Tribunal has been established as a means for Māori to seek institutional redress for the injustices of earlier government actions and laws that took Māori land, nearly destroyed tikanga and te reo. Public initiatives, such as the 1990 Sesqui centennial, have enlightened Pākehā about Aotearoa-New Zealand history. Events like the te Mana exhibition alerted Pākehā to the vibrancy, beauty and value of things Māori. Māori generally became more active in promoting te reo, kapa haka, and all aspects of Māori culture, as they engaged in a widespread cultural renaissance and cultural empowerment, reclaiming and re-treasuring Māori ways as part of an active process of de-colonisation. However, the greater visibility of the presence of te reo and of tikanga Māori, combined with social and political conscientisation about the damaging impacts of colonisation through such initiatives as Project and Network Waitangi, reached some Pākehā more than others.

My research studies Pākehā who have chosen to learn in Māori cultural learning contexts with tikanga Māori as the foundation of the learning and teaching, a context where Māori are in the majority. The Pākehā I am studying have all learnt te reo and have chosen to learn about the Treaty of Waitangi. They have chosen to engage interculturally with te ao Māori in educational settings. In order to 'thicken' the Pākehā story available in the literature, for this research I sought out those Pākehā who identified as Pākehā, and who had engaged with nga ao o nga iwi in a Māori learning context. In doing so, I sought those who had experienced this intercultural context of their own volition, where they were the learners and Māori, the teachers, and where tikangā Māori was the foundation. By seeking out those people who had these experiences, I was aiming to hear from people who had, of their own choice, been informed by experiences generated in a context that were in contrast to the dominant, Pākehā social context of Aotearoa-New Zealand. I wanted to hear from people who

identified as Pākehā and who had the opportunity of having their dominant, assumed, monocultural status affected by being learners in a Māori cultural learning context. I wanted to hear from people who had experienced the different positioning of the Māori cultural learning context, a different discursive environment. This research does not study Pākehā in that context as such. Rather, the ways of being Pākehā of those who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts are explored. I aim to understand the meanings these Pākehā bring to being Pākehā after their experience of being in a Māori cultural learning context.

THE INTERCULTURAL CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

From some iwi perspectives, the intercultural situation of Pākehā learning in the Māori cultural context can bring unique historical, social, and political considerations. Pedagogy is an area Māori use to re-assert their tino rangatiratanga, to nurture their tikanga (Awatere, 1984; Bishop, 1994, 2003; Hohepa & Jenkins, 1996; Mead, 1996; Walker, 1987, 1990, 1996) and to decolonise (Smith, 2005). A lot of Māori pedagogy is centred on the teaching of te reo and tikanga Māori. The taonga of te reo Māori was nearly destroyed by the processes of colonisation and by the betrayal of Te Tiriti o Waitangi by the Crown (O'Regan, 2006). Therefore, Pākehā -- whose "political ancestors" are the colonists (Gaita in Bell, 2004a, p. 26) -- learning te reo in Māori cultural learning contexts has received a complex reception from Māori, one that ranges from criticism to welcome.

In this intercultural environment, the contemporary ambivalence about Pākehā connection with, and separation from Māori, works on many levels. Separation from Māori works to keep Pākehā protected from encountering damaged historical and contemporary indigenous realities, in which Pākehā are implicated. Separation therefore perpetuates an apoliticised consciousness amongst Pākehā. Further, separation works to keep Pākehā monocultural, ignorant of te reo and tikanga, and by default, devaluing and disrespecting of the indigenous culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand, a culture promised to be protected as equal to that of settlers from Britain by Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Separation, though, also works to protect Māori from Pākehā appropriation, assimilation and from invasion into contexts where tikanga Māori is being revitalised, in recuperation after the damages Pākehā colonisation has inflicted on Māori identities. Further, separation works to maintain a strategic barrier between Māori and Pākehā in order to facilitate

Māori claims for justice and political equity. Contemporarily, therefore, monocultural separation of Pākehā from Māori can be constructed as either colonising or postcolonial, depending on the situation. Separation of Pākehā from Māori can be colonising because it allows Pākehā to remain monocultural and to maintain the dominance of an assumed, unchallenged identity, unaware of history, unaware of contemporary impacts of colonisation on Māori. Separation of Pākehā from Māori can be postcolonial because it can grant Māori the autonomous space of cultural recuperation. In the contemporary context, intercultural connection between Pākehā and Māori can bring both colonising risks and postcolonial possibilities, depending on how the specific, local, contextual involvement is negotiated. Hence, the topic, the site and the sample of this study, Pākehā involved in Māori cultural learning institutions, bring political and ethical complexities. These ambiguities are at the hub of contemporary, cross-cultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā.

BACKGROUND TO AND GENESIS OF THE RESEARCH TOPIC

The research topic has evolved out of my own personal experiences of engagement with nga ao o nga iwi Māori and out of my own involvement as a learner with Māori cultural learning contexts. In outlining here some personal experiences of my own Pākehā engagement with nga ao o nga iwi Māori, I aim to give context to my enquiry and to show how some of my personal experiences connect to and mirror those issues fundamental to the research topic.

Unusually, as a child in the 1960s, I had experiences that made te ao Māori a distinct part of the context in which I grew up. My parents' political engagement with Māori issues, their interest in, concern for and knowledge of te reo, Māori history, and tikanga Māori, and their social network of friends amongst Māori, brought our family closer to nga ao o nga iwi Māori than was usual for Pākehā at that time. We, then, using the theoretical terms of this thesis, inhabited alternative subject positions from those provided for us by the dominant discourses of the social environment that surrounded us. Trips through the country in our old Thames van or in the Ford Falcon station wagon were often interrupted by "That looks like a pa site", followed by an evacuation of the family from the vehicle and, "I think that's a food-storage pit", "Look at the midden", "Mmm these could have been where the fortifications were", all said in tones of great excitement and awe. If friends of 'us kids' were present, their confused, quizzical faces

spoke volumes about how alien this connected approach to 'Māori stuff' and Māori history was to other Pākehā at that time. We knew we lived in a "Māori country" (Grimshaw as cited in Mikaere, 2005, p. 44).

The reception from Māori, that I was aware of anyway, at that time to Māori-friendly Pākehā (Pākehā who were friendly not because Māori were 'just like us' but who were genuinely interested in and open to learning about nga ao o nga iwi Māori) was one of pleasure and gratitude. So, as a child in Māori cultural contexts, I felt my family's involvement was welcomed positively and cherished.

Apart from occasional marae experiences, it was not until 1989 that I next consistently engaged with nga ao o nga iwi Māori, in a context of tino rangatiratanga for Māori, where tikanga Māori was the foundation. After living overseas, I had determined on my return to learn te reo.

In the interim time, between the engagement as a family in the 1960s with nga ao o nga iwi Māori and 1989, a lot had changed: the Māori, political and cultural renaissance was well underway and with it a new kind of discourse about being Pākehā. Whether rightly or wrongly, because of my parents' early awareness of and commitment to the support of Māori historical grievances and our early valuing of te reo and tikanga Māori, I felt distanced from the kind of Pākehā described in Māori-activist discourse, distanced from Pākehā as blind to colonising history, ignorant and devaluing of te reo and tikanga Māori and blind to Pākehā privilege and power. I had always been aware of and cared about the colonising history, the political and social injustice, and the valuable reality of Māori as a vivid, different culture.

It was during engagement with nga ao o nga iwi Māori in Māori cultural learning contexts, that I was face-to-face with the dilemma of how to differentiate myself as an individual, who had been formed by experiences other than those of the mainstream, from the group identity that had been constructed for Pākehā in contemporary social and political discursive environments. At the same time, regardless of my individual negotiation of the positioning of Pākehā as racist, colonist, historically and culturally ignorant, in the wider discursive environments, being in a Māori cultural learning environment as an adult gave me the experience of being subject to another culture,

being a minority for once, not having the security of cultural knowledge as a foundation.

While learning te reo in a Māori cultural learning context, I noticed a range of complex intrapersonal responses to being there as a Pākehā. As well as pleasure, gratitude, a sense of homecoming, personal enrichment, I also experienced denial, defensiveness, insecurity, and alienation as I negotiated my individual sense of self with the way the collective identity of Pākehā positioned me, as I negotiated being Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context. These responses were a surprise to me. The context had called forth a complexity in my Pākehāness and in my relationship to Māori that had been completely submerged.

As an interesting aside, it was only in the early stages of preparation for doing this research that I came to realise that in seeing my origin as contemporary and feeling my history began with my immediate family, I was displaying a similar historical amnesia to that which Māori were attributing to Pākehā, that same attribution I was resisting. My great-grandfather on my father's side was a Taranaki farmer, beneficiary of the Taranaki wars. Through his wealth, my family had been privileged. Indicative of a diverse range of ways of being Pākehā existing at that time also, though, two of my great-grandfather's uncles ran away from Taranaki, married Māori and became proficient in te reo. My great-grandfather on my mother's side was also proficient in te reo. And, as a young, Chatham Island man, he was one of the key-holders for Te Kooti and his people on the Chathams. In this way, my family have been agents of the brutality of New Zealand's colonising history. At the same time, they have also demonstrated an alternative relationship to Māori. My family did not, though, carry the colonising blindness into our contemporary living and did not accept the bland, we are one people, we are a country of perfect race relations discourses that were common assumptions of Government and non-Māori in the middle of the twentieth century.

Alongside my responses to engagement with nga ao o nga iwi Māori recounted above, I wondered what the responses were of other Pākehā, who had more traditional Pākehā upbringings, to being learners in Māori cultural learning contexts. I wondered what they went through as they consistently engaged, face-to-face with the Māori cultural learning

environment. I wondered what their engagement would be able to tell us about how being Pākehā is experienced.

These experiences provided the genesis for some of the themes of the research thesis: how Pākehā individuals negotiate their lived experience in relation to how the collective identity Pākehā positions them and how they negotiate being in a Māori cultural learning environment.

In the early stages of preparation for the research I began to read the academic and wider literature on Pākehā. In doing so, I discovered, speaking broadly, a lot of the literature similarly elided Pākehā with colonist, racist, denier of history, monoculturalist etc. I experienced a frustration and sadness that the other kinds of Pākehā I knew were not much written of, the kinds of experiences of Pākehā I knew about had not been widely-acknowledged as attributable to a Pākehā identity, that the wider diversity of Pākehā had not, broadly speaking, been represented. I found the level of commitment and didacticism, often required of Pākehā in the literature that spoke of a politically, postcolonial Pākehāness, was also alienating.

However, I acknowledge the importance of the literature's role in bringing to the surface of contemporary Pākehā reality, buried colonising history and its attendant consequences. I also support the importance of the literature's concern about and attention to the contemporary deployment of discourses that advance further colonising projects. At the same time, the kind of subject positions for Pākehā that this discourse in the literature offers, largely neglects to include representation or exploration of the lived experiences of Pākehā who resist Pākehā hegemony. I sense a danger that Pākehā is becoming a term not many would choose to claim, either because of its elision with colonising practices or because of the level of commitment and didacticism being a postcolonial Pākehā is constructed as entailing. I feel that opportunities to represent the creative resistance and negotiation of the lived experience of many Pākehā in specific, local contexts are being overlooked.

My responses to a lot of the literature, therefore, provided a further impetus and motivation: to represent a wider diversity of stories about what it can mean to be Pākehā. Such a purpose brings a particular struggle: while I write I am aware there is a

danger of being interpreted as preaching a redemptive discourse of Pākehā or of being seen as adding to the "self-deception" that Jesson identified as endemic amongst Pākehā (as cited in Mikaere, 2005, p. 168). Writing this thesis, then, has been a risk, one I valued taking, in order for the plurality of Pākehā voices to be recognised.

As I write this thesis, I am grateful to and want to honour the tolerance Māori people have extended to the Crown, to governments and to Pākehā in the last two centuries. Without that tolerance, Aotearoa-New Zealand would be a far less safe place for Pākehā to inhabit today. In no way do I want this thesis to be interpreted as encouraging Pākehā to take advantage of this tolerance by continued complacency. Instead, I would like the attention I give to the range of meanings that comprise being Pākehā, to enrich our understandings of being Pākeha.

The Pākehā I study in this research are different from the majority of Pākehā. For a start they self-identify as Pākehā, a label that still meets with resistance from a lot of non-Māori New Zealanders. While a lot of Pākehā continue to be resistant to the use of Māori words, to learning about the Treaty and to learning about tikanga Māori, the Pākehā I study in this research have learnt te reo, have made a voluntary commitment to understand the Treaty's place in Aotearoa-New Zealand's historical and contemporary life, and to develop knowledge of tikanga Māori.

These Pākehā have chosen to study in Māori cultural learning contexts where tikanga Māori is the foundation of the learning and teaching, and where Māori are in the majority. That they have made these voluntary choices suggests that the Pākehā I study in this research have thought about the place of Pākehā in Aotearoa-New Zealand and that they have thought about being Pākehā in relation to Māori. The actual experiences of learning in Māori cultural learning contexts can also be expected to have provided further opportunities for the participants to have thought deeply about the meaning of being Pākehā.

Therefore, the choices these Pākehā have made and the experiences they have had suggest that their conceptualisations of the meaning of being Pākehā will be multi-layered. Being Pākehā means different things to different people. What does it mean to people who have been immersed in Māori cultural learning contexts? In order to seek

this depth and complexity about the meanings of being Pākehā, I set out to interview six Pākehā students who had learnt te reo, who had studied in Māori cultural learning contexts, and who had engaged with issues of te ao Māori in educational settings. By studying the layers of meaning around being Pākehā that their language produced, I was seeking the answer to the following question.

RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the meaning given to being Pākehā by six students who have learnt te reo and who have chosen to study in Māori cultural learning contexts, and to engage with te ao Māori in educational settings?

Secondly, I asked how do these meanings about being Pākehā relate to the existing literature on Pākehā identity?

OUTLINE OF STRUCTURE OF THESIS

In order to study the meaning the six Pākehā give to being Pākehā, Chapter Two provides a background to how other writers have understood and researched Pākehā identity. It allows me to place my study in the context of that already-existing literature. Chapter Three explains the methodological choices I made. In this chapter, I describe the theoretical background of the research, the data-collection tools and data analysis method I used in order to gather and understand the meaning the six participants bring to being Pākehā. At the same time I describe the participants' backgrounds along with the ethical challenges I faced while doing the research. In Chapter Four I present my findings, my analysis and my discussion. The last chapter, Chapter Five, concludes the research by further summarising and synthesising the results in a way that explains the significance of the findings and which points the way for future research.

Appendices are followed by a glossary of Māori words used in the thesis.

 In Chapter One, I have shown why I think that the topic of this research is important, because it is at the hub of contemporary intercultural relationships in Aotearoa-New Zealand. My aim of exploring the meaning that participants bring to being Pākehā has been explained and I have clarified my research question. I have also shared the background to the genesis of my research, and then outlined the structure of the thesis.

The following chapter describes some of the more pertinent literature which deals with the meaning given to being Pākehā. Reviewing this work will demonstrate the way that my inquiry fits with, grows out of and contributes to the already-existing scholarly context.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Because my study concentrates on the meaning Pākehā who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts bring to being Pākehā, I first look broadly at how the meaning of being Pākehā has been influenced by two discourses that are represented widely in the literature on Pākehā and on Pākehā-Māori relationships. These discourses are Pākehā as meaning being separate from and ignorant of te ao Māori; and Pākehā as meaning being appropriator, assimilator and dominant controller. After describing the way that the meaning of being Pākehā is often associated with being ignorant of and separate from Māori, maintaining a dominant identity, I then visit the work of two major contributors to the work on the meaning of Pākehā identity as postcolonial, of Pākehā in connection with and knowing about te ao Māori: King (1985; 1999a; 1999b) and Spoonley (Spoonley, 1986, 1988; 1995; 2007). Following the contemporary emergence of applied research literature on Pākehā in connection with Māori, I then review the work of Campbell (2005) and Jellie (2001), to create a context for my enquiry on what being Pākehā means to those who have engaged in Māori cultural learning environments.

PĀKEHĀ AS SEPARATE FROM MĀORI AND DOMINANT OVER MĀORI

The civilised coloniser and the savage native were two common stereotypes used to maintain a discursive separation of Pākehā from Māori and to further entrench colonisation. A separation between Māori and Pākehā has been more recently called for by Māori (Awatere, 1984; Mead, 1996). Māori resistance to and negotiations with the presence of Pākehā and with the Crown have been active since the 1830s (Walker, 1987, 1990). In the 1970s and 1980s, the cause of tino rangatiratanga continued to be promoted and furthered in a way which could not be ignored by the Crown or by as many Pākehā as before (Butcher, 2003; Durie, 1998; O'Regan, 1995; Spoonley, 2007). At this time, Māori drew a strong boundary between tangata whenua and tauiwi for strategic reasons. Māori assertion of a collectivity, distinct and separate from Pākehā, supported their political endeavour to have the injustices inflicted on their

people, by contemporary and historical colonisation, redressed. Hence, today, the separation of Pākehā identity from tangata whenua identity is discursively deployed by Māori to further the process of decolonisation (Bell, 2004a; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999).

One response to the pressure from Māori for injustices to be redressed and for tino rangatiratanga to be respected, was the promotion of an institutionalised, state discourse. Diverse in its locales of effects, this institutionalised discourse constituted biculturalism, by separating Māori and Pākehā into two separate peoples (Bell, 2006; During, 1985; Jackson, 2004; Margaret, 2002b; Mataira, 1995; Meredith, 1998; Spoonley, 1995; Spoonley, Macpherson, & Pearson, 2004). Within the bifurcated environment of biculturalism, as it is currently constructed, being Pākehā can mean to be separate from Māori (Bell, 2006). Questioning this level of bifurcation, Bell (2006), in reference to Said (1993), states that the relationship between Māori and Pākehā is much more connected than this bifurcation suggests, and in turn, that Pākehā identity is much more connected to Māori than this would suggest. Despite this mutual connectedness, the emphasis on a discursive separation of Pākehā from Māori helps enable Māori to maintain a protective boundary around the revitalisation work of indigenous rights.

Separation from and ignorance of the indigene is also a premise for Pākehā identity within settler theory. Writers on settler identity and on Pākehā as a settler identity describe how separation from the indigene is one of the premises of cultural identity for the settler and for Pākehā (Bell, 2004a; Lawson, 1995; Maclean, 1996; Turner, 1999a, 1999b). These writers argue that settlers and Pākehā keep themselves blind to history so they maintain a separation from the indigene, in Aotearoa-New Zealand that is from Māori (Bell, 2004a; Lawson, 1995). According to settler theory, not only do Pākehā undergo a process of separating from their original home culture, its homeliness and its authority, they also keep separate from the violent history of their home-making in the new country. This separation avoids recognising the violence on which Pākehā being and belonging in Aotearoa-New Zealand is based. Hence, Pākehā identity is constituted as an alienated one, rejecting of history, cut off from the homeland.

Settler theory also describes how separation from the indigene is overcome in a way as settlers, at the same time as avoiding recognition of and connection to the indigene and

to colonial history, appropriate features of indigenous culture in order to gain the authority and comfort of homeliness (Lawson, 1995). The discursive environment that creates a separate identity position for Pākehā from Māori, also identifies Pākehā as appropriating when in connection with te ao Māori. While some Pākehā resist Māori rights to tino rangatiratanga, reject the configuration of Māori as a separate people, ignore the wounding outcomes of colonisation for Māori, nonetheless they appropriate unique and distinct features of Māori culture in order to achieve or enhance a special identity for themselves. In this way, Pākehā – individuals, businesses, clubs etc., especially in the international arena when marketing products – have a history of appropriating, without consultation, cultural features such as Māori names, patterns and designs as their own (Turner, 1999b). Separation is constructed, then, to serve Māori interests as protecting the indigene from Pākehā appropriation. In this discursive and social environment, a mistrust of Pākehā coming close to, engaging with, nga ao o nga iwi Māori, has developed in some quarters and appropriation of Māori cultural features has been perceived as characteristic of Pākehā.

When Pākehā are not separate from Māori, when they are in connection with Māori, their identity has been strongly configured in some of the literature to be that of appropriator and or controller. Bell (2004a; 2004b; 2004c) writing of the connection of Pākehā with Māori, premises the connection on a suspect hybridity through which the coloniser dilutes, appropriates or romanticises the indigenous culture. Jones and Jenkins (Jones, 1999, 2002) describe how the desire for Pākehā to know the experience of the other, of Māori, can operate (whether consciously or not) as a wish for knowledge in order to have power and control over the other, over Māori. Jones has cautioned against this wish for knowledge of the experience of the other, arising from connection of the dominant culture with indigenous cultures, because this impetus has been linked to an underlying desire for power. Those Pākehā who do not have an assimilatory, dominant or appropriating agenda have received much less attention. Along with Pākehā meaning separate from Māori, and when in connection with Māori being appropriating, there are many examples of Pākehā meaning being a dominant identity.

The dominance of Pākehā as a represented identity has been particularly prevalent as a topic in the literature (Adds et al., 2005; Barclay & Liu, 2003; MacPherson & Spoonley, 2004; McGregor, 1996; McGregor & Comrie, 2002; Walker, 1996). These sources

demonstrate that Pākehā versions of reality are privileged over Māori ones, particularly in the media. This literature which has documented the ideological power of Pākehā through media representation attributes Pākehā identity with an assumed, monocultural privilege and dominance. When Pākehā ideological dominance is aligned with the institutional dominance of Pākehā, Pākehā identity continues to operate as a colonising one on many levels (Nairn, 1986). Pākehā then are shown to have been constructed as a dominant identity in this literature, an identity made dominant through representation and selectivity.

Nevertheless, despite the plethora of literature on the dominance of Pākehā representation, it has also been argued that Pākehā are an empty category in the discursive relationship that separates them and Māori (Bell, 2006; Maclean, 1996; Pearson, 2004; Pearson & Sissons, 1997). Māori are a rich, discursive construct of unique distinction; whereas Pākehā are not filled-out or coloured in, not just white but transparent (Maclean, 1996). For example, Bell has shown how Pākehā identity and its history remains unelaborated by using an absence of Pākehā representation at a long-term historical and cultural exhibition at Te Papa, the national museum (Bell, 2006, p. 261). Pākehā as a category, dominantly represented yet discursively empty, indicates a paradox in the way that the dominant, universalising invisibility of whiteness can lack the power of cultural distinction (Pearson, 1989, p. 68). Because of a lack of cultural distinction and cohesion, Pearson, in the sociological work he has done on Pākehā identity, has found Pākehā to be merely a category, rather than a collective cultural identity.

Despite this lack of cohesion and elaboration, writers have identified Pākehā as a dominant identity. Pākehā identity has been aligned with the dominant, universal invisibility of whiteness (Mulvey et al., 2000). Writers on whiteness identify whiteness as a dominant norm. This dominance of whiteness, in western discursive environments and in the subject positions they offer to whites, particularly through the mainstream media, is often invisible to white people, such as Pākehā (Jackson, 1999). A self-interrogation of what it is that constitutes the specifics of collective, white identities in order to begin the political and cultural project of explaining and understanding the way that privilege has constituted whiteness as universal has been advised (Krizek, 2006). This project of visibilising the power of whiteness has been adopted by some Pākehā

writers, particularly those involved in the Network Waitangi project (Bell, 2004a; Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Huygens, 2002; Huygens, Black, & Hamerton, 2003; Margaret, 2002a, 2002b; Nairn, 1989; Nairn, 2001; Slack, 2004; Sneddon, 2005).

These writers consider Pākehā identity to be invisible and difficult to know, even by Pākehā, because of the way that those who are white can experience their collective and individual identity as indistinctly amorphous and because of a lack of historical curiosity and knowledge. In particular, the power of being Pākehā eludes Pākehā awareness. These writers recommend that intercultural relations between Pākehā and Māori can only improve if Pākehā take time to raise their awareness about the assumptions -- created by being white, ahistorical and part of the dominant norm -- that underlie their cultural identity. The meaning of being Pākehā, then, closely aligns with the meaning of being white, with being part of an invisibly, powerful norm, that of whiteness. Pākehā writers on whiteness encourage Pākehā to become more self-aware about what being Pākehā means; they encourage and see a need for more research about Pākehā identity.

The dominance of Pākehā and of Pākehā's assumed power emerges as a continued theme in two foundational studies on the discourse-use of Pākehā, which further the understanding of Pākehā as a dominant identity. The first, Wetherell and Potter's influential work on the way racism is expressed in Aotearoa-New Zealand, aims to portray the dominant discourses of members of the majority group: Pākehā (1992). In open-ended interviews, Wetherell asked questions of eighty-one, middle-class Pākehā about a range of topics including affirmative action for Māori; New Zealand's colonial history; the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand and about Māori activism. She and her fellow researcher found that the sample used liberal, egalitarian principles to achieve illiberal ends. Their thesis was that Pākehā discourses were the negotiated product of the structural inequalities that exist between Māori and Pākehā. Because racism is structural, the language of the dominant group, Pākehā, reproduced those dominant relations. The sample did this unconsciously, using the social resources of interpretative repertoires, the common-sense understandings available in society. Wetherell and Potter showed how the sample furthered illiberal aims, by calling on fair-minded principles of egalitarianism, or on pragmatic principles about what works effectively, or on liberal rhetoric that resists compulsion. The aims achieved through the

sample's discourse, using these liberal principles, included minimising of and distancing from the impacts of colonising history; arguing against the compulsory learning of te reo in schools; and resistance to any rationale for redressing past injustices to Māori through affirmative action. Further, Wetherell and Potter found that the sample saw Pākehā as an unmarked, un-raced norm, as "representative of an international modernism" (1992, p.127).

They found that Pākehā discourse worked to maintain a separateness from Māori, at the same time as conflating Māori and Pākehā together as categories, using nationhood as the unifying trope. The discourses the sample used about Māori activism assumed that Māori were creating the problem and that before Māori activists came along, "Society was integrated and harmonious" (1992, p.160). Wetherell and Potter found that Pākehā used a separation from the concerns of history in order to justify the "sharp practices of colonisation" (p. 190), to valorise the status quo and to "blame" and "denigrate" (p.151) any threats from Māori to the status quo. The separation from history allowed Pākehā discourse to establish Pākehā as "quiescent" and "passive" in response to Māori activism (p.158). The discourse rested on the "invisible, normalising" and "latent" power (1992, p.158) of Pākehā.

Despite the sample's having been selected from a "'liberal' and egalitarian' society such as New Zealand" (1992, p.197), Wetherell and Potter found that the discourse of members of their sample persuasively justified and legitimated structural oppression (p.198). The meaning their study brought to being Pākehā emphasised Pākehā as a structurally dominant identity, separate from Māori and from colonising history, and blind to the impacts of Pākehā dominance and privilege. These findings regarding the discourses Pākehā use are similar to those of McCreanor's doctoral thesis (1995). He used discourse analysis of newspaper articles, of public submissions, of a politician's speech and of historical texts to examine the linguistic resources which were common patterns that Pākehā use to talk about Māori-Pākehā relationships. His study of Pākehā ideology identified discourses of racism, superiority and monoculturalism. Amongst a range of ten linguistic resources, he identified a range of ten common patterns, including the 'One people' discourse which Pākehā use to position Pākehā and Māori as the same as each other. Another discourse was the 'Good Māori/Bad Māori discourse', which positioned good Māori as those who fitted in with society and bad Māori as those

who did not. A further discourse he found as belonging to Pākehā was the 'privilege' discourse: Pākehā had rights, but when Māori claimed those same rights, they were defined as unfairly privileged. Hence, the discursive work of McCreanor identified Pākehā identity as dominant, privileged, and blind to difference.

The above section has shown the ways that some of the literature has constructed Pākehā identity as separate from Māori and, when in connection with Māori, as an appropriating identity. Pākehā have also been shown to be constructed as having a dominant identity over Maori -- an identity founded on blindness to colonising history and blindness to their own power. However, this characterisation of Pākehā can be seen to be operating as a Pakehā stereotype.

Pākehā connection with Māori has often been one of appropriator, assimilationist, or controller. Much of the literature on Māori justice and on the Pākehā historical and contemporary relationship with Māori constructs Pākehā in this way. Such characterisations build a stereotype of what it can mean to be Pākehā and of the characteristics of Pākehā in connection with Māori. Stereotypes can construct demonised cultural identities through a process of generalising and othering (Holliday, Hyde, & Kullman, 2004). The stereotyping of Māori has been well documented. The prevalence of a Pākehā stereotype has been almost overlooked by comparison.

However, some researchers found that while some Pākehā exemplified and supported the stereotype, others were resistant. For example, Tilbury found that Pākehā "resistance is occurring" (1999, p. 280) to these prevalent discourses of 'we are one people' and 'good Māori and bad Māori', in spite of the stereotypes. In her interviews focusing on Pākehā-Māori friendships and their influence on ethnic identity and attitudes to race relations issues for her doctoral thesis, Tilbury demonstrated that interpersonal contact between peoples of different ethnic identity can positively influence understanding and tolerance. Allport's contact hypothesis (1954) stated that contact between people of different ethnic origins brought greater tolerance and understanding and improved intercultural relationships. Allport's influential thesis can be seen to be at the base of many of the calls for the breaking-down of barriers between peoples, including Māori and Pākehā. Moving away from a Pākehā identity premised on separation from and

ignorance of Māori, a Pākehā identity premised on connection to Māori is also a distinct thread within the literature: a postcolonial identity.

One of these calls came from King, who in 1985 wrote *Being Pākehā* in order to explain to Pākehā what being Pākehā could mean in an environment where the growing discursive power of Maori was creating an unease among some Pākehā about their place in Aotearoa-New Zealand and an anxiety about what being Pākehā involved and how Pākehā were being positioned. He looked at the qualities, the issues and the responsibilities of Pākehā, using his own experiences as a historian, as a biographer of Māori and as a writer on things Māori, and using his own background as a third generation, European-New Zealander of Irish, Scottish and English descent.

His sharing of these experiences and insights helped King in his goal to communicate with Pākehā who were faced with the dilemma of how to be, when not able to return to "either the violently coercive policies of the nineteenth century or the benign inertia of our recent history" (1985, p. 176). King encouraged a way of being Pākehā that was educated about and respectful of Māori historical grievance and tikanga Māori. At the same time he developed what was to become a prevalent and familiar defining feature of Pākehā identity: Pākehā identity arises through connection to and belonging in the land, Aotearoa-New Zealand. While reassuring Pākehā that they were as entitled as Māori to consider themselves at home in Aotearoa-New Zealand, King argued for Pākehā to become more connected with Māori.

At the same time, part of this book concentrates on explaining the impacts of the demands for Pākehā separation from Māori concerns. King describes his positioning by some Māori of his work as disrespectful and non-permitted, as he articulates the dilemma of a Pākehā wanting to connect with te ao Māori, yet being mistrusted and kept at a distance for doing so. King's anecdotes illustrate how Pākehā as an identity in connection with Māori can be besieged. His book also demonstrates how as a response, Pākehā can construct themselves as equally entitled to turangawaewae, just as entitled to claim Aotearoa-New Zealand as their home as Māori.

In 1999, King rewrote *Being Pākehā* for a new "social and cultural climate" (King, 1999b, p. 9). Rather than explaining Māori concerns and rights to Pākehā as King intended in *Being Pākehā* (1985), King felt there was now a need to explain Pākehā concerns and rights to some Māori and to some Pākehā. In *Being Pākehā Now: Reflections and recollections of a white native*, by citing and illustrating his own spiritual and emotional connection to the land of Aotearoa-New Zealand, King asserted a "white native" (1999b, p. 9) identity for Pākehā. Hence, while encouraging Pākehā to respect Māori by becoming more knowledgeable and open to things Māori, King usurps, even appropriates, the indigenous status of Māori (Bell, 2004). Employing the "white native" identity for Pākehā, King reasserts the Pākehā connection to land as the basis for a second indigenous people in Aotearoa-New Zealand. To some degree, this connection to land was considered to be in the nature of Pākehā. While King used his influence as a writer and social historian to educate Pākehā about ways to be Pākehā and connected and respectful to Māori, he did not articulate further what this might mean for Pākehā, what this might mean for Pākehā individuals, or what kinds of qualities might be developed in this relationship with Māori. A further edited book (King, 1999a) invited Pākehā to write of their experiences as people in respectful relationship with Māori. The variety of contributors showed the spectrum of attitudes and experiences comprising what could be configured an "evolving Pākehā culture" (1999a, p.7) in New Zealand.

Spoonley's work has described this "evolving Pākehā culture" (King, 1999a, p.7) as postcolonial (Spoonley, 1995). Other literature has characterised Pākehā identity in this way also. Social project writing from Project and Network Waitangi shows the processes of conscientisation involved in Pākehā developing a postcolonial identity (Huygens, 2002; Margaret, 2002a, 2002b; Nairn, 2001). Historical, revisionist writing (Belich, 1986) redresses the imbalance of a lot of previous writing about New Zealand history. Contemporary social writing (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Johnson, 2005; Slack, 2004; Sneddon, 2005) produces discursive resources about postcolonial ways of being Pākehā, available in individually varying degrees for Pākehā to draw from.

In contrast with the literature that positions, and sometimes essentialises Pākehā as a colonising identity (Berg as cited in Spoonley, 1995, p. 105), the political and cultural orientation that Spoonley suggests constitutes self-identified Pākehā identity is a

postcolonial identity. While Spoonley argues for a Pākehā identity that is postcolonial, both Yeatman and Spoonley do acknowledge the "impossib[ility] of obtain[ing] an unambiguous closure for the label of Pākehā" (Yeatman as cited in Spoonley, 1995, p.86).

In order to support his picture of Pākehā as postcolonial, Spoonley (1995, p. 94) also points to early writings by Ritchie (1992) and by Scott (1981). Along with these postcolonial Pākehā writers, creative, literary writers (Gadd, 1976; Mitcalfe, 1969) worked from the 1960s onwards to produce literature in contrast to existing, colonial, 'we are one people', 'we are a little England'- type discourses. The sidelining of this early literature which wrote of respectful Pākehā-Māori relations and of a Pākehā identity in respectful connection with Māori (Chan, 1989; Evans, 2007) has limited the discursive resources available about the many meanings of being Pākehā.

Spoonley, while bringing this postcolonial orientation to the forefront, describes it as potentially constituting a Pākehā ethnicity characterised by "the resistance to colonialism and its dominant structures and ideologies [and] driven by the desire to restore the integrity of colonised peoples, and to create space for their institutions, practices and values" (1995, p. 94). Added to this, he describes postcolonial Pākehā as developing a steady commitment to biculturalism. I understand Spoonley's "space" in the above quote to mean the creation of space through the transformation of current ideological, economic, and institutional structures so that tikanga Māori is acknowledged – presently the granting of such space is mostly token only, and often resisted. To support the postcolonial project of valuing the foregrounding and empowering of Māori ways of being, some Pākehā learn te reo and tikanga Māori (Jellie, 2001). In doing so, consideration of another kind of 'space' becomes relevant for postcolonial Pākehā and for Māori: that of Māori space for tikanga and te reo, as autonomous from Pākehā. Research into the ways this space is being negotiated or would best be negotiated is notable for its absence. While Spoonley has asserted a Pākehā identity wedded to postcolonial politics, and while the social project writing of Project and Network Waitangi have outlined the stages Pākehā go through to become decolonised and postcolonial (Nairn, 2001), nevertheless applied research documenting how that postcolonial orientation can be lived is very limited.

From a range of work that has looked at Pākehā in connection with Māori (Archie, 2005; Barnes, 2006; Campbell, 2005; Jellie, 2001), I will now concentrate on two recent applied-research studies that have focused attention on the meaning of Pākehā in connection to Māori. These two recent theses have studied bicultural Pākehā (Campbell, 2005) and Pākehā who have learnt te reo me ona tikanga Māori (Jellie, 2001). In her doctoral research thesis, Campbell undertook semi-structured interviews with self-identified Pākehā, bicultural practitioners of psychology, and sought the meanings the participants brought to being Pākehā. Placing her work on bicultural Pākehā in context, she stated that Pākehā as well as Māori were being constrained by "essentialising assumptions" (2005, p. 110). Employing discourse analysis and deconstruction to the data, she identified key metaphors that participants used to illustrate their experience of being bicultural: a battle, a journey, heart biculturalism, and collegiality. Campbell identified that being bicultural for her participants was a battle because of having to fight and resist the hegemony of other Pākehā and of institutional systems. She found that, for her participants, being bicultural was also a journey because it involved an ongoing, responsive engagement and commitment in specific, changing contexts, a heart biculturalism. The participants made a distinction between a heart biculturalism, which was in contrast to tokenistic, fake biculturalism. Campbell also identified collegiality as fundamental to the biculturalism of the participants, those who had a collegial relationship with Māori, were open to learning, had respect, compassion and an awareness of politics, and were supportive, "working through aroha" (Campbell, 2005, p. 178). Campbell also identified the discomfort bicultural Pākehā can experience amongst other Pākehā. In her work, discourses about Pākehā different from those found by Wetherell and Potter (1992) and McCreanor emerged (1995).

Similarly, Jellie's participants, in her Masters thesis study of the formation of Pākehā identity (2001) in relation to te reo me ona tikanga Māori, expressed sentiments in contrast to those found by Wetherell and Potter (1992) and McCreanor (1995). Similar to Campbell, Jellie found that her participants experienced the discomfort of being between two worlds. Also, Jellie found a similar involvement of the heart amongst participants as Pākehā who had learnt te reo me ona tikanga Māori. First, Jellie used the quantitative method of a questionnaire of 226 first-year, university students of history and chemistry in order to explore the relationship between self-identification as a Pākehā and holding positive or negative attitudes to te reo learning and to Māori. This

survey was carried out in response to a desire to explore Spoonley's suggestion that those who termed themselves Pākehā were more likely to have more empathy for te ao Māori. She found that those who termed themselves Pākehā had more empathy for te ao Māori, that those who learned te reo had more empathy for te ao Māori, and that those who learned te reo were more likely to term themselves Pākehā.

Using a further qualitative method of semi-structured interviews of twelve learners of te reo, Jellie identified key groups of data emerging from the interviews. The data she concentrated on covered the reasons for learning te reo, the experiences of learning te reo and Pākehā identity. Jellie identified three main reasons for participants' decision to learn te reo: an affinity to te ao Māori, an awareness of social injustice, and the influence and support of family and friends. Jellie concentrated on three kinds of experiences Pākehā learners of te reo had: positive experiences, negative experiences and the experience of being in between two worlds. Positive experiences by far overwhelmed negative experiences. They included enrichment, a sense of the privilege of learning about a distinct and valuable culture, a sense of comfort around doing the right thing as New Zealanders of European descent, and admiration from other more monocultural Pākehā.

Negative experiences included facing prejudice from other Pākehā and a sense of a burden of responsibility that came with the knowledge of te reo and of te ao Māori. The experience of being in between two worlds for participants was valued for the educative role in relation to monocultural Pākehā it brought; at the same time it was an experience that brought discomfort and challenge. The third group of data found that participants' Pākehā identity was developed by being te reo learners. According to participants, a significant part of being Pākehā was being in relationship with Māori, and the learning of te reo had brought greater depth and awareness of te ao Māori. Hence, both Jellie and Campbell's research elaborated further on what a postcolonial orientation might look like in more detail than that introduced by King or by Spoonley.

FURTHER-ELABORATED RESEARCH AIM

Thus, some of the recent research shows the creation and emergence of different discourses about ways of being Pākehā. Recent research shows how discourses of ways of being Pākehā, alternate to those identified by Wetherell and Potter (1992) and

McCreanor (1995), begin to emerge when Pākehā in intercultural engagement with Māori are interviewed. My research aims to discursively explore the language of participants about their experiences as Pākehā who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts by learning te reo, tikanga Māori, and about te ao Māori. Having identified in this review, the way that most of the discourse analysis work in the literature concentrates on the discourses used in the service of continued Pākehā dominance, my exploration of the meanings the participants in this research bring to being Pākehā seeks a more diverse range of discourse.

By taking a discourse analysis approach to the language that participants from this intercultural-engagement context generate, my research provides an opportunity for a comparative reflection about discursive constructions identified as belonging to the majority group Pākehā and the discourses the participants create. By taking a discourse analysis approach to the language of these participants, the research also facilitates reflection about Pākehā as postcolonial. My research asks, what can those who engage with Māori cultural learning contexts, by learning te reo and tikanga Māori, and about te ao Māori, tell us about the meanings of being Pākehā? Secondly, I ask how these meanings about being Pākehā relate to the existing literature on Pākehā identity.

In this way the chapter has outlined how some of the literature describes the meaning of being Pākehā. Pākehā as meaning being separate from, appropriating of and dominant over Māori has been described. A more postcolonial identity position for Pākehā has been detailed, and I have outlined some recent applied research on postcolonial, bicultural Pākehā. The next chapter explains the theoretical basis, the processes of project management and of data analysis, the considerations of ethics, and the actions and decisions which were part of the design and fulfilment of this research.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I explain my decision to interview the particular sample of participants I selected, in order to gain more understanding about the experiences of Pākehā who have undergone some steps on the bicultural journey (Campbell, 2005). In this chapter I describe the participants, the processes involved in recruiting them, and some of the ethical considerations involved in researching people. The interview process and the discursive analysis of the information are explained. As well as establishing the validity of the research, I describe the limits of my research approach. Key terms are defined and my approach to cultural identity and the theoretical basis for my research design are outlined. I aim to achieve a description of the study that enables a clear understanding of how and of why I went about the research as I did, making the decisions behind the scenes transparent.

SELECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PARTICIPANTS

The participants were selected because they identified as Pākehā and had learnt in Māori cultural learning contexts. Those who identify as Pākehā are most likely to have increased empathy for te ao Māori (Spoonley, 1995, p. 104). Those who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts have greater contact with Māori, and are more likely to speak about ways of being Pākehā that do not reproduce the dominant, discursive version of Pākehā as separate from Māori (Jellie, 2001).The purposiveness of the sample has informed the research direction as it has allowed exploration into alternative ways of being Pākehā. The participants were neither Network or Project Waitangi workers nor political activists. The participants were simply people who identified themselves as Pākehā, and who had engaged with a Māori cultural learning context, where tikanga Māori was the foundation of the learning and teaching, and where Māori were in the majority. All participants were people who had learnt te reo, tikanga Māori and about te ao Māori and about the Treaty, before or during the research.

Before inviting potential participants into the research project, I needed to gain ethical approval from Massey University Human Ethics Committee. After spending some time ensuring that the rights of the individual participants to confidentiality were protected, ethical approval from Massey University Human Ethics Committee was granted (see Appendix A). Their permission enabled me to send a letter (see Appendix B) to a Māori cultural learning institution and an accompanying poster and information sheet sample. My letter requested a meeting to discuss the research project, and to discuss the possibility of my gaining permission to invite participants from the campus into the research. It was some months before I was able to meet with a representative at the institution, and three months after my initial letter, I was told that permission to come to campus and invite participants had been declined.

Immediately, I amended my initial ethics application, so that I could seek to gain permission to approach two other learning institutions, one a university-based, Māori studies, learning environment, and the other a Māori cultural learning context. I also sought to gain permission to invite participants by snowball-sampling, a method whereby I could contact people I knew, who could then contact people they knew, who in turn could contact people they knew to tell them about the research. This amendment was approved, allowing me to invite participants from a further two institutions and by snowball sampling. In retrospect, I would prefer to have applied for all three modes of participant recruitment in the first Ethics application, approved in February, as the months of awaiting permission to recruit participants were stressful.

While waiting for ethical approval, I continued designing the interview schedule (see Appendix C), and I trialled it in two pilot interviews. The interview schedule was devised over a number of months. I designed the questions in response to themes present in the literature, in response to my own experience of being a learner in Māori cultural learning contexts, and in response to feedback generated from two pilot interviews. I was also guided by the advice of my supervisors and by the comments of a Pākehā person (my sister) who had learnt te reo in an immersion environment for a year who read and commented on the interview schedule.

The literature I was drawing on suggested that cultural identity shifted according to context (Collier, 2002; Hall, 1996; Holliday et al., 2004).The literature on Pākehā

concentrated a lot on the colonizing aspects of Pākehāness, and on Pākehā separation from Māori. My interview-schedule questions aimed to acquire data that could be compared with this literature.

This influence of the themes in the literature intertwined with the influences of my own experiences as a learner, in the design of the questions: I had an awareness of how the Māori cultural learning context elicited complex, intrapersonal responses to my own identity as a Pākehā. Some of the questions sought to create space for participants' responses that might reveal layers of complexity about similar themes: What did being in relation to te ao Māori teach participants about themselves as Pākehā? How did the participants' relationship to 'being Pākehā' shift according to levels of comfort in the context? How did the participants' relationship to 'being Pākehā' shift according to relationships with different groups of people? Another example of the way I designed the interview schedule to capture complexity, was by including the less-commonly used, but flexible, term *Pākehāness* in some questions, while other questions employed the more commonly-used phrase *being Pākehā*. Such alternate wordings encouraged participants to look at their cultural identity from different perspectives.

Prior to interviewing actual participants, I trialled the interview schedule with two individuals who had previous involvement with te ao Māori, and were currently learning or had learnt te reo Māori in a Māori learning context in the past. These pilot interviews allowed me to reflect on the interview schedule. Other than understanding more how interviewees were likely to respond to some of the questions, the experience of the pilot interviews did not indicate a need to make changes to the interview schedule. The pilot study confirmed the unexamined nature of the experience of Pākehā in relation to Māori; the discomfort that examination could elicit and the value of that examination for the participants. From the pilot interviews, I was able to anticipate the importance of giving time to and encouraging the participants in order for them to be able to articulate experiences they had not had the opportunity of reflecting on previously. From the pilot interviews, I was also able to anticipate a potential level of discomfort for participants in relation to questions about identity. My obligations were to the comfort of the participants and to the integrity of the research process as outlined in the information sheet and in the consent form. Nevertheless, I retained questions in the interview schedule that I knew from the pilot interviews might create discomfort.

These particular questions were designed to encourage answers that considered the relationship between Pākehā identity and personal identity in quite intricate and intimate ways. The discomfort occurred when participants were asked to reflect on ways in which their personal experiences were cultural, belonging to Pākehāness. I chose to retain these questions as, on balance, the level of discomfort was minimal and the value of the responses to these questions was significant for learning about how the Pākehā participants negotiate being Pākehā. The information sheet acknowledges that potentially discomfort can occur. From the pilot interviews, I also learnt that the interview experience could bring participants enrichment, awareness, and in one case "an epiphany" (pilot interview, personal communication, 10 July, 2007), as well as some discomfort. Because the gains seemed to outweigh the minor discomfort for the participants, this encouraged me to continue with the questions as they were.

Even at the early stage of the pilot interviews, common themes seemed to emerge in the talk of the participants and common strategies in response to specific questions. The themes that carried through into the initial categorization of interview data and through to the final analysis of the data were the following: a strong sense of contact with Māori in early life and a sense of resistance to being like 'those other Pākehā'. At the same time, some of the data generated by the two pilot interviews were very distinct from each other. This affirmed for me that interviews can "allow a relatively standard range of themes to be addressed with different participants" and they "can be a particularly effective way of getting at the range of interpretive repertoires that a participant has available, as well as at some of the uses to which these repertoires are put" (Potter, 1996, p. 134).

Once ethical approval of the amended research had been granted, I was able to start contacting the institutions which were my potential sites for research and also set in motion the snowball sampling, so that participant recruitment and interviewing could begin. After gaining permission from the Head of School and the teachers of the classes, I distributed posters and handouts, and visited te reo and Treaty of Waitangi classes to invite students from the university campus (see Appendix D). By this means, two participants were recruited. A third person interested in participating in the research contacted me from the university, but as she had not learnt te reo at all, I explained that I

had to decline her offer to be involved. Once my request to invite participants from the second Māori cultural learning context had met with approval from their own Ethics Committee, posters and handouts were promptly distributed to their te reo classes. From this institution, one potential participant contacted me, but at too late a stage, after I had already written the first draft of my data analysis and the data collection phase was complete. I thanked her for her interest and explained that unfortunately it was too late for me to include her in the study.

Recruitment by snowball sampling was achieved by contacting people I knew, via email, telephone and in person, to ask them to tell others they knew about the research, the details of which were outlined in a hand-out that was distributed to them by the contacts (See Appendix E). Those interested were able to contact me by email, text and cellphone as my contact details were given in the handout. Through snowball sampling, I recruited four further participants into the research.

The poster and handout used in all the recruitment processes did not define the word Pākehā. The poster and handout aimed to reach those who self-identified as Pākehā, who had learnt te reo, and had experienced learning in a Māori cultural learning context. The six participants all met these criteria; those who were studying at university had previously studied in a Māori cultural learning context. All those participants recruited by snowball sampling had experienced learning in a Māori cultural learning context, prior to the research. As it happened, all participants had also been involved in education that taught them about the Treaty.

The ages of participants ranged from mid-twenties to sixties. There were four females and two males. There were many other differences amongst the participants. Some of the participants were raised in an era prior to bicultural governmental policies, prior to widespread Māori activism, and prior to the public, Māori cultural renaissance. Others were born into an era where decolonisation and awareness-raising, Māori activism and a valuing of tikanga Māori, were part of the discursive environment in which they grew up. Participants had studied te reo for varying lengths of time, ranging from six months to over thirty years. The lengths of time participants had spent learning in the Māori cultural learning environment, and engaging with issues of te ao Māori -- like the Treaty and the promotion of tikanga Māori -- in an educational setting, also varied. Because of

the range in duration, the participants' levels of proficiency in te reo varied as did the depth of their intimacy with the Māori cultural learning context, and their degree of involvement and understanding of issues of te ao Māori. I will introduce each participant, in turn. All the participants have been shown these descriptions and have approved them. All descriptions below use pseudonyms. The six participants are Brian, Trudy, Susan, Beth, Paul and Lisa.

BRIAN – Brian is in his sixties. A scientist, and father of three adult children, he has been learning te reo and tikanga Māori in a Māori cultural learning context for three years. Initially motivated to learn because he wanted to support his daughter who was learning for vocational reasons, due to the intrinsic benefits he has continued on without her for a further two years. He considers that learning te reo and tikanga Māori has been invaluable and has influenced his world view to be more Māori-identified. Through his involvement, his understanding of Māori social issues and Māori activism has enlarged considerably.

TRUDY – Trudy is in her forties. Working in the social sector, she has learnt te reo and tikanga Māori in a Māori cultural learning context for a period of six months. Her early life was spent in a largely Māori, rural community. Wanting to reconnect with that Māori world from her childhood, and strongly wanting to respect te reo and tikanga Māori by learning more, she wishes to resume her studies when her other commitments allow. She sees the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori as a responsibility attached to the right to be Pākehā.

SUSAN – Susan is in her thirties, and parent of one Pacifika child. She grew up in a largely Māori, rural community where she learnt te reo and tikanga Māori in her teenage years. Since then she has attended a Māori cultural learning context for a year, and has been a student of Māori culture and Treaty issues at a university. An undergraduate student, intending to work in social services, Susan is motivated to connect to te ao Māori for personal reasons, for social conscience reasons and for vocational reasons.

BETH – Beth is in her sixties. Her ex-husband is Māori and she has two Māori adult children. Working in the social sector, she has been intermittently involved with learning te reo and tikanga Māori for over thirty-five years. Initially as a primary school

teacher in the 1960s, she took advantage of any after school te reo classes. She then learnt te reo at university. Since then, motivated by support for her children, and for the intrinsic benefits she receives, she has learnt in Māori cultural learning contexts. She has deeply valued learning tikanga and waita in her whānau, hapū and iwi settings where she continues to participate. She considers being able to learn mātauranga Māori a privilege.

PAUL – Paul is in his thirties. A PhD student, he has intermittently studied te reo and tikanga Māori in Māori cultural learning contexts, and at university, over the last fifteen years. Initially, he studied te reo because he realized, in a conversation while being taught bone carving, that in order to get a closer understanding of the meaning of the word 'mauri', a word he was curious about, he would need to learn more of the language and its culture. While studying te reo in a Māori cultural learning context, Paul became a te reo tutor. He values the learning experiences Māori cultural learning contexts brought him, over and above the language skills. The learning experiences enlarged his understanding of social issues and his sense of social responsibility as a Pākehā.

LISA – Lisa is in her twenties. An undergraduate university student, she has studied te reo and tikanga Māori at a Māori cultural learning context for a year, and is currently studying te reo at a university. Learning te reo is important to her as she has always loved the language and strongly values Māori ways of being. She hopes to become a te reo teacher.

Initially, when I was first contacted by the participants, I ensured they met the criteria for participants for the project and I explained the research further. If the prospective participants were still interested, which they all were, I met with them, to go through the information sheet (see Appendix F) and the consent form (see Appendix G). We discussed the project and I answered any questions they had before participants signed the consent forms and before we began the interviews which were based on the semi-structured interview schedule.

All the interviews were held in private spaces, selected by the participants: three in their homes, one in mine, and two at their workplaces. They ranged in length from one hour

to two hours long. Being semi-structured, the interviews allowed me to be flexible: if a participant had already covered the content, I would skip a question. I also changed the diction of the questions in response to what I perceived would best suit the different participants' language styles and I was able to accommodate the participants' particular interests by sometimes following their leads when we talked.

I did follow-up interviews with four of the participants; one of these was via email. Two of the follow-up interviews were motivated by my needing to check the meaning of some of the responses; for example, I had a follow-up interview with Lisa to seek clarity about her comment that she was proud of the Taranaki history. Assuming it was the Māori history she felt proud of, I needed to make sure. The follow-up interview confirmed this. Two of the follow-up interviews happened because there had not been time to complete all the questions. In Susan's case this was because, the interview had been conducted in the presence of her toddler which affected my ability to ask all the necessary questions; in Paul's case there was a time constraint due to external circumstances.

FURTHER ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Respect for the participants was of primary concern to me. I wanted them to feel comfortable with the research and to raise any questions with me. Before conducting the interviews, we discussed any issues that were raised in the information sheets and the consent forms. Mutual expectations and responsibilities were clarified before interviews began. By its very nature, the process of naming an internal process or external event in a personally meaningful way, creates the possibility of associated, deeper issues being raised for the participant, so clear contracting was important. Respectful and caring communication provided a basis from which the research could proceed ethically. I also made it clear that when the transcripts were checked, participants were going to be free to change anything they were uncomfortable with. In this way I attempted to forestall and alleviate any possible negative outcomes.

However, I was concerned that, in my exploration of Pākehā experiences in Māori cultural learning contexts, negative views from participants might be elicited, that could reflect badly on Māori cultural learning institutions. Early on I pledged, if such data emerged, to count as relevant only that data about Pākehā; the focus was to be on what

such data said about Pākehā, rather than about Māori cultural learning institutions. As it happened, the small amount of data that emerged in this vein was not relevant to the thematic concerns of the research questions and was discarded.

Confidentiality was of paramount importance to my ethical treatment of the participants and of the institutions. In agreement with the participants and the institutions, and in accordance with the information sheet and consent form, all identifying features of participants and institutions have been removed in presenting the findings. The transcriber of the interviews signed a confidentiality agreement. Thus, any potential harm which might come from the research was minimised.

 "My concern is with the harm done when the participant recognizes him/herself in the research" (Tilbury, 1999, p. 60). Like Tilbury, who is referring to her interpretation of some of her participants' data as representative of racist discourse, I have a similar concern. During the interview, I asked questions of people in a conversational way. By applying discourse analysis to their responses, I ignore the important emotional and ontological connection people have to their own words as being indicative of the truth of their experience within a particular context (Rosenblatt, 2003, p. 227). I was worried that participants might feel objectified and de-valued by my analysis of their responses in terms of repertoires and resources that were not immediately apparent within the interview context. In an attempt to address this concern, I alerted them to the treatment their words would undergo, and have acknowledged this in the summary of the research they have been sent (See Appendix H).

MY ETHICAL BASE AS A RESEARCHER
The following experiences made a useful contribution to my undertaking this type of project and contributed to my ethical base as a researcher: My background of intermittent, educational engagement with te ao Māori helped equip me and give context to my inquiry. However, my insider status had dangers as well as benefits. I needed to be open in my interpretation of the data, and to be aware of the danger of being restricted by my own perceptions of the issues. Mindful of my own experiences, I needed to maintain an open stance to the data the participants brought to the interviews.

My knowledge of te ao Māori and of bicultural issues came from study of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, of te reo Māori and of bicultural education at university, undergraduate level, and from teaching Te Tiriti o Waitangi to adult learners in a community setting as part of my employment as an adult literacy tutor trainer. I have also learnt parts of te reo Māori part-time in Māori cultural learning environments. In a Māori cultural learning environment, where I was the sole Pākehā participant, I was taught Māori literacy tutor training. I have studied cross-cultural relationships in a New Zealand context, and the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi in the Aotearoa-New Zealand context at undergraduate and at postgraduate level. In 2005, I completed a 25 point postgraduate research project in communication as a pilot for this research. In addition, my background and training in counselling gave me the skills and confidence to manage the interview situation and to mitigate any concerns the participants may have had.

As with some of the participants, connection with nga ao o ngā iwi Māori was present for me from an early age. I heard te reo from the day I was born. At primary school age, I was "thrown into" Māori culture group activities at Wellington Teachers' College along with my brother and sisters (Keri Kaa, personal communication, 1995). I have been privileged to have experienced around me the different spiritual, cultural, social practices of another people, experiences I am grateful to have had.

Despite these experiences, my furthering of the research process was not without my own cross-cultural, indigene-settler relationship dilemmas, similar to those raised in the literature and to those illustrated in the analysis of the participants' experiences in Chapter Four. One dilemma was part of the reason my research focus turned from solely concentrating on participant responses to Māori cultural learning contexts to concentrating more widely on learning about participants' ways of being Pākehā. In closely studying the cultural interface that exists for Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts, I felt an increasing discomfort, because I had a sense I was transgressing boundaries of moving into the Māori context. My sensitized response arose in part because of the refusal from the first learning institution I contacted to allow me to invite participants into the research from their campus. To maintain my intended research focus on Pākehā and to maintain a boundary between my research on Pākehā and invasion into the Māori context, I in part adapted my research focus. That participants had experienced learning te reo, tikanga Māori and about te ao Māori in a Māori cultural

learning context became the criteria for exploring the ways having been in a Māori cultural learning context affected perceptions of being Pākehā for these particular participants.

MY ROLE AS A RESEARCHER

My role as researcher encompassed a range of activities: pragmatic, ethical and intellectual. At first, I engaged in project management, to a degree, as I sought and gained ethics approval, negotiated permission to access potential participants, and recruited participants and arranged interviews.

Once I moved into the research phase, I tape-recorded and took occasional notes during the interviews. While listening, responding, asking questions and maintaining an open stance to the data the participants brought, I was mindful of the literature and of the concerns underpinning the research questions, and, sometimes, of the potential categories the responses could be organized into.

During the analysis and the tape-transcript checking meetings, I maintained concern about the participants and the integrity of their meanings, and the writing-up of the project has required my continued attention to the ethical process of the research. At the same time as being in touch with the participants and the research purpose, I established a consultative role with the learning institutions early on about how the research recruitment would proceed, about how institutional and participant confidentiality would be protected and about how the findings would be shared with the institutions.

Throughout the research, I have had to be open to the process of change. When the first institution declined permission for me to display posters and visit classes in order to invite learners into the research from their campus, I needed to widen my search for participants and I felt I needed to reconnect with and adjust my initial focus. I have also needed to be open to change in the following ways. While I manoeuvred my way forward with my original intention, the voices of the participants, both individual and collective, surprised my expectations at times, and influenced the course of the research. The literature opened me to a world of challenging and complex ideas. To have selected from them would have made my path easier. Engaging with all of them at least to some degree, has altered my perspective and my understanding about what it might mean to

be Pākehā learning te reo and tikanga Māori which has not always been a comfortable process.

During the research, my obligations were to the comfort of the participants and to the integrity of the research process as outlined in the information sheet and the consent form. During the interviews, I tried to build trust and warmth -- necessary conditions for rich, deep data capture -- but also to help create a positive experience of the research procedure for participants.

Trust is also built on honesty and transparency. During the interviews, I disclosed to participants how my methods of analysis would, in part, take a contrasting approach to personhood from that expressed in everyday discourse and in the interview. The role of analyst brings foundations for behaviors and attitudes different from those of the interpersonal interviewer and I tried to be clear and open about that.

Before proceeding further with the description of my data analysis strategies, I would like first to define and put into context some important terms that contribute to the theoretical basis of the analysis. The following paragraphs define the way the terms discourse, ideology, subject positions, agency, discursive environment, and lived experience are used in the thesis. They are followed by an explanation of my theoretical approach to cultural identity and an outlining of the epistemological basis of the research: social constructionism.

KEY TERMS

At its most simple definition, discourse can be defined as all kinds of "talk and text" (Tuffin, 2005, p. 87; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Discourse is therefore language-based and is never neutral (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Everyday discourse in everyday situations is always working to achieve some consequence, and language is actively selected to give a specific version of reality in order to effect that consequence. If a different consequence is aimed for then a different version or language account will be conceived (Tuffin, 2005; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Therefore, "language is actively constructing rather than reflecting what it portrays" (Tuffin, 2005, p. 88). Individuals use discourse's work of construction, its intended effects, and their variability according

to purpose and function, on an everyday level in interpersonal communication to build versions of reality.

Discourse can be used to address people collectively and then it has the power to privilege some versions of reality over others for an audience. Discourse then can be "a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events" (Burr, 2003, p. 64; Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1990, 1996). The power of discourse's selection of language to construct privileged versions of reality can sometimes rest on the selection of one particular word or phrase over another. For example, different providers of discourse, in the recent, November 2007, police raids on Ruatoki, could be heard contrastingly describing those imprisoned as *terrorists* or as *political activists* or as *youth workers*. Such language terms and phrases link to wider discourses, to wider collections of talk and text that define versions of events and of group identities. In analysing these linkages, we can see how repetition and amplification work to build particular ways of seeing reality.

The constructive power of discourse then is more far-reaching than the one-to-one, interpersonal context and by reaching many people has a social, cultural and political power to influence the kind of readily-available versions of reality for people (Billig et al., 1991). These readily-available versions of reality, dominant discourses, tend to sideline alternative versions of reality. Ideology is the name given to shared, common-sense, taken-for-granted versions of the world and of ideas that language and dominant discourses create (Billig et al., 1991). As part of everyday living, people use ideology in a way that builds and maintains shared notions of the world.

Ideology also relates to power, in that power can be attained through the privilege of certain taken-for-granted understandings. Social and political power can be maintained for certain groups by the operation of ideology through language and discourse; ideology can provide the shared understandings which establish and support the power of the group. In this way discourse can operate hegemonically, serving the power of the dominant group, oppressing the less powerful. The privileging of taken-for-granted understandings means that alternative views are rendered difficult to access. Critically, hegemony operates by the dominant, oppressive notions of reality being adopted by the

less powerful. Using the November, 2007 police raids on Ruatoki as an example, the reports are already located in an existing ideological context that privileges the status quo and misrepresents Māori (McGregor, 1996; McGregor & Comrie, 2002; Walker, 1996). The already-existing idelogical context that privileges particular versions of the status quo and ignores Māori realities influence how the arrests are reported and interpreted.

However, despite the hegemonic capacities of dominant discourses, people are not just empty receptacles of discourse. Through discourse's power to construct, shape, define versions of reality, it creates subject positions for people (Davies & Davies, 2007; Davies & Harre, 1990; Gavey, 1989). "Subject positions provide the place from which to experience subjectivity" (Campbell, 2005, p. 33). Simply articulated, subjectivity is the experience we have of ourselves (Parker in Campbell, 2005, p 30). People exercise their agency by choosing to adopt, ignore, resist or transform the subject positions offered them by discourse (Davies & Harre, 1990). Nevertheless, dominant discourses do make certain subject positions about selves, others' ideas and experiences, easier to adopt than others.

In my discursive environment -- a metaphorical phrase I use to signify the context within which meanings are produced and negotiated – discourse about the police raids on Ruatoki were available to me from a range of discourse providers: TVONE news, Māori TV News, Mana magazine, the Māori slot on Nine to Noon Radio New Zealand National, Radio New Zealand National News, the Manawatu Evening Standard, postings on a civil rights website and too many others to mention. The choices of talk and text that these discourse providers selected, offered versions of the events that I could negotiate, using my own agency. Although discourse constructs versions of reality, I could choose the versions of reality I wanted to adopt, and I could transform existing versions into new versions. This process is agency. I use agency to create subject positions for myself.

My discursive environment also included interpersonal contexts, ranging from conversations with activist writers whose primary concerns were finding support for those imprisoned, who were infuriated by the actions of the police and the mainstream media's representation of events, to conversations with very mono-cultural,

conservative Pākehā whose main concerns were the safety of the nation and approval and support for the swift action of the police. The discursive environment of the activist writers' conversation can be seen as offering and taking up alternative subject positions to those offered by the dominant discursive environment that the monocultural, conservative, Pākehā were drawing on to construct their subject positions. Different discursive environments can privilege different discursive meanings over others. People are subject to, agents of, active negotiators within many discursive environments. As Weedon writes, "Discourses and discursive practices which may be contradictory and conflicting […] create the space for new forms of knowledge and practice" (Weedon, 2004, p. 19).

Individuals' lived experience influences the decisions they make as individuals in exercising and negotiating their agencies and subject positions in relation to discourses, dominant and otherwise. Lived experience can be the avenue through which new collective discourses come into being, as they are shared on the margins (hooks, 1990). Lived experience is richly formed through all kinds of contexts – familial, nature-based, educational, imaginary, to name a few examples – and through all kinds of interrelationships. Discourse is not a clear path or an exact mirror to lived experience; nor can lived experience be completely controlled by discourse.

Experience, as well as discourse, constructs (and can be constructed by) subjectivity. Therefore, subjectivity is not limited to subject positions offered by discourse. Experience is lived in both language and non-language based ways. It exceeds discourse (Davies & Davies, 2007). The meaning we get from lived experience exceeds verbal expression. The verbally-expressed meanings we give to our lived experiences become discourse. Any social constructionist-sourced methodology, discourse analysis in particular, has its limits in being able to study lived experience. We can only study the expressions of lived experience (Davies & Davies, 2007). In part, this study concentrates on the way that participants' expressions of lived experiences both mediate and are mediated by dominant discourses, and how they create new discourses. In part, this study researches the participants' expressions of their lived experiences in relation to dominant discourses of Pākehāness, which have been identified as deployed by or constructive of Pākehā in the service of continued Pākehā dominance. It is the lived experience of being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts that is the criteria for

inclusion in this study, because it is anticipated that the lived experience of these Pākehā will generate discourse that is different from those stereotypical, dominant discourses detailing what it means to be Pākehā.

In this study, I have sometimes used the term 'lived experience' to refer to 'expressions of lived experience'. This is because the use of repeated, cumbersome phrases -- for example, 'participants' discursive constructions of their lived experiences' -- can interfere with ease of reading. Therefore, unless otherwise stated, 'lived experience' also refers to 'expressions of lived experience'.

From the 1970s onwards, overt, far-reaching political activism amongst Māori -- and the Pākehā responses to this -- transformed the intercultural relationships between Māori and Pākehā in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Māori voices were heard speaking about Pākehā colonisation, Pākehā denial of history, Pākehā racism, Pākehā privilege. Māori were strategically drawing a strong line between tangata whenua and Pākehā. Pākehā were being positioned as separate from Māori in order to revitalise Māori cultural identities damaged by colonisation and to protect Māori from Pākehā appropriation and assimilation. In the theoretical terms of this thesis, discursive environments were creating subject positions for Pākehā that positioned them as racist, colonisers, ignorant and denying of history, ignorant and devaluing of te reo and of tikanga Māori and as separate from Māori. The lived experience of some Pākehā in this environment was one of awakening to historical injustice against Māori and of awakening to the need for protection and for knowledge of te reo and tikanga Māori, from a more involved engagement with te ao Māori.

It is in this context of awakening that the term postcolonial Pākehā is used. In this thesis, when I use the terms postcolonial Pākehā or postcolonialism I do not intend 'post' to mean 'after'. Postcolonialism rather than signifying 'after' colonisation, acknowledges postcolonialism as concurrent with ongoing colonising practices. I intend postcolonial to signify acknowledgement of past and current colonisation, combined with support for the work that confronts the consequences and the sites of production of these colonisations. Being postcolonial is an ethical and political acknowledgement of and concern about the ongoing consequences of colonisation.

The term Pākehā is used in three ways in the thesis. First, Pākehā refers to the non-Māori, New Zealander majority, whose experiences have primarily been formed in relationship to this country. Second, it refers to the discursive constructions that signify the above description of Pākehā. Pākehā as the non-Māori, New Zealander majority is the larger group to which a third meaning for Pākehā both belongs, and is separate from: Pākehā as an avowed identity label for those of postcolonial orientation. This signification of Pākehā is often premised with the adjective *postcolonial* in the thesis.

I have defined the above terms as I use them in the context of the thesis. These key meanings help clarify and elaborate my theoretical approach to communication, agency, lived experience, and postcolonial Pākehā identity. Before giving further detail about discourse analysis and my approach to the data concerning the meaning participants bring to being Pākehā, I first need to outline my theoretical approach to cultural identity.

THEORETICAL APPROACH TO CULTURAL IDENTITY

In alignment with my understanding of the constructive power of discourse, and the creative power of individuals' lived experiences, I combine a critical approach to culture with a communicative approach. Firstly I will describe the critical approach to culture, then the communicative approach. A critical approach to culture acknowledges the significance and relevance of social power to cultural identity. Critical approaches to culture connect the discourses that construct, maintain, and develop cultural identities with historical, social, discursive power relationships (hooks, 1990, 1994; Martin, Nakayama, & Flores, 2002b, p. 12). So, critical approaches to culture acknowledge that cultural discourses can also operate politically. Culture is seen, then, as existing in a political context. Hence, critical approaches to culture enable Pākehā cultural identity to be understood and studied as operating ideologically and hegemonically.

Critical approaches to culture are also interested in understanding how, on a group level, cultures can have power over, dominate, subjugate other groups or negotiate and mediate with them (Martin, Nakayama, & Flores, 2002a, p. 13; Moon, 1999). This power-over often occurs at the level of meaning as different cultures privilege different interpretations of meanings over others (Collier, 2002) and if cultural groups have social, political and economic dominance, then the meanings their culture privileges can

dominate cultures who have been made less powerful (Holliday et al., 2004, p. 168). For example, in the Aotearoa-New Zealand context, Eurocentric, western cultural meanings have dominance in wider society over culturally-indigenous ways of interpreting the meanings of events, ideas, and objects in the world.

Critical perspectives on culture are interested in understanding how individuals within cultural groups negotiate the subject positions that being members of cultural groups provide. These perspectives are interested in understanding the way that individuals negotiate the power relationships that exist between different cultural groups in power relationships with each other. Such interests are of immediate relevance to understanding how Pākehā negotiate their cultural identity in relation to Māori. Critical approaches to culture understand individuals to be involved in mediating those collective, cultural and ideological discursive meanings in shifting, fluid, dynamic ways (Martin et al., 2002a, 2002b). Therefore, critical approaches to culture allow flexibility towards the nature of cultural identity.

While collective, cultural discourses, the meanings that are privileged by particular cultures, can provide subject positions for individuals to inhabit, it is acknowledged this relationship between collective, cultural-identity discourse and the individual is not completely determining (Hall, 1996). According to critical approaches to culture, a person, as part of his or her lived experience, negotiates and mediates the positionings made available from being a member of a particular cultural group. A significant consideration for the critical approach to culture, amongst many, is how the lived experience of individuals can impact on the discursive power of the collective, cultural identity and vice versa. Hence, the critical approach to culture suits a language-based enquiry into how individual Pākehā negotiate their cultural identities in relation to context and wider social discourses about Pākehāness.

Sharing the perspective of the critical approach to culture, the communicative approach to culture also sees that cultural identity is a negotiated and relational process (Collier, 2002, p. 142). Collier's communicative theory of cultural identity stresses the way that cultural identity is produced in communicative contexts. "Cultural identities are negotiated, co-created, reinforced, challenged through communication" (Collier, 2006, p. 56). In contrast to the critical approach though, Collier's communicative theory of

cultural identity concentrates on interpreting collective, meaning-making activities that cohere around more traditionally familiar aspects of cultural analysis eg values, core symbols, rituals of food and death, language.

Collier's communicative theory of cultural identity identifies six dialectics of cultural identity (Collier, 2002). The dialectic most relevant to this study is the avowal/ascription dialectic. The avowal/ascription dialectic concentrates on how self-perception is affected by the perception of others. How closely people avow their cultural identity, relates to the ascriptions other people or discourses give to that cultural identity Avowal is "This is who I am […] as a member […] of my […] cultural group here and now […..]. Ascription of identity consists of […] [T]his is how I see you seeing me as a member of my cultural group here and now" (Collier, 2002, p. 132). Collier explains that people's avowal changes according to the communicative contexts they are in. So, for participants, their avowal to the label Pākehā may be understood to change as a result of the communicative context they are in, and the ascriptions that are active in those contexts.

Both approaches see that cultural "[i]dentities are *emergent* (italics in original) […,] co-created in relationship to others" (Collier, 2006, p. 56). Both approaches lend to this study of Pākehā who have engaged with te ao Māori through Māori cultural learning contexts, the ability to see being Pākehā as an individually-negotiated, contextually-based, process of "becoming" as well as of "being" (Hall, 1990, p. 225), and to see the cultural identity of Pākehā as discursively constructed.

While the communicative and critical approaches to culture are fundamentally compatible (Collier, 2002, p. 139), they also bring distinctions that enrich and enhance this study of ways of being Pākehā. The critical approach to culture brings a perspective of power, history and ideology of language to the study of cultural identity that is relevant to Pākehā as "[…] political heirs to the work of colonising" (During, 1985, p. 370). The communicative theory of culture provides tools, in particular the conceptual tools of avowal and ascription (Collier, 2002), to describe how individuals contextually shape and align their collective, cultural labelling with their lived experiences.

I have shown how both the critical and communicative approaches to culture accept that cultural identity is quite different from a *lived essence*. I am not, therefore, using cultural theory to search for a definitive essence about the participants' ways of being Pākehā. Rather, I study the ways that the participants use language to talk about their experiences as Pākehā, and the ways that their language relates to or diverges from existing discourses about Pākehā experience and identity.

Despite the dynamic, individually-negotiated nature of cultural identity, the intercultural communication context can still be experienced and understood, as a meeting of collectively-shared contrasts and differences (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2007, pp. 316-362). Intercultural contexts can be places where collective, cultural differences, individually negotiated, meet. In this way, the intercultural, communicative context can provide a place where historical, social and power relationships are mediated, verbally and non-verbally (Martin & Nakayama, 2007, p. 143), and where cultural identities are produced and negotiated through communication (Collier, 2006). The intercultural, communicative context brings, therefore, potentially rich experiences, which on reflection give insights into identity (Martin & Nakayama, 2003, p. 369; Samovar et al., 2007), particularly for majority group members in 'minority' cultures.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND TYPE OF DESIGN
In order to support my study into the language participants use to construct meaning about their experiences as Pākehā who have learnt about tikanga Māori, about issues of te ao Māori, who have learnt in Māori cultural learning contexts, and who have learnt te reo, I have selected semi-structured interviews as a data collection tool and discourse analysis as my mode of analysis for the information the interviews generate. The qualitative tool of semi-structured interviews allowed me to go deeply in an open-ended way into the information that the interviews generated. The interview process enabled me to seek a range of in-depth information about complex issues of identity, identity in relationship and individual and collective identity negotiation (Tilbury, 1999). A qualitative approach allowed the research focus to evolve, rather than be fixed by the framework that quantitative research often imposes early on in the research process (Tremaine, 2007). Using qualitative research methods allowed me to be responsive to my learnings about the research topic as the research process unfolded.

A qualitative approach allowed deep and detailed investigation into postcoloniser lived experience, using the data that a small sample can generate. The research's attention to language that a qualitative approach entails supports my attention in this study to the way language constructs cultural identities and intercultural experiences. Social constructionism provides an epistemology for my research approach that highlights attention to language (Crotty, 1998). Social constructionism recognizes language as the key to constructing what we can say we know about the world. The power of language is in its capacity to construct realities for us (Gavey, 1989; Gergen, 2001; Harre & Gillett, 1994; Harre & Langenhove, 1991; Wetherell, 2003; Wetherell & Potter, 1988; Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001). We are not born into the world with identity, rather our identity is made for us, constructed by language in interpersonal contexts. Therefore, by using discourse analysis to analyse the information gained from participants in the interviews about the topic, I apply a method which has its theoretical basis in social constructionism (Crotty, 1998).

As stated above, my study is based on the assumption that understands that culture and cultural identity are constructed by language, and that different contexts produce, reproduce and transform cultural identities through the creative capacity of communication and language (Burr, 2003; Collier, 2006). I am not assuming there is an unchanging essence to the participants' identity as Pākehā, so my research is not setting out to seek that essence. Rather, my study seeks to find a range of meanings about being Pākehā, a range of meanings in response to experiences and contexts. This attention to the shifting, constructed nature of cultural identity is indicative of a social constructionist epistemology (Burr, 2003; Crotty, 1998; Tuffin, 2005; Tuffin & Howard, 2001). I am not looking for a fixed, unchanging truth about the *nature* of Pākehā. In accordance with social constructionism, I seek the meanings participants give in language they use about the experiences of being Pākehā. These meanings are always contextual, always mediated, always negotiated, and therefore not *essentialist,* not able to define an essence which is shared by Pākehā. Hence, my focus on how participants negotiate their lived experience of being Pākehā in different contexts, and in relation to existing discourses, is compatible with a social constructionist epistemology.

DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGIES

Having selected interviews as my data collection tool, I needed to decide the mode of analysis in order to study the talk of the participants. The one-to-one interviews enabled participants to talk quite intimately, and the subject was potentially a very personal one. So, I wanted an analytic approach that allowed reflection on the lived experience of the participants. At the same time, the subject of how Pākehā, a majority culture, experienced being in Māori cultural learning contexts -- indigenous, minority contexts—was a political one, so the analysis needed to be able to consider power relationships between groups and individuals. I needed to be able to compare and contrast the lived experience of individuals in relation to the collective existence of group identities and to consider cross-cultural relationships. Language was the medium through which these themes would be studied; language is the site of identity-construction work (Tuffin, 2005), so I needed a sensitive language tool for my analytic approach.

Discourse analysis enabled me to analyse the participants' language-use, both for what it revealed about their interpretations of lived experience as individuals as well as their perceptions of the way being part of a collective called Pākehā affected them. Discourse analysis also allowed me to look at the strategies participants used to tell their stories, to represent their experiences. Discourse analysis had enabled other researchers to identify widely-available discourses in the literature and in society on being Pākehā (Bell, 2004a; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) discourses which work to build and define collective identities, and to provide and define subject positions for individual identities. Others had used discourse analyis in interview-based studies of Pākehā (Campbell, 2005; Jellie, 2001; Tilbury, 1998, 1999). As well as fitting in with an already-existing methodological approach to the subject of Pākehā identity, my discourse analysis approach to the data was theoretically consistent with my social constructionist framework and my communicative, contextual, critical perspective of culture, outlined above.

To mitigate against a deterministic approach to discourse, which would suggest that discourse determines individual meaning-making by imprinting people's subjectivities as though they were blank, receptacles for ideology, I have selected interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources as an analytic tool for my discourse analysis. Rather

than reducing the participants' individual agency over meaning-making and subject positioning, the flexible and agentic approach of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources understands the participants' employment of language in a more empowering way (Tuffin, 2005; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). This approach recognises that while language is used to construct our being in the world, we are also creative in resisting, negotiating and innovating the subject positions language creates for us (Gavey, 1989; Wetherell et al., 2001). The use of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources, while anticipating that some language use will be commonly-shared between people, also allows for and expects variability of language use according to purpose and context and is therefore suitable for studying individual negotiations of collective identities.

To further clarify the process I adopted as a research strategy, I define and describe interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources below, as well as giving an example from my data analysis of a repertoire and the resources used to compose it. After that, a description of the actual process of analysis I undertook to identify the repertoires and resources follows.

Interpretative repertoires can be described as "culturally valuable linguistic resources from which accounts may be put together" (Tuffin, 2005, p. 175). Repertoires are the "resources harnessed" to make accounts "work and seem reasonable and plausible" (Tuffin, 2005, p. 84). Potter describes repertoires and resources as "systematically related sets of terms, often used with stylistic and grammatical coherence, and often organized around one or more central metaphors" (Potter, 1996, p. 131).The characteristic of centrality is reinforced by Hepburn where repertoires are described as "packages of ideas" (as cited in Tuffin, 2005, p. 84).

As the above paragraph shows, the terms interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources are often used interchangeably by discourse analysts (Burr, 2003; Edley, 2001; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Before giving an example of an interpretative repertoire composed of linguistic resources, from my own data analysis, I will explain that linguistic resources are participants' accounts that share similar key terms, share common positions, and do common work. These similar accounts, the linguistic resources, are organised into interpretative repertoires, which are larger patterns of accounts which have shared functions and shared effects. A repertoire functions as an

umbrella under which resources are gathered together that are identified as belonging to that repertoire. This organization of linguistic resources into small groups that compose the large groups of interpretative repertoires, follows the approach of Bowker (2003) and Bowker and Tuffin (Bowker & Tuffin, 2002, 2003, 2007). By using this two-layer approach to the data, I intend to achieve structure, clarity and accessibility to the meanings of the data.

As an example from the Findings section of the thesis, of the structuring of accounts into linguistic resources, and of linguistic resources into interpretative repertoires, I will describe what I have called the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire. One common "package of ideas" (Hepburn as cited in Tuffin, 2005, p.84), and "systematically related set of terms" (Potter, 1996, p. 131), I identified in the interview data was the way participants commonly used language to describe their resistance to the ideas others have about what it means to be Pākehā. The participants' expressions of their lived experience commonly displayed a resistance to some kinds of positioning that being labeled as Pākehā gave them, in particular a resistance to Pākehā stereotypes.

Although groups of accounts which displayed this resistance shared similar expressions, ideas and interpretations, identifiable as belonging to the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire, the groups of accounts also took various positions and did different work, achieving different effects from each other. These different groups of accounts were grouped into linguistic resources. These linguistic resources are part of the interpretative repertoire. For instance, some accounts belonging to the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire spoke of resisting how being Pākehā can be seen to mean having a superior attitude to Māori and some accounts belonging to the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire spoke of resisting how being seen to be Pākehā can mean being seen to be racist. I grouped these similar accounts of resistance to the 'other Pākehā identity', the one participants did not ascribe to, into the *resisting how others perceive Pākehā* resource. Other accounts belonging to the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire spoke of participants' resistance to owning the label Pākehā because the label immediately brought to awareness associations with colonizing history and with contemporary social and political dominance. These similar but different accounts of resistance to the 'other Pākehā identity' were grouped into the *resisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā* resource.

Two further linguistic resources comprised the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire. The accounts that made up these further two resources were organized around data that showed challenges made to 'those other Pākehā' by participants – these accounts comprised the *challenging those other Pākehā* resource -- and the other accounts were organized around data that showed participants feeling threatened by 'those other Pākehā'. These accounts were grouped into the *being threatened by those other Pākehā* resource.

Each of the four linguistic resources' accounts are oriented to shared positions and effects about resistance of 'the other Pākehā identity' and resistance to stereotyping of Pākehā. Each linguistic resource does different work from the other in relation to the resistance of 'the other Pākehā identity'. The four linguistic resources compose the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire. The *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire is made up of linguistic resources that participants use to speak of their lived experience of feeling different from commonly-shared, dominant, stereotypical ideas of what it means to be Pākehā. The repertoire demonstrates a resistance to those commonly-held ideas and uses four different linguistic resources which each do different work and achieve different effects, as they talk of this resistance.

Above I have shown how I structured the data into linguistic resources, by identifying small "packages of ideas" (Hepburn as cited in Tuffin, 2005, p. 84) or "systematically related sets of terms" (Potter, 1996, p.131) or groups of language that shared common effects, consequences and purposes. These smaller groups of patterns of words, the linguistic resources, when compiled together, compose the larger groups of commonly shared-patterns of words, the interpretative repertoires, the larger "packages of ideas" (Hepburn as cited in Tuffin, 2005, p. 84) or larger groups of "systematically related sets of terms" (Potter, 1996, p.131). Linguistic resources and interpretative repertoires function together to create, negotiate, offer, and represent subject positions of the participants regarding particular experiences, issues, responses to particular events and to discursive environments. Because repertoires represent commonly-shared interpretations of the world, of experience, of ideas, they can be like discourses in that they construct shared versions of reality. Similar to discourses on a macro level, repertoires can be seen as discourse on a micro-level, creating and offering negotiable subject positions (Tuffin, 2005).

When speakers use interpretative repertoires, and the linguistic resources that build them, they are relying on already existent, historically developed, socially-embedded language terms, terms often constitutive of common sense of communities. "Thus, interpretative repertoires can be seen as a kind of culturally shared tool kit of resources for people to use for their own purposes" (Burr, 2003, p. 60). People use interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources to express their opinions and experiences, and to place their opinions and experiences in contexts. People use the regularity of repertoires flexibly, individually, creatively in order to negotiate their own positions in relation to larger discourses (Tuffin, 2005). Repertories can use the common currency of language to reflect dominant discourses, discourses of commonsense. People can also use repertoires' currencies of language to challenge dominant discourses.

With this particular sample of Pākehā who are part of a minority who have learnt te reo, chosen to learn in Māori cultural learning contexts, and to learn about the Treaty, the interpretative repertoires identified in this research will represent new discourses, emergent discourses, shared by this group. A lot of attention has been given already to the discourses about Pākehā dominance, ignorance and devaluing of te reo and tikanga, and blindness to the impacts of colonising history etc. (Bell, 2004a; King, 1985, 1999b; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Studying the interpretative repertoires -- the discourses -- of this sample of Pākehā, assists new discourses, new common-sense understandings, and new ways of making sense to emerge. Also, the grouping of participants' talk into interpretative repertoires, allows contrasts and comparisons to be drawn between the participants' repertoires, their discourses, and the discourses identified in the literature as belonging to Pākehā. For example, the 'we are one people' discourse identified as belonging to Pākehā (McCreanor, 1995) contrasts with the responses of the participants in this research which have been organised into the *being defined by difference from Māori* linguistic resource that is part of the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire. A further example of a discourse already identified as being deployed by Pākehā is the 'affirmative action for Māori privileges Māori' discourse (McCreanor, 1995). Clear contrasts can be established between this discourse and research participants' responses which make up the *awareness of privilege* repertoire.

Consistent with social constructionism and a critical and communicative approach to cultural identity, subject positioning theory allows the interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources to resist fixing identity as a consistent, continuous, definite, ongoing orientation, perception, essence or attitude. The repertoires and resources are used flexibly according to context. For instance, with one resource, *valuing the learning of history,* Trudy defines the Treaty "as a bowl […] for which the rest of our living actually happens" and that "The Treaty […] definitely defines me as a Pākehā". With the *Pākehā is limited* resource, Trudy defines herself as more than Pākehā, suggesting that the "rest of [her] living" is not entirely contained by reference to the partnership of the Treaty.

Interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources were particularly suited to this study as, engaged with te ao Māori as they were, having respect for and valuing te reo, tikanga Māori and te ao Māori as they did, the participants could be understood to be already occupying and producing creative subject positions which were distinct from and alternative to those widely available in the literature and in wider society. While employing discourse analysis to identify the ways hegemonic views in language are maintained, as researchers commonly use discourse analysis to do (Edley, 2001), I have used the tools of discourse analysis -- interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources -- to focus on how the individual participants negotiate the discursive environment that collectively positions them. I used the discourse analysis tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources to organize the spoken words of the participants into groups. These groups allowed readily identifiable means to trace the relationship between the participants' spoken words and the discourses in the literature and in wider society. For example, the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire can clearly be compared and contrasted with the commonly-shared discourse, identified in the literature review, of Pākehā identity as separate from Māori. The discourse analysis tools of interpretative repertoires, linguistic resources and subject-positioning have supported the capture of data that shows the shifting and dynamic nature of the meanings this sample bring to being Pākehā.

Discourse analysis, with its tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources, acknowledges the social constructionist power of language. At the same time, interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources acknowledge the creativity with which

individuals use language, and the empowering agency people employ when using discourse. Despite this, I recognise the limits of discourse analysis as a tool for analyzing the full range of human experience. Burr points to these limits when she writes of how discourse analysis and social constructionism have yet to incorporate the extra-discursive meaning-making of embodied experience (2003, p 197). She suggests "a further creativity" is needed (2003, p. 200). While having stated its suitability to my research task, I also recognise discourse analysis's limits, which at times I have felt keenly: from my own being in the world, I believe there is a lot more to experience than what can be said and that unspoken experience contributes to the communicative potential of relationships and situations. Hence, while proceeding to analyse ways of talking, I acknowledge the experiences that lie outside of language that still contribute to the meaning we give to and get from the contexts and relationships we are in.

Discourse analysis concentrates on what is being said and on its effects; it concentrates on the strategies as much as on the content. Sometimes, I have felt constrained by this imperative. Rather than using commonly-shared content as a sole guide to categorization and analysis, the task of identifying the common strategies of language I found a more difficult one. Nevertheless, the consistent concern of discourse analysis with the 'how' something is said, as well as the 'what', has, I believe, brought more analytical range and depth to the data than a thematic analysis would have done. Discourse analysis brings a relevant methodology to the topic, locating it in an existing tradition; it also offers an opportunity for reflection, comparing and contrasting the repertoires, mini-discourses, used by participants and identified in the analysis, and the discourses identified as deployed by Pākehā in the service of continued dominance and colonisation.

HOW DID I GO ABOUT THE ANALYSIS?

The analyst identifies interpretative repertories and linguistic resources by close reading of people's talk, by searching for "patterns in language in use, building on and referring back to the assumptions she or he is making about the nature of language, interaction and society and the interrelationships between them" (Taylor, 2002, p. 39). The analyst influences the selection, organization and construction of those patterns in the data (Tuffin, 2005). I began the analysis with multiple re-readings of and re-listenings to the transcripts and interviews, searching for patterns in language use and noticing

commonly recurring topics and issues. I extracted these commonly-recurring clusters of participant responses. By focusing on common participant responses that were relevant to the literature, to the thematic concerns of the research questions and/or to my own perceptions of what was interesting and pertinent, I was able to group the extracts into initial themes.

While looking for common patterns, I was aware, in particular, of the existing academic literature on the colonizing dominance of Pākehā as a culturally disrespectful, blindly dominant, and historically ignorant identity and of contemporary discourses of Pākehāness in wider society. I was sensitized then, to prioritise the patterns that 'talked with' those constructions and perceptions of Pākehāness, from the perspective of Pākehā who engaged with te ao Māori. I acknowledge that, while the extracts that form the basis of the resources and repertoires are indicative of mostly commonly-recurring responses, I have influenced the selection and therefore the organization and construction of these patterns of data. While this influence guided, in part, the prioritizing of the data, language use by participants in the interviews was the primary factor in my organizing and selecting of the data.

After initial grouping into themes, I then looked for patterns of similarity in the way language was being used by the participants. In addition to shared content, linguistic resources share a way of using language to produce a similar result. Linguistic resources share both themes and effects, both topics and outcomes. So, I needed to find common patterns of use, and the commonly-shared outcomes and effects of the speakers' words, and not just group accounts by content, by theme. I asked questions of the themed extracts, such as "What effects are these extracts producing for the speakers?"; "Are these extracts constructing an issue in a particular way, by defining it, exaggerating it, minimizing it, or synthesizing it with something else or…?"; "Is there a particular position these particular extracts are elaborating?" and so on. This concentration on the outcomes achieved by the talk moved the categorization away from only content into categorization also for strategy, for discursive effect, for what the language as a tool was being used to achieve.

After a long and deliberative process, I organized the selected extracts of mostly commonly-recurring responses into five interpretative repertoires: *identity through*

connection to Māori; resisting the other Pākehā identity; awareness of privilege;
valuing of knowledge; and Pākehā as a changeable identity.

METHODS OF ACHIEVING VALIDITY

Discourse analysis is a tried and tested method of analysis in the field I am researching. Therefore, the "analytical tool[s] [were] valid for the area studied" (Kvale, 1996, p. 217) and validity was enhanced as I "buil[t] on earlier work" (Potter, 1996, p. 139). The literature has been a guide in developing the focus of the research, so the research method is contextualised in an existing tradition.

The epistemological tradition of social constructionism encourages reflexivity in researchers so that they "acknowledge their inherent subjectivities and [are] aware of the ways that they may impact on the process and product of the research" (Campbell, 2005, p. 34). Recognizing the relevance of my personal interest in the research topic, I acknowledge that my own subjectivity has contributed to the motivation, the design and the approach to the analysis of the findings of the research. At the same time, as drawing on my personal interest, I have endeavoured to minimize its subjective impacts by selecting accounts that are typical of the talk of the participants, and by linking the accounts to identifiably-relevant linguistic resources and interpretative repertoires.

By endeavouring to make my procedures of data collection and data analysis "transparent and the results evident" (Kvale, 1996, p. 252), and by linking my findings to the literature, I have further acknowledged and alleviated the impact of my own subjectivity. Despite this, I accept that another researcher may have identified different repertoires according to their own priorities and emphases.

The accounts I have chosen to exemplify the linguistic resources were selected on the basis of their clarity and cohesion. Data, relevant to the resources, were discarded if they were repetitive, when sometimes they appeared in phrases sprinkled throughout the interview, rather than in linked-together sequences, or because of the limits of word-length. So, accounts that are presented here are only indicative examples of the data that made up the resources. Ellipses have been used when irrelevant data, in the form of discontinuous content and asides, interfered with the clarity of the account. Ellipses represent the exclusion of my own informal comments, along the lines of "mmmm",

"yeah" and "aha"; sometimes they represent my doing a follow-up question or interim interview questions, or my repeating the participants' words or saying a few words in order to fill a gap or to encourage the participant to continue. An ellipsis of three dots […] indicates a short omission; an ellipsis of five dots […..] a longer omission.

Because the interview questions sought reports of specific incidents, participant responses were less influenced by the interview context than might otherwise have been the case (Weiss, 1994). I designed the interview tool and then I trialled it. Clarity of recording and accuracy of transcribing were of paramount concern to me. The interviews were not transcribed by me, but by a professional transcriber, who had signed a confidentiality agreement. On receipt, I checked the transcripts against the tapes, and then began a painstaking process of minor corrections. The transcripts were then sent to the participants who made additions and omissions. Two participants chose to make no changes. The checked and amended transcripts then provided the basis for the inclusion of extracts in the thesis. The participants' descriptions have been validated by the participants. I asked participants to check over my descriptions of them. Four participants were happy for the descriptions to remain as they were; two participants edited their descriptions and these are the versions that are included in this report.

In this chapter I have spent some time giving background to and explanation of the methodological decisions I have made. The chapter described how social constructionism provides the theoretical framework for my study, and how discourse analysis has worked to analyse the information generated from the data collection tool of the semi-structured interviews. In particular, the discourse analysis tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources have been elaborated. Key terms fundamental to the theoretical orientation of the thesis have been defined, and my critical and communicative approach to culture has been explained. I also used this chapter as a space to describe some of the ethical and pragmatic challenges and considerations of my study.

In the next chapter, the findings are presented. Extracts of the transcribed voices of the participants, talking about their lived experience of being Pākehā from Māori cultural learning contexts, are analysed. The extracts have been organized into categories of five interpretative repertoires: the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire, the

resisting the other Pākehā identity repertoire, the *awareness of privilege* repertoire, the *valuing of knowledge* repertoire, and the *Pākehā is a changeable identity* repertoire. Each repertoire is composed of linguistic resources, of which there are sixteen in number.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

In order to show the data which the interviews generated regarding the meaning participants bring to being Pākehā, Chapter Four presents the five interpretative repertoires that I organised the data into: the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire, the *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire, the *awareness of privilege* repertoire, the *valuing of knowledge* repertoire, and the *Pākehā is a changeable identity* repertoire. Chapter Four also presents the sixteen linguistic resources that comprise the five interpretative repertoires.

In order to present an overview of the findings, the following diagram displays the repertoires and resources I used to organise and categorise the interview data. However, the categories of repertoires and resources are not entirely discrete as the format of the diagram might suggest and there is some overlapping of categories.

Having shown the interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources in diagrammatic form in order to give an overview of the organisation of data and the way they connect with each other, the rest of this chapter will explain each interpretative repertoire and linguistic resource in detail. The first repertoire is the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire.

Identity through connection to Māori REPERTOIRE

Amongst the central issues generated in the data were discourses that clustered around Pākehā identity being connected to Māori. In contrast to the discursive environment that provides separate-from-Māori subject positions for Pākehā, or ones that assimilate Māori and Pākehā into a category of one people (Butcher, 2003; King, 1999b; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) the identity talk of the lived experience of the participants largely grouped around connection to Māori, while recognising difference from Māori.

Three patterns of talk were identified within the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire. These were organised into first, *being Pākehā and 'do-ing' as Māori*, second, *having authentic connection to Māori*, and third, *being defined by difference from Māori.*

Being Pākehā and 'do-ing' as Māori RESOURCE

Data that generated this resource were organised around participants describing some of their most intimate daily actions as inspired by and sourced from Māori tikanga. The three accounts chosen to exemplify this resource demonstrate participants clearly naming and identifying themselves as Pākehā while describing the things that they do that are Māori.

The first account in this resource arose in response to questions about what Pākehā as a cultural identity signified for Lisa and why she was doing the course.

> LISA Being a Pākehā for me is [.....] thinking Māori most of the time, I think, I think of um of rākau, like the trees, of manu. Like sometimes I'll walk through the bush and say oh "Tēnā koe" to the birds. Um or I'm at the beach and I'll say "Kia ora" to Tangaroa and I'll um I think about the world of Māori. I think about Papatuanuku, um the land, you know, and

even in um manaakitanga, you know of welcoming people at home and being respectful of people you know, giving of kai. Yeah. And I think even it kind of helps me um a little bit accept death, you know? I'm quite happy to go back into land […].I love Māori culture […]. You know, I feel it in my heart, you know, and some people don't understand that. They really don't. As a Pākehā, I feel it, I feel it within me.

In this account, Lisa's connection to Māori is described as occurring outside Māori contexts; she brings her connection to Māori to the world of nature, to her home, to her wider world. Lisa's extract describes in detail how her lived experience and her values are connected to Māori and are shaped by te reo and by Māori belief. Lisa feels the connection in her "heart […] within me". Lisa distinctly claims a Pākehā identity, not a Māori one, yet her Pākehāness involves ways of being that are Māori.

The second account selected to illustrate this resource comes from Beth's response to questions about the positive effects engagement with Māori learning contexts have had, and about Māori influences that have formed her sense of Pākehā cultural identity.

BETH "It's been such a gradual process over the years, I'd say definitely it [contact with te ao Māori, learning in a Māori cultural context] has contributed to the person I am. And to my um spiritual side […]. It's like the life force of everything, connectedness to everything, animate and inanimate, you know, yeah. And the, the spiritual presence of tupuna. Like you might go to a marae and a person will greet you "Tēnā koutou" and it's just the one person, but what they're acknowledging is all the unseen ones with you […..]. Things like not washing your tea towels with the rest of the washing. When I see other people doing it, it's like ooh, fancy washing your tea towels with your socks and your undies. Yuck […].

When Beth refers to the separation of tea towels from underwear in her washing, she is demonstrating the ways that her daily life is informed by the principles of tapu and noa. It is Māori practice to separate the sacred, from the common. The account continues:

Things like you know, definitely not sitting on tables and handbag on tables […]. Like I say, I say a Māori grace when I have my dinner at night […] - when my sister comes, we do a Pākehā grace - and that's just to, because everybody's who's handled the food on its journey to where it got to me, has put some influence, of their influence on it. So to say grace, to ask for it to be blessed, and made noa or just you know just ordinary, it means when I take it in it's not holding those influences it's been in contact with. Yeah it [mātauranga Māori] has influenced my world view,

my way of being, the way I live day to day, my spirituality. Yeah, it influences the way I am in the world. And I'm still Pākehā."

Consistent with the first account, while acknowledging and owning a Pākehā label for her identity, Beth's account demonstrates the Māori influence on her daily ways of being. She describes it as a "gradual process", thirty years in the making. In particular this account shows how Beth positions herself as subject to indigenous spiritual discourse: when greeted with "Tēnā koutou" (a plural, Māori greeting), she accepts that her unseen tupuna also are being greeted; her Māori grace accepts that food is tapu and needs to be "noa" before being eaten.   These ways of being are negotiated according to context: when Beth's sister comes, she says a Pākehā grace. Beth is not claiming a fixed set of cultural practices, but one which shifts according to interpersonal context. Beth is a Pākehā who *does* Māori things in some contexts and not others.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF *being Pākehā and do-ing as Māori* RESOURCE
In this resource, connection to Māori is explicitly shown by the participants' descriptions of their daily practices. Respect is implicit, by the participants maintaining a label separate from Māori for their identity. Participants respect and acknowledge that although they act and think in Māori ways sometimes, this does not mean that they are Māori. These accounts show participants granting Māori the respect of space. Respect is also implicitly shown by the participants by, while maintaining this separate Pākehā identity, choosing to practise Māori values on a daily basis, because they value them. While doing so, they acknowledge the source of those values.

These accounts that show ways of being Pākehā that espouse Māori values by practising them on a daily basis suggest a blended identity. The hybridity these accounts display is one that is built on respect, valuing, and an intimate relationship with Māori tikanga and te reo. Therefore, it can be seen to be different from the hybridity sometimes ascribed to Pākehā, the hybridity arising from colonist appropriation (Bell, 2004a, 2004c).

This lived experience of being Pākehā and practising Māori values must negotiate a discursive environment in which appropriation happens regularly and destructively, in which the inflicted wounds of colonisation have not been fully addressed, creating bitter cynicism amongst some Māori, and a distrust of Pākehā 'blending' with Māori (Bell,

2004a; Bishop, 1994; Pihama, 1994; Smith, 2005; Stewart- Harawira, 1993). The participants' connection to Māori, acted on by the adoption of language, daily practices, and world views, arises from open-ness to, valuing of and respect for te ao Māori, te reo and tikanga Māori. The participants cross borders between Māori and Pākehā, but their engagement with te ao Māori is different from the much criticised appropriation of symbols, practices and Māori words some Pākehā organisations use to add uniqueness and exoticism to further hegemonic goals of identity-building or national aggrandisement (Bell, 2004a; Maclean, 1996; Turner, 1999b).

By engaging with Māori cultural learning contexts, participants have learned about te reo and tikanga Māori. As a result of this learning, participants choose to practise Māori values. In engaging with these practices -- practices which were at risk of decimation from colonisation and which were sustained in life by tangata whenua tenacity (O'Regan, 2006)– participants help maintain the life of these practices. It can be inferred that the intention of the participants is to support te reo and tikanga Māori through their engagement and relationship.

The participants' lived experience demonstrated in the '*being Pākehā and do-ing as Māori*' resource, shows participants, while maintaining separate identity as Pākehā, connecting to Māori through practising Māori values on a daily basis in a respectful, valuing and intimate way. The resource exhibits a direct contrast to dominant constructions of Pākehā as separate, disrespecting, appropriating, assimilationist and ignorant of Māori and is a subject position that is largely absent from discourses about Pākehāness and about hybridity (Bell, 2004a; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). It also exhibits their shifting subject positions – "sometimes" Lisa greets nature in te reo; sometimes Beth says a Māori grace.

In the absence of discursive signification in Aotearoa-New Zealand's representational environment of this way of being Pākehā and yet being hybrid, the participants, informed by knowledge of te reo and tikanga Māori, model to other Pākehā, bicultural ways of being Pākehā. In so doing, the participants as border-crossers can provide a bridge-maker role between Māori and those Pākehā who still adopt colonising attitudes of disrespect and ignorance; between Māori and those Pākehā who maintain a distance through indifference; and between those Māori who collectively attribute colonising,

disrespectful attitudes to Pākehā and those Pākehā who are open to Māori, knowledgeable of te reo and tikanga Māori and respectful of it. The following, much-shorter resource continues the theme of connection to Māori, by focusing on early contact.

Authentic connection to Māori resource

The data that have been organised into this resource all focus on the participants' lived experience of an early connection with Māori in their childhoods. This connection, formed early on in the participants' lives, brings a sense of authenticity to their accounts of connection.

The first account came about when Brian was asked about his involvement with te ao Māori, before doing the course.

> BRIAN The house [his grandfather's] was full of Māori artefacts, old cloaks hanging in the hallways and my grandfather, his hobby was carving Māori weapons and tokotoko, and things like that and although I didn't know it at the time, he spoke fluent Māori […]. Both my twin brother and I have Māori middle names. And that might have come a little bit from my mother as sort of homage to my grandfather. So, although it was kind of, neither my younger sister nor brother have Māori middle names, but we did. And I think, and we're both ending up speaking, learning te reo and my other two siblings aren't. So, it's little things like that can actually I think quite make you, I mean you're aware all the time, you write your name, that, that you're not Māori. But you know you live, there is a connection, and so two of my three children have got some Māori names.

This account shows that through his grandfather's interest in Māori and because he and his brother were given a Māori middle name, Brian has had a sense of connection with Māori from early times. Brian describes how the connection to Māori through Māori middle names is an enduring one in his family: most of his children have Māori middle names. Because his middle name is Māori he describes himself as being able to be aware of a connection to Māori "all the time".

Having a middle name that is Māori brings Brian a sense of an intimate authenticity in his connection to Māori. Brian builds this sense of authentic connection to Māori by also citing his grandfather's fluency in te reo.

Consistent with the above account, Trudy's account also describes an early sense of connection with Māori. Her response arose in answering questions about what involvement she had had with nga ao o nga iwi Māori, and about the specific impact she had experienced from being in Māori cultural learning contexts as a Pākehā.

> TRUDY Some of my first words were in Māori. I was left with a Māori "aunty" [due to mother's illness] and I was about eighteen months. I think I'd spoken before that but I just remember kai and tūtae. I mean, you know, things that were very important to a baby (laughs) [.....]. I feel that something that I would have, I would have maybe naturally grown up with, I kind of missed out on for a long time [.....]. For me, actually having the people to say to me it's okay, not only are you welcome on the marae but we will show you the protocol for coming onto the marae [...], it's like re- welcoming, for me, re- welcoming me into something that I left behind.

The authenticity of Trudy's early connection to Māori is built on through her description of her "first words" as being in te reo. By describing the experience of being welcomed on a marae, and of being shown marae protocols, as a "re-welcoming", the account further talks of the authenticity of connection, the sense of rediscovery that these early contacts with Māori have created for her.

The final account in this resource arose from a response to a question about whether Susan saw Pākehā as a label for her ethnicity.

> SUSAN There's this, you know the English Irish thing going on but then there's also a very strong sense of um when I was young and brought up in an environment, a very kind of Māori environment that um yeah [...]. I see it [Māori culture] as being quite different than to kind of what my European culture is, but I don't see it as being foreign to myself.

By talking about contact with Māori at an early time having come about by being brought up in "a very kind of Māori environment", the account describes a connection to Māori that sits alongside a sense of English and Irish origin. In this way, the account positions Susan's European culture as separate and different from Māori culture, yet, because of the early contact she does not consider Māori culture as alien.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF THE *authentic connection to Māori* RESOURCE

This resource demonstrates how connection to Māori arises in the lived experience of the early lives of participants. Because of the emphasis on childhood, these accounts support the claim to an authentic sense of connection to Māori. Significantly, the lived experiences these accounts describe occurred prior to the particular discursive separation of Māori from Pākeha, constructed by the bifurcation of bicultural discourse (Bell, 2006; Spoonley, 1995). The experiences also occurred prior to the contemporary popularisation for Pākehā of becoming more connected, knowledgeable and familiar with te ao Māori, as part of a postcolonial orientation (Spoonley, 1995). This context lends an unforced authenticity to the connection to Māori they feel. They speak of this connection in a way that suggests participants experience a sense of early influence on their identity from this experience of authentic connection.

This relationship premised on connection resonates with the way that Said (1993) describes the post-colonial relationship as contrapuntal rather than bifurcated. Bell refers to the "overlapping and intertwined nature of [Māori and Pākehā] cultures and their histories" (Bell, 2004a, p. 258). This intertwining, rather than a bifurcated bicultural relation, seems a better match for the lived experience that participants express in this resource. Connection to Māori is further illustrated in the next longer resource, with particular emphasis on the recognition of Pākehā difference from Māori.

Being defined by difference from Māori RESOURCE

Overall this resource, demonstrates participants' talk of acknowledging their difference from Māori and the way they consider that an intercultural rather than a necessarily monocultural relationship exists between Māori and Pākehā. Data which I did not include here, but which also generated this resource, talked of acknowledging that Māori historical experience of colonisation has constructed different social positions for Māori from those of Pākehā, and that this experience creates a defining difference between Pākehā and Māori, so that when participants engage and relate to Māori, they are aware of this difference.

The five accounts selected to exemplify this resource identify being Pākehā as built on a respectful, intercultural relationship with Māori. The first account is based on the perception that Māori are different from Pākehā. The next two accounts identify

media's lack of representation of Pākehā as respectfully, interculturally relating to Māori in a way that meets and acknowledges Māori difference from Pākehā. The fourth account illustrates the way that Pākehā connection with Māori in the Māori cultural learning context can be an unforgettable encounter with cultural difference and the last account identifies how the construction of Pākehā as different from Māori can trouble the lived experience of a sense of connection to Māori.

The first account came about in response to a question about how difficult or easy it has been for Trudy to talk about her cultural identity as a Pākehā.

> TRUDY But the thing is that I think my Pākehāness is something that I feel, I think I feel it when I'm in relation to Māori. That's when I feel it. That's when I identify it […]. My, my definition of my Pākehāness is, is almost entirely in relation to my relationship with Māori, you know, Māori people.

This account shows Trudy's cultural identity as a Pākehā comes into being in relationship to Māori (Collier, 2002). Being Pākehā is something she first feels, then identifies, and then defines in context, in a relationship premised on difference from Māori. The account identifies Pākehā as different from Māori, yet in relationship with Māori. Trudy's words show that she is granting Māori the space of a separate identity, while still being in connection with Māori.

By the phrase "almost entirely", Trudy signifies a subject position for Pākehā that acknowledges the relationship with Māori as primarily important to being Pākehā. By doing so, she resists the white-native subject position for Pākehā (King, 1985) which emphasises the connection to the land of Aotearoa-New Zealand, a connection unmediated by the tangata whenua relationship with the land (Bell, 2004a), as primarily important to being Pākehā (Spoonley, 1995).

This acknowledgement of Pākehā as different from Māori yet connected to them is amplified in the following two extracts, which focus on the way Pākehā are represented in the media.

This account arose in response to a question about how Pākehā are portrayed in the media.

> BRIAN I don't think they make any real effort to represent white New Zealand as Pākehā. Yeah I think, I think Pākehā has a counterpoint in Māori. I mean, and so there is, I think, yeah there's a relationship and if you identify as Pākehā, then you identify that as Māori as well. [As a Pākehā] you recognise cultural differences and approaches and, and that has some importance in your life. Whereas mainstream media I don't think has any acknowledgement of that whatsoever.

The account continues to show Pākehā as connected with Māori, while acknowledging Māori difference from Pākehā. Interestingly, Brian positions Pākehā in this excerpt as distinct from white New Zealand. Pākehā distinction lies in recognising "cultural differences and approaches" and it is this Pākehāness, that acknowledges a relationship with Māori and that acknowledges "Pākehā has a counterpoint in Māori", which is missing from media representations. This excerpt comes close to Spoonley's idea of Pākehā as postcolonial (Spoonley, 1995).

Consistent with the second account in this resource, this third account talks about an absence of representation in the media of the meaning of Pākehā being about meeting with Māori. The third account also refers to an absence in the media of any acknowledgement of Pākehā and Māori being different from each other, yet connected in a relationship. This third account arose when Trudy was asked about ways that her experiences as a Pākehā were the same or different from notions of Pākehāness portrayed in wider society. In this account, I have needed to insert words in brackets to provide the clarity that context provided at the time of the interview.

> TRUDY We're actually engaging, the Pākehā on that course, we're engaging [with te ao Māori]. We all were there with this real sense of purpose and a sense of coming to meet [Māori] and the, the notion of Pākehāness portrayed in wider society are, they're not about meeting that at all. So in fact, they're [the media's representations] more about meeting American or Australian or English. It [representation of Pākehā in the media] is invisible. It is quite ephemeral.

The account describes how being in a Māori cultural learning context brings Pākehā together with Māori, to "meet" and "engage" with te ao Māori. The account shows that media, according to Trudy, are not interested in representing such meeting and engagement. Trudy describes the way her lived experience of being Pākehā has been

about meeting and engagement with Māori. The absence of representation of her way of being Pākehā in the media is evocatively described as "invisible" and "ephemeral".

The two accounts above demonstrate a subject position of Pākehā being different from Māori, yet in intercultural relationship with Māori. Trudy and John's accounts demonstrate that such respectful and connected ways of being Pākehā, are not represented in mainstream media.

The fourth account in this resource turns the focus to the context of the Māori cultural learning environment. The account came about in response to a question about any positive experiences Paul had as a Pākehā on the course.

> PAUL The whole world changed because, because of the different language and the different stories that she was telling […]. I've never forgotten the, the sense, this kind of, a completely different way of experiencing things out there that I'm not privy to because I'm not participating in that culture. And that's new, so that's, I guess I, that's another one of those assumptions. I guess I assumed that we all lived in the same world and we just spoke about it differently and that was a moment of feeling, no it's really quite, the Māori world well you know, it's not the same world.

This account describes a particular moment that Paul remembers when a teacher, who was very special to him, was describing, in te reo, a particular symbol. (She was a teacher who insisted on always speaking in te reo.) At that time, the account describes, he became acutely aware that being a Pākehā in a Pākehā culture was distinctly different from being Māori in the Māori world. While bringing Paul as a Pākehā together with Māori, the Māori cultural learning context has brought Paul an experience of difference, not of sameness. There is no casual hybridity signified in his talk. The words "completely different" show the contrast he experienced, and the level of surprise in his awareness.

This fourth account in this resource demonstrates how te reo, spoken by a person - imbued with tikanga from the old people, as this teacher was, can effect an intercultural experience as it did for Paul imparting to him the understanding of how te reo and Māori tikanga can create and communicate an holistic and unique world view. By using the phrase "the Māori world is not the same world", Paul indicates his understanding of

this difference in perspective as fundamental. The account demonstrates Paul's valuing of te reo, as not only a different perspective on the world but as creating a different world. The power of language is evoked here as a constructionist medium through which worlds are constructed. This evocation is particularly poignant, with the knowledge that the survival of te reo and tikanga has been fought for, and stubbornly preserved by generations of Māori, despite the history of colonisation. This account also can be identified as belonging to the *valuing the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori* resource, because of the centrality of the value of te reo to the account.

This fourth account in the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource, as part of the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire, describes a Pākehā, heir to the work of colonising (During, 1995), experiencing, in part, the distinct, unique difference of a culture whose people were near decimated by his political ancestors. However, he is not using this experiencing as an appropriation. Māori culture is a culture he is not part of. He is "not participating in it", but he is experiencing a connection to it. Nor does this account demonstrate Paul assimilating Māori; the experience makes him more aware of Pākehā and Māori difference, rather than less.

This account shows that through stories being preserved and handed on in te reo amongst Māori, Pākehā too can experience the survival of Māori perceptions. To characterise this account of Paul's as expressive of a romanticised experience of Māori culture as undamaged, "romanticised, indigenous essence" (Bell, 2004a, p. 88), denying the wounds of colonisation, would ignore Paul's acknowledgements in other accounts of the destructive impacts of colonisation on Māori history. Paul's relationship to te reo and tikanga Māori, informed by the damage of colonisation, can be seen as one that values what remains as a taonga to be protected, maintained, handed on, something he claims in another account from the *valuing the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori* resource to be part of the "responsibility" of being Pākehā. Central to this account, is how Paul, while in connection to Māori, has acknowledged the experience of Māori as different from Pākehā as a positive experience. Paul's account arose in response to a question about positive experiences in the Māori cultural learning context.

The next and final account in the resource demonstrates a struggle with encountering Māori difference from Pākehā, while in connection with Māori. This particular

explanation came about in response to questions to Susan. She was asked whether Pākehā was a label for her ethnicity, and asked to talk more about the unease she mentioned feeling in being treated as a Pākehā separate from Māori in a course context.

> SUSAN I see it [Māori culture] as being quite different than to kind of what my European culture is, but I don't see it as being foreign to myself [.....].Maybe that's why I struggle so much with being identified straight as a Pākehā, maybe that's why I always thought it was a bit offensive. Maybe that's why. It's because it's like, maybe because it's split us in two. You have to be here or here. [Susan uses her hands and arms to signify two separate places, one for Māori and one for Pākehā.] […]. I don't mean fighting or anything. I just mean as two separate entities […]. Maybe that's why I struggle with […] um a discomfort that um being identified as Pākehā is that it seems quite a separate entity from being, identifying as a Māori, and that must be where I feel the negativity of the word is that it doesn't mean that you can have those intertwining stuff. It means that you're separate and you might engage in that world but not be part of that world. There is no, I don't believe there is a name for the um the closest name when I was growing up was half caste. It was a name that gave some mental picture that, oh there's a bit of mixed blood here. Now I can't, I don't have any right to say that about myself because it's not true, but it's kind of what I want to say is like um, I want to say look, I'm born of this English kind of Irish stock, but it doesn't, but I'm inside, I'm kind of mixed up.

This extract arose after Susan had been describing how her rural childhood was intertwined with Māori. Being defined as different from Māori, the separation this generates, is outlined as a struggle for Susan in this account. This extract shows that the bifurcation of bicultural relationship goes against Susan's lived experience, based on her early connection to Māori. Susan's lived experience of having her identity strongly influenced by being amongst Māori, can make being positioned as separate from Māori, a painful dilemma for her to resolve. By defining Pākehā and Māori as different, by separating them, "it's split us in two" and she misses out on all "those [*sic*] intertwining stuff". Resonant with her account in the *authentic connection to Māori* resource, Susan says though she is of English/Irish stock, there is a sense of this identity being mixed with Māori in some way: "inside, I'm kind of mixed up". This identification makes it difficult to fully accept a Pākehāness defined by difference from Māori.

By identifying Māoriness in her Pākehāness, Susan's words, show a quite different concept from the "settler dream" (Lawson, 1995) of displacing the indigenous identity

by inhabiting their space. In fact, the discursive formation of identity in Māori environments early on in Susan's life contributes to her identity, so that it is her own sense of identity that is displaced when Māori and Pākehā are discursively and strategically separated. By almost wishfully thinking that she is mixed-up inside with Māori, Susan takes a very different position towards Māori than if she were to consider herself apart from them. But, the discursive environment that shaped her early on makes the separation that may be needed to recognise difference difficult for her to achieve.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF *identity through connection to Māori* REPERTOIRE

The *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire demonstrates a contrasting way of being Pākehā from the separate-from Māori subject position, commonly attributed to Pākehā. Counter to monocultural notions of Pākehā as separate from Māori and being ignorant of and tending to devalue tikanga Māori, the *being Pākehā and doing as Māori* resource talks of a valued and knowledgeable connection to Māori. The talk demonstrates a hybridity and a connection to Māori that is neither appropriating nor assimilationist; the talk maintains a separate –from- Māori distinction, while demonstrating respect for te reo and tikanga Māori. In doing so, it demonstrates ways of being Pākehā that are in contrast to Pākeha as appropriator and assimilator.

The *being Pākehā and 'do-ing' as Māori* resource illustrates how participants' Pākehāness is formed by their individual, lived experience as they engage with te ao Māori. Therefore, it is also a Pākehāness in contrast to that created by the separateness of Māori and Pākehā, a separateness that is fundamental to the identity-construction work of current discourses of biculturalism (Campbell, 2005; Jellie, 2001; Maclean, 1996). The talk in the *being Pākehā and 'do-ing' as Māori* resource shows participants' capacities as bridge-makers between the two cultures. The talk adds diversity to understanding of ways of being Pākehā because it is a Pākehāness informed by Māoriness. Diversity is also shown in the way the participants' "doing as Māori" shifts according to context.

Consistent with the above resource, the *authentic connection to Māori* resource troubles the construction of Pākehā as separate from Māori. This resource focuses on the way experiences of contact with te ao Māori, formed in childhood, in a different discursive

social environment, are spoken of as an authentic connection to Māori, influencing participants' senses of their own identity.

Rather than the hegemonic conception that constructs New Zealanders, Pākehā and Māori, as one people (Mikaere, 2005), the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource largely shows participants' talk as acknowledging difference from Māori while expressing connection with Māori. In this way, the resource is in contrast to Pākehā as either separate from Māori or as appropriating of Māori when not separate. The resource is also in contrast with Pākehā as assimilationist, in contrast with Pākehā conflating Māori with Pākehā into 'one people'. This resource continues to demonstrate a connected relationship to Māori rather than a bifurcated one or an assimilationist one.

The diversity of Pākehā is shown in this resource, by talk that shows relationship to Māori is fundamental to Pākehā identity, rather than the more common notion of Pākehā identity being built on relationship to land (Bell, 2004a; King, 1985). Two accounts from the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource describe how Pākehā, as an identity that meets and engages with Māori while acknowledging difference from Māori, is an identity ignored in the media. This lack of representation of the participants' ways of being Pākehā is in contrast to the commonly-accepted dominance of Pākehā representation in the media (Barclay & Liu, 2003; McGregor & Comrie, 2002). Such talk signals an absence of diversity in the representation of Pākehā in the media.

Paul's account from the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource shows the Māori cultural learning context providing the opportunity for Pākehā to be connected to Māori while acknowledging Māori difference. By encountering the other, by subjecting himself to their language and culture as a learner, Paul as a Pākehā develops a new appreciation for the ways Māori tikanga is different from Pākehā tikanga. In doing so, he takes up a contrasting subject position, demonstrating a diversity from that which is commonly constructed for Pākehā: Pākehā as assimilationist and Pākehā as appropriator. This fourth account in the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource shows how the Māori cultural learning context can teach Pākehā about Māori cultural difference without the experience being necessarily one of appropriation or assimilation. Largely, the extracts in this resource have shown how Māori cultural contexts have been

valuable for understanding, defining, acknowledging, and developing a sense of difference from Māori, rather than a sense of sameness.

The resource shows, in the last account, though, that separation based on the defining of Māori as different from Pākehā can be difficult for Pākehā to negotiate, when a lot of their early lived experience has been in Māori environments. The diversity of the lived experience of some Pākehā can then conflict with the discursive environment that positions Māori and Pākehā as separate. The 'we are one people' discourse commonly suggests that Māori are or should be just like Pākehā (McCreanor, 1995); whereas, Susan's previous account says, I, a Pākehā, feel a Māori response in some situations. To interpret this resistance to separation from Māori as seeking power through assimilation obliterates the complexity of the lived experience that can be the outcome of early relationship with Māori. When Pākehā identities are formed in early life in a Māori environment, people can struggle to find a 'home' in the current discursive environment of Māori-Pākehā relations. Some Māori have also written of a struggle, in mediating this environment that bifurcates Māori and Pākehā (Bevan, 2000; Collins, 2004; Meredith, 1998). Strategic, collective positioning of Pākehā and of Māori, that neglects the entangled relationship, conflicts with and creates inner conflicts in the lived experience of some Pākehā as well as some Māori.

The *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire has largely demonstrated that, in contrast to the discursive construction of Pākehā as separate from Māori, the participants enjoy and are enriched by a Pākehāness that is informed by a strong sense of connection to Māori. By doing so, the participants demonstrate more diverse ways of being Pākehā, ways that demonstrate a border-crossing tendency and a bridge-building capacity between the two cultures.   While this repertoire has demonstrated that participants share in a sense of connection to Māori, the next repertoire, *resisting the other Pākehā identity*, focuses on how that sense of respectful, aware connection to te ao Māori and its concerns, can mean some participants share a sense of disconnection from other Pākehā.

Resisting the other Pākehā identity REPERTOIRE

This repertoire is built around participants' data that spoke of their experience of being Pākehā as different from that prevalently-attributed to being Pākehā. It is this dominant, prevalently-attributed way of being Pākehā that the "other Pākehā identity" in the repertoire title refers to. The data generated by the participants' talk was organised into four resources: first, responses that spoke of resisting how others perceive and identify Pākehā; second, talk that challenged those other Pākehā; third, talk that spoke of being threatened by those other Pākehā; and fourth, responses that talked of resisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā. This sense of difference and separation from other Pākehā has also been found amongst bicultural Pākehā and Pākehā learners in Māori contexts by Campbell (2005), Jellie (2001) and Barnes (2005).

Resisting the way others perceive Pākehā RESOURCE

This resource is organised around the central idea that participants sometimes resist the way they are being perceived as Pākehā, by others. Data belonging to this resource showed participants resisting a number of perceptions of them as Pākehā. Research participants talked of resisting perceptions and judgements from other Pākehā of them as naïve for wanting to learn te reo; not being European-identified enough; and being closed to issues of Māori justice are some examples of the data belonging to this resource. The two extracts I have selected to exemplify this resource though, show the participant resisting perceptions of being 'Pākehā and superior' and resisting perceptions of being 'Pākehā and racist'.

This first account came in response to a question about how others' reactions to Susan in the Māori cultural learning context affect her, and this account also comes in response to my follow-up question, which the ellipses signify, about how Susan manages the anxiety which she had previously mentioned that her white skin can create for her in Māori settings.

> SUSAN But we are perceived in, as we walk into the [Māori cultural learning context], in a white skin. Do they think that we come being superior? And our, my uneasiness is that, but what if every ten people, ten Pākehā people before me come here with that [superior attitude]? Am I going to be put in the pool of Pākehā people who are not good for Māori people? [.....].I'm just going to have to work out some real strong strategies [...]. Because I get a strong sense that people look at me and see

a middle-class, European or Pākehā person, but I kind of want to scream and go oh but I'm much more, you know.

The above account demonstrates how being Pākehā brings concern about unwelcome perceptions to Susan. Susan describes the way that as a Pākehā, she senses the likelihood of being perceived as having superior attitudes towards Māori. Citing how dominant Pākehā may hold this superior attitude -- "[W]hat if every ten people, ten Pākehā people before me come here with that?" -- Susan shows she understands how this perception by Māori has come about. Despite this, she is made uneasy by this perception. Susan feels she is judged alongside the Pākehā stereotype, and she struggles against that.

Using the metaphor of being "put in the pool of Pākehā people who are not good for Māori people", Susan graphically describes her sense of powerlessness at being positioned as part of a group who hold destructive and superior attitudes, counter to her own, towards Māori. In order to resist these perceptions of herself because she is a Pākehā, Susan describes herself as having "to work out some real strong strategies". The word "strategies" is often used to convey a tool for gaining power. Strategies are used here to gain power over a sense of powerlessness about being perceived as wielding destructive power. That the restriction of the positioning makes her want "to scream" shows the strength of the emotions that are involved.

The first account selected to represent this resource shows how being in the Māori cultural learning context has enabled Susan to get a sense of how frustrating it can be to be positioned according to assumptions based on skin colour. It is interesting to note that unwelcome positioning, based on incorrect assumptions arising from appearance, is a well-acknowledged component of the lived experience of Māori, while this aspect of lived experience for Pākehā is not at all well-documented.

The next extract continues to talk of strong feelings about others' assumptions and positioning. The following account arose from a section of the interview where the themes were about Susan's response to being on the course, to representations of Pākehā and about whether Susan thought her way of being Pākehā was typical or less common.

SUSAN You know it makes me really angry that other European people think because I've got a white skin, they think I'm going to fall into step with these racist comments. […]. I shut my mouth a lot around European Pākehā people. Um, if I feel that um, if I feel any um this will be like talking to a brick wall because we won't get into a discussion here, it will be um, then I'll just kind of shut my mouth. But if I feel there is some room for movement, you know on both ways, then um, to keep myself safe is about not accepting those racist stuff, that's how. Because it really impacts on me, I don't like it at all.

Being positioned as racist because of having a white skin, although that positioning is misguided and unwelcome is the focus of this account. In contrast to the idea that whiteness brings welcome privilege, Susan's accounts speak of the unwelcome restrictions and limitations that her white skin brings. This account describes how she is positioned by 'her own', through their assumptions that she will share in their racist attitudes. "Shutting her mouth" is not her only strategy; she speaks when there is a sense of potential for "movement". In this way, Susan shows she does act as a political and cultural bridge-maker sometimes, when the circumstances show her she will not be "talking to a brick wall". The different behaviour according to context also demonstrates the way Susan's level of active postcolonial-ness changes according to context. Interestingly, Susan finds safety in speaking out, in trying to build bridges between peoples. Speaking out keeps her safe from the way the assumptions, the positioning and the racism "really impact[] on her". The bridge-maker theme between the participant's support of te ao Māori and "those other Pākehā" continues in the following resource.

Challenging those other Pākehā RESOURCE

This resource is organised around participants' experience of challenging those other Pākehā. Data, identified as belonging to this resource which I have not presented here, showed participants challenging other Pākehā political points of view regarding Māori issues. Participants acknowledged that being part of a Māori cultural learning context had contributed to their ability to see social issues from a Māori perspective, which often put them in a position of defending the Māori point of view in social issues arguments and challenging 'those other Pākehā'. The extract I have selected to exemplify this resource shows Trudy's response to those Pākehā who say there is no

value in learning te reo Māori. This data came when I asked Trudy about what responses she has had from people to her being on the course.

> TRUDY They say, "Why would you do that thing of learning the language and going in there? I mean there's no value in it." The challenges are more for me actually remembering this learning, allowing it to inform my daily life to such a degree that I'm actually able to talk with other Pākehā who do have a block about it. That's the challenge, […] a sense of shame and, and embarrassment at times, you know, for my other people, you know other Pākehā people, strongly.

Here, Trudy is describing the way that by learning te reo she meets with disparaging comments from other Pākehā. She resists the opinions of those who believe that learning te reo is a waste of time. Trudy is prepared to challenge the perceptions of those "other Pākehā".

While challenging those "other Pākehā", Trudy is conscious of needing to reach them. She uses her learning on the course as a means to reach those other Pākehā "who do have a block about" the value of te reo learning. The extract indicates how being on the course in a Māori cultural learning context provides Trudy with opportunities to educate other Pākehā. Having crossed the border into te ao Māori, she takes on a political and cultural bridge-maker role with other Pākehā.

The notion of a distinct and separate line being drawn between herself as a Pākehā is strongly delineated at the end of the extract where powerfully-emotive words are used for this distinction: "a sense of shame and, and embarrassment at times […] for […] other Pākehā people strongly". Yet, Trudy also describes them as "my other people", indicating how she both belongs and does not belong with this group.

Being threatened by those other Pākehā RESOURCE
This resource continues to display the sense of resistance towards those other Pākehā, but it shows this resistance to be an experience that is threatening and confronting. Other data that supported this resource included participants being selective about whom they shared their resistant beliefs with and sometimes watering down the expression of their resistant beliefs when with those other Pākehā.

The single account I selected to illustrate this resource comes from a time in the interview when I was asking Lisa about the kind of reactions she has had from others to her being on the course.

> LISA Um, you know I've had kind of when I was telling people that kind of, that's what I was doing. Um, I've had like answers or you know, people saying why would you want to do that? It's a dying culture, a dying language. And I just remember hearing that […]. Their views are totally against what I see. So there's been um some quite challenging questions come up. Um, and even confronting, because it's something that like I feel really, I kind of feel threatened I suppose because it's part of me, you know. Um, and I feel like I'm like um, yeah but then I'm like no, a little bit threatened maybe you know, by, by um people not understanding.

Lisa's account continues to demonstrate the emotionally-charged nature of the participants' resistance to some other Pākehā. Rather than challenging others, she describes a kind of withdrawal. Lisa describes herself as personally attacked, because of her close identification with te reo learning and with the value of tikanga Māori. In her relationships with other Pākehā, with other white people, her experience is not one of being privileged by the dominant status of a powerful group. She describes being marginalised and threatened by 'her own'.

Resisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā RESOURCE

This resource is based on the idea that to be a Pākehā can mean feeling a need to resist on an individual level a lot of the negative associations and connotations of being part of a Pākehā collective. Data about this individual resistance to the negative connotations of the collective Pākehā label, demonstrates how naming oneself Pākehā and being Pākehā can immediately bring awareness of colonising history, and of contemporary dominance.

The first of the two accounts I have chosen to illustrate this resistance follow. This extract arose when Susan was answering a question about whether anything of significance had been left out in the interview, whether there was more she wanted to say.

> SUSAN In my personal life, in my personal life there's been a lot of negativity around Māori and their culture and um and so that's why I

struggle to be Pākehā […]. For me, a lot of Pākehā people behave quite negatively towards that cultural stuff. I don't want to be part of a culture that um sees itself as the dominant, you know this is the way and the only way, I don't want to be part of that.

Susan's account describes her refusal to take up the dominance that is part of the ascribed status of being Pākehā. From her own experience of the Pākehā around her, she positions Pākehā as closely aligned to negative attitudes to Māori culture and this makes it difficult to avow a Pākehā identity. In taking up a Pākehā identity she needs to work at ways to resist assumptions of dominance. This ambivalent relationship to the label Pākehā continues in the following account.

> PAUL It's kind of a constraining thing in the sense that Pākehā is negative really in a, in a, I mean historically Pākehā came and disrupted and colonised and, and did nasty things to Māori culture, so yeah, I guess it makes sense that I resist that identity a bit […]. I'm just explaining why I probably don't, don't like to identify with that label because I guess it is a bit, to me there are those negative connotations around Pākehā […..]. I don't think it has to be negative, it's negative if I don't do anything with it. It's negative if oh yes, I'm a, I'm a colonising Pākehā and you know but I think it can be positive if, if I own, if I kind of take up the criticisms that are in that.

At first, Paul describes resisting the ascriptions of being Pākehā. Further comment in the account shows how his relationship to the attribution of Pākehā as colonist moves, if he "takes up" the criticism implicit in the attribution. At first he says he "resist[s] that identity"; then he says that the attribution of colonist doesn't "have to be negative" if he "does something with it". This account shows how Paul's active postcolonial-ness shifts according to context, and with it his own relationship to the label Pākehā. In this account, Paul shows that both ways of being Pākehā are open to him, depending on how he exercises his agency at the given time. The name Pākehā brings colonising history to the surface. It is not that Paul denies that history. Other accounts show him fully acknowledging the consequences of Pākehā colonisation of Aotearoa. But he can find that history of colonisation constraining on a personal level if it is associated with expectations about him predicated on that history. Paul then goes on to make the distinction between being a Pākehā who acknowledges the history and does something about it and being a Pākehā who does nothing about it.

Interestingly, in the *being aware of Pākehā privilege in the Māori cultural learning context* resource and in the *valuing of the learning of te reo resource* Paul exhibits the ways that in other contexts, at other times, he immediately "take[s] up" the criticisms of Pākehā as colonist. In this way, the data shows the meaning Paul gives to being Pākehā, his subject position in relation to Pākehā as colonist, shifts according to intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts. What Paul demonstrates here is how a postcolonial position, that acknowledges colonisation, is not always fixed; it can be a position that participants can move in to or away from at different times.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF THE *resisting the other Pākehā identity* REPERTOIRE

The repertoire has demonstrated the diversity of resistance that in part makes up the experiences of and responses to being Pākehā from Pākehā who have chosen to experience being part of Māori cultural learning contexts. The accounts show a degree of struggle, feeling of challenge and sense of threat as the participants defend themselves from other Pākehā, as they negotiate negative attributions of being Pākehā, and as they use their experience of crossing borders to act as bridge-makers between their ways of being Pākehā and others' ways. Words such as "I want to scream", "really impacts on me" and "shame and embarrassment" show the emotional intensity of these experiences for the participants.

Significantly, a number of the accounts have shown the work participants put in to enact their ways of being Pākehā. Pākehā is not a stable, passive group identity of privilege, dominance, unity, superiority. The repertoire illustrates the work participants put in to the dynamic relationships that exist between themselves and their ascribed identity as Pākehā, and between themselves and those other Pākehā (who no doubt have their own diversities). The repertoire illustrates, also, the work participants engage in as they dynamically shape and construct their ways of being Pākehā. The work of being postcolonial and Pakeha shifts according to context.

Susan and Paul's accounts show the way that at times the resources they use can sound similar to those deployed by Pākēhā in the service of continued dominance and minimisation of the impacts of colonisation, identified by Wetherell and Potter (1992) and McCreanor (1995). Susan's account, though, acknowledges Pākehā as a dominant entity, whilst describing her own resistance to a complacent adoption of that dominance,

and also describing how she wants, as an individual, to hold herself separate from the adoption and attribution of that dominance. In his account describing the attribution of dominance as personally constraining, Paul also talks of the way that "taking up" the attribution, by acknowledging the historical and contemporary reality of Pākehā as colonist, releases him from that sense of constraint.

While being a postcolonial Pākehā has been described as being a journey of stages (Campbell, 2005; Huygens, 2002; Nairn, 2001), a number of accounts in these resources, in particular Paul's account in the r*esisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā* resource, suggest that these stages can be concurrent with each other within the one individual, rather than fixed and linear.

The *resisting the other Pākehā identity* repertoire has illustrated that being Pākehā is not automatically experienced as consistently powerful or unified, experiences often assumed as belonging to majority group members as a given. Neither is being Pākehā consistently experienced as postcolonial.

The first two of the five interpretative repertoires have been presented. The first repertoire has shown how participants' talk speaks of Pākehā ways of being that are connected to Māori rather than separate, and it is a connection built on respect. The second repertoire has shown the way that participants resist Pākehā stereotypes of dominance. Also, this second repertoire has introduced the way that for participants a postcolonial orientation can be negotiated according to interpersonal and intrapersonal contexts. To further understand the meanings that these participants, who have engaged with te ao Māori in educational settings bring to being Pākehā, a further three interpretative repertoires are presented.

The third and fourth repertoires, the *awareness of privilege* repertoire and the *valuing of knowledge* repertoire, continue to demonstrate subject positions that are largely in contrast to those identified as prevalent amongst Pākehā. The final repertoire in the findings, the *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire, focuses on the way that participants demonstrate that being Pākehā can involve taking up a range of subject positions.

Awareness of privilege REPERTOIRE

One of the broad patterns that the data generated from the participants' responses was talk which spoke from the subject position of Pākehā as aware of being privileged; participants' talk acknowledged that being Pākehā brought privileges. This talk was organised around the *awareness of privilege* repertoire. This repertoire data was organised into two resources: first, one that talked of how awareness of Pākehā privilege can be positive; and second, one that spoke of how participants were aware of Pākehā privilege in Māori cultural learning contexts.

Being aware of Pākehā privilege is positive RESOURCE

The two accounts I have chosen to illustrate this resource demonstrate participants' talk valuing the awareness of privilege. The first account shows how being Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context has provided Paul with the opportunity of developing acute senses of his own privilege. The first account I have selected to illustrate the resource arose when I asked Paul to talk about any difficult experiences he had as a Pākehā in the Māori cultural learning contexts where he had studied.

> PAUL: I think some of those bad experiences were, were good in the sense that they were a bit of a wake up and um I should have felt uncomfortable. […] I mean it's very easy to just take stuff, take privilege for granted […]. There are some things that are really unjust at the moment, you know, and that, some of that personal discomfort connects with some of that and that's probably a good thing. So I'm not exactly, I guess I'm trying to say that some of the negative experiences can also be understood as positive in the sense that they connected with hugely negative things that I wasn't aware of and it was, it's probably a good thing to become a bit more aware of them.

Describing his sense of privilege as a 'wake-up', Paul shows this waking-up comes about through a process of "personal discomfort" in a Māori cultural learning context. That Paul had been blind to the "really unjust" and "hugely negative" things for Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand society shows how effectively Pākehā privilege is masked. Engaging with the Māori cultural learning context made Pākehā privilege visible to Paul. The account also demonstrates Paul's welcoming this "personal discomfort" as a "good thing" because it disturbed his taken "for granted" sense of his own privilege. The visibility of his own privilege brought with it awareness of current injustice for Māori, and how he as a Pākehā was implicated in that. He understood the "wake-up" call to his Pākehā privilege to be a "positive" thing.

The second account in the *being aware of Pākehā privilege is positive* resource comes from a follow-up interview with Susan. I asked her to talk about what had changed when she started to name herself Pākehā. Having stated that she had begun educating herself about Māori, she said the following:

> SUSAN: The challenge is not to take it [privilege] on board and carry it around personally. I think acknowledging that I am in a position of privilege, you know I've had food on the table and jobs and da de da and yeah many haven't and some of that is because of um simply that they were Māori. They were, they were treated very differently. They had not the same entitlements, they had, you know, and some of that continues today and um, so acknowledging the truth about that is quite empowering, isn't it, because you can move on and ask what can I do about it?

This extract shows Susan understanding that her privilege has been created for her because in the past Māori did not have "the same entitlements". She recognises that some of this inequity between Pākehā and Māori continues presently. "Acknowledging the truth" about this is not an automatic given. She suggests there is a choice to be made about acknowledging the past, unjust treatment of Māori and the past and present entitlement of Pākehā, or not. She chooses to acknowledge this privilege of Pākehā entitlement. In an interesting turn of phrase, this acknowledgment is experienced as "empowering". Rather than this empowerment passively adding to acceptance of a sense of assumed, unacknowledged, yet lived privilege, Susan uses the term "empowering" to describe the ability to act against this privilege. In this way, the awareness she has gained of her own privilege, partly from being educated about Māori, becomes a positive force for action.

Susan clearly acknowledges the impact of colonisation on Māori. While distancing herself, as an individual, from the unjust acts of the past and the present, and while recognising that her privilege is a result of those acts, Susan resists taking the accusation of privilege "on board [to] carry it around personally". She uses her personal agency to choose to act against structural privilege, yet recommends against the individual's taking full responsibility for structural inequalities. For Susan, the recognition that her privilege was created structurally, empowers her to use her individual agency to act with responsibility for an outcome that helps redress the inequalities and injustices. In this

way, Susan constructs awareness of privilege as positive, because acknowledgement of privilege is a catalyst for action.

Being aware of Pākehā privilege in Māori learning context RESOURCE

This resource is organised around participants' descriptions of how their awareness of Pākehā privilege makes them unwilling to repeat such privilege in the Māori cultural learning context.

This first account emerged in response to questions about times when Beth became aware of being Pākehā while on the course and about what being Pākehā meant to Beth.

> BETH: I think that being in te ao Māori […] sometimes I forget that I'm Pākehā and sometimes I'm really aware of it […]. It's like if I'm asked to do a karanga I kind of think twice and look around to see if there's a Māori person who can do it instead of me, because I haven't got the whakapapa […]. I'm just mindful not to trample on anyone. So I might ask, you know, and look around or ask if anyone else wants to, is going to do it, but if there's not, then I will. [.....] I am Pākehā […]. I'm a Pākehā who has been privileged to have been able to learn a huge amount of mātauranga Māori .

Beth describes being able to learn mātauranga Māori as a privilege. This statement reflects her respect for te ao Māori and her valuing of the ako she has been involved in. Recognition of privilege is further evident when, going on to describe when she is most aware of being Pākehā in the Māori cultural learning context, Beth chooses those moments when as a Pākehā she is put in a higher position than the Māori around her. When asked to do a karanga (usually the role of the senior kuia), she demonstrates her awareness of Pākehā as privileged by asking whether anyone else wants to karanga, so as to be "mindful not to trample on anyone". This part of the account demonstrates Beth's awareness of the privilege and power relationships that exist within te ao Māori amongst Māori, at the same time as being sensitive to and acting responsibly with regard to the structural power and privilege Pākehā have over Māori outside of te ao Māori.

Even while in the Māori cultural learning context, this extract suggests that Beth is aware of the structural privilege that exists for her outside of the Māori cultural learning context and she is careful not to reproduce this in the Māori context. Despite this

privilege, Beth acknowledges she lacks an important, alternative source of privilege in the Māori context: she has no whakapapa. This lack also influences her being "mindful not to trample on anyone". This example shows that privilege for Pākehā is not a static entity, continuously present, continually the same, and how engaging with the Māori cultural learning context can disrupt an assumed sense of that continuous 'white' privilege.

The second account in the *being aware of Pākehā privilege in Māori learning context* resource comes from responses to questions to Paul about what feelings he had about being Pākehā while being on the course, about why he thought he had the feelings and whether they changed depending on how inside or outside of the tikanga of the course he felt himself to be.

> PAUL: In the case of Māori and Pākehā differences, the awkwardness is exacerbated by the historical conflicts, and the continuing socio-economic differences and so on […]. I was blessed by so much tuition in te reo that it got to the point where in terms of understanding what was said during whaikōrero, karakia and so on, I was more 'on the inside' than many of the Māori students […]There was also a continual awareness of how much this proficiency was evidence of privilege […..]. It's, I guess, given the history and given the situation, sort of political situation with Pākehā and Māori, it is a touchy thing. It can be quite dodgy when Pākehā are involved um, not, I mean it's nice when Pākehā are supporting Māori initiatives and stuff, but it becomes, I can see why people are sensitive and, and uncomfortable when Pākehā are sort of leading stuff or guiding stuff or being involved in management of stuff that's, you know, has to do with Māori culture and language […..]. But even if I was just nominally Māori, if I had a whakapapa, you know, some Māori blood as they say, then I think I would have stayed […]. I think the Pākehā identity made an important difference.

This account shows Paul immediately recognising the current and past inequalities of the Māori-Pākehā relationship. Paul then describes how his awareness of privilege as a Pākehā is heightened in the Māori cultural learning context, because the amount of teaching he received and his resulting acumen has expanded his privilege. Sensitive to his identity as a Pākehā in the Māori cultural learning context, because of Pākehā who have appropriated Māori culture and colonised Māori people, he says that he felt uncomfortable that his new knowledge and awareness resulted in his being "more 'on the inside' than many of the Māori students". He was sensitive to this positioning of

him, a privileged Pākehā, "on the inside", over and above those students with whakapapa.

Taking a leadership role (Paul was now becoming a tutor), felt "touchy' and "dodgy"… "given the history and […] political situation with Pākehā and Māori". This awkwardness contributed to his deciding to leave the Māori cultural learning context. His reluctance could be seen as an escape from the responsibility that comes with power and honour in the Māori world, yet at the same time, he may have sensed that the responsibility and honour was not truly his, despite the offer. In this extract, Paul's sense of privilege as a Pākehā hindered him from developing a full involvement in te reo learning and teaching. Lacking whakapapa, he felt he lacked the right to excel or lead. Although, the sense of privilege is constructed as hidden from Pākehā in a lot of the literature, Paul's awareness of privilege as a Pākehā is clearly evident in this account.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF *awareness of privilege* REPERTOIRE

Structural inequities, historically produced by colonisation, have been hidden from Pākehā. This hiddenness has helped support an idea amongst Pākehā of a class-less, egalitarian society, enabling many Pākehā to be unaware of their structural privilege. In fact, this avoidance of a sense of privilege has been identified as a potential cultural attribute of Pākehā (Campbell, 2005; Maclean, 1996). The monocultural social context, the dominant, invisible background of white, western, New Zealand-ness, which is a product of colonisation, can mask Pākehās' sense of their own privilege. In this way, the invisibilising of dominance which whiteness theorists have identified as a part of being white (Jackson, 1999; Krizek, 2006; Schlunke, 2004) is relevant to Pākehā. The *awareness of privilege* repertoire focuses on data that acknowledges the privileges inherent in being Pākehā.

Susan's and Paul's accounts in the *being aware of Pākehā privilege is positive* resource are in contrast to prevalently expressed resentment in response to attributions of privilege to Pākehā (Chateau, 1989; Haden, 1990; Wall, 1986). Such writing rejects any suggestions of complicity, and of responsibility, of Pākehā with the privileges colonisation has brought about. In direct contrast to Pākehā responding to attributions of privilege as an insult or as an assault, Paul's and Susan's accounts in the *being aware of*

Pākehā privilege is positive resource value and welcome the awareness of privilege. Awareness of privilege in these accounts is constructed as a welcome 'wake-up' and a valued platform for action: it is positive.

In contrast to being Pākehā amongst a mono-cultural background that invisibilises privilege, being Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context can bring awareness of privilege to the fore. Rather than turning away from acknowledging his privilege, Paul's account in the *being aware of Pākehā privilege in the Māori cultural learning context* resource demonstrates acceptance of personal unsettling. Such unsettling exemplifies the pedagogy of discomfort that Jones and Jenkins endorse as an educational approach that 'wakes up' the coloniser to their privilege (Jones, 1999, 2002). Paul's account is also indicative of the value of Pākehā engaging with Māori cultural learning contexts for the processes of conscientisation and personal and social transformation that New Zealand academics and activists have identified as valuable as part of the process of finding more equitable and socially just ways of being Pākehā (Bell, 2004a; Huygens, 2002; Huygens et al., 2003; Margaret, 2002a; Nairn, 2001, 2002). Paul's extract illustrates a Pākehā willing to be 'unsettled', 'troubled', 'discomforted' by the unjust and negative aspects of the other's lived reality. Hence, his is a subject position in direct contrast to those described as traditionally belonging to Pākehā: ones that deny cultural, social difference and Pākehā privilege. Of course, his own subject position regarding the acknowledgement of these things shifts according to context as other accounts show.

The structurally-embedded power relations, resulting from colonisation, and actions of the Crown, and from the contemporary, political, social and discursive environment that maintains the ideological relations of dominance inform both Beth's and Paul's actions as they negotiate their privilege. In the *being aware of Pākehā privilege in Māori learning context* resource, structural privilege of being Pākehā is negotiated alongside the cultural privilege of whakapapa. The parts of Beth's and Paul's accounts in that resource which speak of being without whakapapa show how the Māori cultural learning context can provide majority culture members with experiences that disrupt any sense of assumed privilege. Their response to their sense of privilege is reflexive. Despite being offered leading roles, they are hesitant to take them. This caution points to an unresolved unease in negotiating Pākehā privilege in Māori cultural learning contexts.

Beth's and Paul's accounts intimate an acknowledgment that learning of te reo and tikanga Māori is not to be received lightly, is not just a freely available 'bonus' for living in New Zealand, in other words something to be readily appropriated, it is a learning and a knowledge of revered worth. They suggest that being allowed access to learning te reo and tikanga Māori is a privilege rather than a right. Their talk also demonstrates a 'wish to know' that is not premised on the 'wish for power' (Jones, 1999, 2002). Their talk shows how engagement with Māori cultural learning contexts can be a place to become more aware of Pākehā privilege and to work at ways of negotiating their Pākehā privilege in relationship with Māori.

The *awareness of privilege* repertoire conveys participants' desire not to be blind to their privilege as Pākehā. The repertoire is in contrast to the discourses identified as deployed by Pākehā (McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) to continue invisible dominance through blindness to privilege. The participants demonstrate diversity in ways of being Pākehā by taking up alternative subject positions to those that these other discourses provide. In doing so, they can be seen as building political bridges between Māori and Pākehā in local, social contexts.

This repertoire has outlined the way that participants are aware of their privilege as Pākehā. The theme of contrast to dominant discourses this repertoire achieves continues in the following repertoire. The *valuing of knowledge* repertoire concentrates on participants' valuing of learning about history, and about te ao Māori.

Valuing of knowledge REPERTOIRE

Valuing of knowledge was identified as a central pattern of the data that participants' talk generated. Participants all spoke of valuing learning te reo and tikanga Māori. Some of the data with this focus spoke of the value of Pākehā learning te reo for future Pākehā generations; of the value of Pākehā learning te reo me ona tikanga for the health of contemporary social relations; and the data spoke of the value of Pākehā learning te reo me ona tikanga as a means to learn about New Zealand's indigenous culture and develop as Pākehā an open-ness and sense of responsibility to the indigenous language and culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Valuing the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori RESOURCE

Three accounts demonstrating the esteem in which te reo is held, and the social and political importance participants attribute to the learning of it, have been selected to illustrate this resource. The first account came in response to a question that asked Lisa why she is doing the course.

> LISA: I would love to pass on my love of, of Māori, of Māoritanga and, and hopefully my knowledge of Māori and te reo onto, onto the next generation, you know.

Here, Lisa, who wishes to become a teacher of te reo, speaks of her love of tikanga Māori and of te reo. She is keen to share her knowledge and values the contribution that her love of and potential knowledge of te reo and tikanga Māori can have for the future generation. In this extract she describes her aspiration to fulfil a bridge-maker role between the two cultures. While this account speaks about valuing the passing on of love of and, hopefully knowledge of te reo in the future, the following account widens that value for the future to a wider context. When asked about the value of the course for being bicultural, Brian says the following:

> BRIAN: For biculturalism to work is to be the best society you can be, it means that Pākehā do need to do what I've done in that learn a little bit more. But we are a minority. There aren't a lot doing that […]. It's been valuable for me and I think it would be valuable for everyone. I would love to see, I would love to see Māori taught in every school […]. I think it would be, it would be a big step forward.

Brian in this account acknowledges that, as a Pākehā learning te reo, he is currently in the minority. If everyone learnt te reo at school, he considers that learning would have the power to work towards "the best society you can be". While this account speaks about valuing such widespread learning of te reo as potentially a "big step forward" for Aotearoa-New Zealand, the following account also values te reo learning as contributing to the social health of this country.

This third account in the *valuing the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori* resource emerged in response to a question about how the sense of social responsibility that Paul has described as arising from engaging in the Māori cultural learning context, has

evolved. I have inserted some words in square brackets to aid in understanding the account and to give clarity in the text that was apparent in the interview context.

> PAUL: I feel like it's, it's kind of absurd to pay lip service to the Treaty and all this kind of stuff and not learn any [te reo and tikanga Māori]. […] But when I first started learning the language, there was none of that kind of sense of, of responsibility as, you know, in terms of all that kind of stuff.

This account values te reo learning and the learning about tikanga Māori as a means for Pākehā to meet the responsibility of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Māori cultural learning context and learning te reo has brought him awareness of his responsibility as a Pākehā. The phrase "pay lip service" to the Treaty suggests a distinction between real and fake engagement of Pākehā with Treaty issues resonant with Campbell's findings about the distinctions between heart biculturalism and fake biculturalism (2005). This account shows how Paul as a Pākehā has progressed on a journey of awareness. The learning of te reo and about tikanga Māori has been fundamental to his journey as a Pākehā in relationship with the Treaty.

The social and political value of knowledge is continued as a theme in the following *valuing of the learning of history* resource. This resource concentrates on the valuing of knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand's history for the many social benefits it brings.

Valuing the learning of history RESOURCE

This resource is organised around data that shows participants endorsing the value of learning about the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Four accounts have been selected to illustrate the *valuing the learning of history* resource.

Amongst a response to a question about what she has learned about herself as a Pākehā from being engaged with te ao Māori and the cultural learning context, this extract emerged.

> LISA: I was never taught the history of New Zealand at school, none, none whatsoever. We learned English history. Just so sad. And now I know, you know, I'm learning about the Treaty and, and um and in the process of learning about the pressures of colonisation, not just within um the pressures of colonisation of New Zealand, but also the world […]And it's

having the knowledge of it makes a real big difference and the aspects of
it.

In this account, Lisa immediately connects learning about the history of New Zealand
with learning about colonisation. By doing so, she demonstrates her acceptance that
New Zealand's history is a colonising history. By also immediately characterising the
Treaty as fundamental to New Zealand history, she further creates a subject position in
contrast to that of dominant conceptions of Pākehāness as denying the history and
validity of the Treaty.

Lisa constructs knowing about the history of "the Treaty" and about "the pressures of
colonisation of New Zealand" as making a real big difference". The absence of
education about "the history of New Zealand at school" Lisa experienced in hindsight as
"just so sad". This sense of loss evokes the value that Lisa places on her new learning.
The account shows that knowledge of the history of the Treaty and New Zealand has a
major impact on Lisa.

This second account in this resource comes in response to a question that asked Lisa to
say more about her sense of difference from other Pākehā which she has just mentioned.

> LISA: It's their ignorance basically. It's putting up the barriers and when,
> they [some other Pākehā] don't seem to know or even are willing to know
> about our history and once they maybe did, maybe they could understand a
> little bit more […]. I think a lot of people were made ignorant about it
> [colonising history of Aotearoa-New Zealand] through education.

Consistent with the above account, this extract also cites the absence of Māori and
Pākehā history in education. In contrast though, this account shows Lisa describing
others' lack of knowledge of history, rather than only her own. Interestingly, the phrase
"made ignorant" suggests an active project against people knowing about Māori history.
This phrase constructs ignorance of history as being as active as knowledge of history
can be: ignorance of history arises from action, not just passive inaction. In other words,
ignorance of history has affects and impacts, just as much as knowledge of history.

This second account in the resource shows Lisa concerned about how ignorance of
history can be the basis for other Pākehā "putting up the barriers" towards Māori. She

believes knowledge of the colonising history of Aotearoa-New Zealand could bring understanding about Māori to those other Pākehā who are ignorant of history. The account demonstrates how, in contrast to a conception of Pākehā as uncaring about Māori and the way that history positions them in relation to Māori, Lisa is engaged with considering the social and political impacts of Pākehā relations with Māori that are built on historical ignorance. This passage also shows how, by advocating for the value of the knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand history as a way to break down barriers between Māori and Pākehā, Lisa plays an important role as a bridge-maker.

In this account, Lisa describes her perception of a lack of will amongst Pākehā to learn about history. This lack of will points towards a need for compulsory education about New Zealand-Aotearoa history in schools, which is taken up in the next extract. The next account also describes some of the affects and impacts of ignorance that the previous extract raised. This third account in the *valuing the learning of history* resource came about in response to questions about why Susan was studying the Treaty of Waitangi and about the value of the courses she has been on for becoming more bicultural.

> SUSAN: Without some knowledge of history um, of where we all fit in Aotearoa, then I think there's a great big gap. There's going to be a great big gap and a lack of, a total lack of understanding [.....]. I just think that some of this stuff should be made compulsory at a younger age and that if we all had a sense of history around some of this stuff, we mightn't be so accusing of the people who are standing up now trying to have a voice.

Susan's account demonstrates concern about the impacts of those "without some knowledge of history" of Aotearoa-New Zealand. If history were "made compulsory at a younger age", Susan's social concern about a "great big gap" and a "total lack of understanding" between Pākehā and Māori would be alleviated. The account constructs the lack of knowledge of history as a current and future threat to social well-being. The account also constructs having knowledge of the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand as having the power to 'save' us and welcomes its compulsory learning in schools from an early stage. Knowledge of history is valued as a bridge to enable understanding amongst Pākehā about contemporary Māori resistance and activism.

This third extract in the resource shows Susan further valuing knowledge of history because it enables us to know "where we all fit" in Aotearoa. By implication, it suggests that through learning more about history we are given the means to 'fit'. In contrast to the way the acknowledgement of colonising history has been constituted as troubling for the colonist settler (Bell, 2004a; During, 1985, 1989, 2000; Turner, 1999a, 1999b; Wetherell & Potter, 1992), the kind of 'fitting' this account posits may be understood to accommodate unsettledness and alienation as a basis for 'fitting', for finding a place for Pākehā belonging.

After Trudy has talked about how she had been wanting to learn te reo for many years, I asked what made her ready to learn te reo. This account came about as part of her response.

> TRUDY I'd just done the Treaty of Waitangi course. […]. It was, it was like a kind of er revelation for me because I realised how little I actually knew. Like I knew certain things but I didn't actually know the full story […]. We had said to these people [Māori] that we will have a partnership. That partnership acts as a bowl […] for which the rest of our living actually happens […]. The Treaty defines all of us and it definitely defines me as a Pākehā.

This account values knowledge of the Treaty, and of history, because getting "the full story" brings an understanding about Pākehā definition and belonging. Trudy values knowledge of the Treaty, and of history, because it has the power to bring partnership. Knowledge can bring us all together and define us within a partnership. Here, knowledge of the Treaty is constituted as fundamental to identity, to belonging, to an understanding of the partnership on which Pākehā being and belonging is based.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF *valuing of knowledge* REPERTOIRE

The talk of the participants strongly validated the importance of knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand history. As further demonstration of the diversity of Pākehā, this repertoire creates subject positions for Pākehā in direct contrast to those constructed by and for Pākehā of Pākehā as ignorant and disrespectful of te reo and tikanga Māori, and as threatened by, denying of or romanticising of history. In this repertoire, participants show the construction of new discourses and new subject positions for Pākehā in relation to learning about history.

Ignorance of Aotearoa-New Zealand history is seen as endemic amongst Pākehā, as part of the lack of political will to constitute, through representation, a filled-out subject position or cultural or political identity for Pākehā, and as cause for an emptiness amongst Pākehā as a people (Maclean, 1996; Turner, 1999a, 1999b). Specifically, Trudy's extract in the second resource describes how she as a Pākehā found definition through knowledge of history

Also, in this repertoire, knowledge of history is constituted as a powerful force for social and personal transformation. Evident here is a frustration about and a mourning for the loss of social value that the lack of knowledge of history creates. Evident here is a yearning amongst the participants for the promotion of knowledge of New Zealand history in order to support a social transformation.

This repertoire has indicated a historical awareness, a cultural knowledge and a political and social concern consistent with a postcolonial orientation. Resources in the following *Pākeha as a changeable identity* repertoire focus on showing the way that Pākehā as an identity-construction is not fixed. Parts of previous accounts in previous resources have demonstrated the way that Pākehāness shifts according to contexts. This repertoire focuses in particular on this changeableness of Pākehā identity and shows, amongst other things, how language-use of the participants does not consistently or automatically demonstrate a postcolonial orientation, an orientation of concern, engagement with and awareness about the contemporary and historical impacts of colonisation.

Pākehā as a changeable identity REPERTOIRE

This repertoire is organised around data that demonstrates how being Pākehā is not a fixed, stable, de-contextualised identity. The repertoire demonstrates the way the construction of being Pākehā, can shift around according to interpersonal and intrapersonal contexts, how it can vary between and within individuals, how it crosses borders. The smaller patterns of data that were identified as constituting the *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire were organised into five resources: the *Pākehā as distinct from white and western* resource; the *Pākehā as merged with western* resource; the *Pākehā is limited* resource; the *Pākehā is all-encompassing* resource and the *Pākehā crossing borders into Māori* resource.

The first two resources concentrate on the changeability of Pākehā identity by focusing on how the term Pākehā's relationship to Westerness varies.

Pākehā as distinct from white and Western resource

The *Pākehā as distinct from white and Western* resource positions Pākehā as separate, different, distinct from being western, westerness and western culture. Rather than Pākehā being an empty identity (Bell, 2004a; Maclean, 1996; Turner, 1999a, 1999b), these two accounts describe Pākehā as an identity that brings distinctiveness.

The first account arose from a response to a question that asked Lisa to talk about what had changed for her when she named herself Pākehā.

> LISA: I just thought of myself as white, a white person, but European, a European white person. My ethnicity was white. […] [Naming myself Pākehā] gave me more strength I think because it um it instead of feeling kind of lost in a world of all these kind of different cultures and ethnicities and things of just being a white, farm girl, um being Pākehā gave me a sense of self and identity within only New Zealand or you know with New Zealand and my closeness to it.

Being a "European white person" is usually linked with being privileged, with power. Interestingly, Lisa's account describes feeling "kind of lost" in that white and western identity. The repeated use of the diminutive adverb "just" – "just thought of myself as white" and "just being a white, farm girl" -- increases a description of being white and western as lacking in the privilege of distinction. The label Pākehā enables Lisa to distinguish herself from "just" being white and western. By bringing her "strength" and "a sense of self and identity within only New Zealand", self-naming as Pākehā brings a distinctiveness.

The next extract continues to identify Pākehā as distinct from Westerner. Following Paul's stating that even though he sometimes feels resistant to being a Pākehā (e.g. when Pākehā means being privileged, coloniser, dominant), he immediately goes on to say that there is a lot he loves about Western culture, and after his detailing those things (Western art, music, literature), I ask whether the Pākehā label still enables him to love the Western aspects of culture he has detailed. Paul immediately says the following:

> PAUL Challenges it. Because, because I guess from inside that [Western culture], scientific knowledge is just progress and the accumulation of knowledge and, and you know there's a kind of um, universal sense to it all, and Pākehā relativises it and makes it just another culture and then there's Māori culture that has a completely different set of values and all the rest and yeah, it can be hard to, to attach, well it's probably impossible to attach the same value
> to those things that I love about Western culture, especially in the light of you know some of the negative things that have been done.

This account shows how Paul, moment by moment, shifts around his interpretations of his cultural affiliations, depending on whether he is calling himself Pākehā or not. When he is "inside" Western culture he feels a "universal" sense of everything –its science, knowledge, art, music. When he names himself Pākehā, he describes how Western universality is challenged, becomes "relativise[d]". He describes Westerness as becoming "just another culture" as he names himself Pākehā. Naming himself Pākehā brings to his attention all the "negative things that have been done" in the name of Western universality.

In this account then, Pākehā has a power to displace the universalising capacity of Westerness. Although Pākehā carries with it defined meanings for Paul, the account shows that being Pākehā is an identity that he takes up inconsistently: sometimes, when "inside" western culture, he is not Pākehā. Significantly, Paul demonstrates that being Pākehā is not a consistent subject-position that he inhabits in a fixed, stable way. Paul shows the deft movements of cultural-identity affiliation that language constructs and creates for us, and that we construct and create through language.

In the following resource, Paul demonstrates a relationship between Pākehāness and Westerness that is in contrast to the relationship elaborated in the previous resource.

Pākehā as merged with Western resource

The next resource is organised around data which shows the way that being Pākehā can easily elide into being Western. Other data that supported this resource demonstrated the difficulty for participants of articulating a distinct Pākehā identity. This account comes from a question to Paul asking him about what being Pākehā means to him.

PAUL: Pākehā values and, and language and you know Pākehā culture is so ubiquitous, it's everywhere that I, you know, it's everywhere. It's even the elements of Pākehā culture I guess. I mean I'm not exactly sure how you define Pākehā, but I would think of um you know the English language and even stuff in America and you know, all Western culture um, it's so um in our faces everywhere.

In this account, Pākehāness is ubiquitous. This account aligns Pākehā culture with English, American and Western cultures which are "so in our faces everywhere". In contrast to the above resource, the account positions Pākehā as indistinct from Western identity; Pākehāness is part of other Western cultures, not separate from them.

The two resources above have demonstrated the way that Pākehā relationship to Westerness is not necessarily fixed or stable. The next two resources further demonstrate the changeability of Pākehā as an identity by focusing on the way that participants either fence off parts of themselves from the label Pākehā or, contrastingly, treat Pākehā as an all-inclusive signifier for themselves.

Pākehā is limited resource

These three accounts selected to exemplify this resource show participants who self-identify as Pākehā resist adopting the Pākehā label for more intimate parts of self. This account comes in response to my questions about how Trudy's awareness of her Pākehāness changes according to when she feels really on the inside of the tikanga of the course, really absorbed and part of its processes, compared with when she does not.

TRUDY: I'm not sure how to differentiate my Pākehāness from everything that I am […]. Not that I don't want to be defined as a Pākehā, but just whether there is only, whether this is, whether this [Pākehā] is an all encompassing description of me […]. I think when we're absorbed we're, we're sort of, we're the essence of who we are and I don't think any of us are any, any kind of label.

The account shows Trudy using the idea of an unlabelled essence to distinguish herself from the label Pākeha. Trudy questions whether her or anyone's "essence" can be contained by a label. Trudy is careful to say that she does not want to disown the label Pākehā for herself; yet, she does not consider it an all-encompassing description. Although certain of the limited quality of the label Pākehā, Trudy remains uncertain of exactly how to articulate or resolve the

dilemma of wanting to remain loyal to Pākehā as an identity, while acknowledging it is not an identity that encompasses all of her. Trudy's account identifies a familiar dilemma: how to accommodate the personal self to the cultural or political self (Yeatman, 1995).

The contrast between Pākehā as a consistently accurate label and a label that fits at some times and not others, is further demonstrated in the following account. The second account came when Paul was asked about naming himself Pākehā. Despite Paul saying that he self-identifies as Pākehā, he says,

> PAUL: I don't, when I think of myself you know in a deep sense, I don't really identify with Pākehā all that strongly [.....]. I just don't have a very strong sense of fit really. I feel quite um more sort of fluid. It's hard to describe.

Paul is acknowledging here a fluid quality of his experience of being Pākehā that he has articulated in other accounts. In this account, Paul specifically describes his experience of identity as fluid, rather than just showing it to be so as he does in some of his other accounts. By using "you know" before speaking of experiencing himself "in a deep sense", Paul appears to seek support for the kind of "deep" experience of self he is trying to signify. While "deep sense" of self seems to come close to suggesting an essence of self, which Pākehā does not begin to name, Paul then shows that this deep sense of self is actually "fluid", changing, malleable, and it is for this reason that the term Pākehā does not have a "strong sense of fit really".

The third account in this resource continues to speak of the way that Pākehā is limited. It came amongst a response to a question asking Susan whether it has been easy or difficult to talk about being Pākehā.

> SUSAN: Although that label's okay for me, it's not truly who I am. It's not um it's made me realise that it's um I'll accept it as um the way I'm seen because that's maybe the only way, you know when you have a brief touch with somebody, they can't get to know you […]. It's very much how people view me as opposed to how I view myself.

Susan's "okay" with the label, but it is not "truly" who she is. Despite describing herself elsewhere as self-identifying as a Pākehā, here, ambivalence

arises; she describes seeing Pākehā as an identity that others ascribe to her mostly, rather than one she avows.

These three participants, Susan, Paul and Trudy, use Pākehā in a limited way to identify themselves. They describe how Pākeha limits them as a label, how it is not sufficiently encompassing. The following resource demonstrates a constrasting approach to the label of Pākehā.

Pākehā is all-encompassing resource

In contrast with the above resource, the following two accounts show participants embracing the label Pākehā in a non-limited way. Replying to questions about his cultural sense of being Pākehā, about positive enrichment from being on the course, and how difficult or easy it has been to talk about his Pākehāness, Brian says the following:

> BRIAN: It is definitely difficult to tie down anything specific as a Pākehā. I am a Pākehā so it's quite difficult to know what other people get out of it [.....]. For me it's a state of mind. I mean [...] you've got an hour of me expressing that state of mind. Being a Pākehā is the sum total of my response.

In this account there are no borders between Brian's talk, between his "state of mind" and being Pākehā. He says, I "am" a Pākehā and being Pākehā is my "sum total" he says. Pākehā as similarly encompassing is also signified in the following accounts.

In response to an initial question about what being Pākehā means to Beth, she says the following:

> BETH: Yeah that's who, that's who I am. I fully accept that's who I am. I am Pākehā [...]. I'm a Pākehā who has been privileged to have been able to learn a huge amount of mātauranga Māori. Been privileged [...]. It's a part of me, part of me so therefore because I'm Pākehā, it's a part of me being a Pākehā I suppose

In this account Beth fully accepts the term Pākehā. Pākehā is positioned as the 'umbrella' under which the parts that make her up coalesce.

The above five accounts in the two resources have shown how Pākehā as a label shifts in relation to self, how it can be positioned differently to either encompass or limit self. The next resource shows Pākehā moving across borders into Māori history.

Pākehā crossing borders into Māori resource

This resource was organised around data that showed participants' talk that elided being Pākehā with being Māori, so that a sense of difference between Māori and Pākehā was rendered, at times, indistinct. The account I selected to illustrate this resource came about in response to a question about connections that Lisa developed between the world inside the course and the world outside the course. In response to the question immediately previous to this account, she had commented on how the course, and its encouragement of Māori tikanga, had enlarged her connection with and love for her place of origin: Taranaki.

> LISA: I feel real proud to be a Pākehā from Taranaki. […] Knowing that the staunchness that occurred in Taranaki is part of me, you know, which I'm really proud of. […] I'm not proud of the way that, I mean, Taranaki, the way the confiscations of land in Taranaki were the most horrendous in New Zealand. I'm proud of the Māori history, not the Pākehā, how they stood their ground, you know, Parihaka, how they stood their ground, Te Rongomai, the peaceful standing that they took.

This account makes particular reference to the events at Parihaka, recently characterised as a holocaust carried out by Pākehā on Māori people (Mikaere, 2004). In her enthusiasm to identify with the courageous, humanely-inspired, resistant actions of Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu and their peoples, Lisa describes a sense of pride in these actions as a Pākehā. The pervasiveness of her identification with the Māori historical stance in Taranaki leads her to "feel proud to be a Pākehā from Taranaki". Lisa is aware of the Pākehā history in Taranaki and acknowledges it as "the most horrendous in New Zealand". As Māori actions become a source of inspiration for her as a Pākehā, as a human being, she expresses an ownership of them: "[…] the staunchness that occurred in Taranaki is part of me". At the same time, as claiming ownership, she is allowing Taranaki to claim ownership of her.

Lisa is deploying a resource from Māori tikanga that says the place where you come from is a part of your identity. She shows herself as a Pākehā, an individual whose

collective identity status is postcoloniser, using a Māori custom of identity formation – association with place—to claim the history of a colonised people as her own. Lisa's use of "they" to signify the Māori who acted pacifically at Parihaka, does show Lisa maintaining a boundary between herself as a Pākehā and those Māori at Parihaka. Lisa, though, discursively positions Pākehā as a subject position that identifies completely with the historical actions of Māori, which in turn can expand the multiple meanings of being Pākehā, but not without appearing to transgress boundaries.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF *Pākehā as a changeable identity* REPERTOIRE
In the first two resources, this repertoire focused on the relationship between Pākehāness and Westerness. Four interesting points arose: First, the dominance of the white and western identity can be experienced as disempowering; second, Pākehā can be experienced as a distinct identity; third, Pākehā can be absorbed into the amorphous dominance of westerness as a non-distinct identity. Fourth, looking at the second extract in the *being Pākehā is distinct from western* resource and the single extract selected to exemplify the *being Pākehā is merged with western* resource, the contradictory experience and definition of Pākehā as an identity that is associated with colonising history, an identity that acknowledges being heir to the colonising settlers, and of Pākehā as an identity that is indistinct from Westerness is expressed by the same individual.

Significantly, the first point shows the white and western identity-position is experienced in diverse ways. The second and third points are significant because they express the contrast between Pākehā as an emergent, distinct cultural identity and Pākehā as a mainstream category, signified in the literature (Pearson, 1990; Pearson, 2004; Spoonley, 2007; Spoonley et al., 2004). It is interesting to consider the contrasting interpretations available regarding Pākehā relationship with Westerness. The way Pākehā can be prone to conflation with Westerness is able to be interpreted as Pākehā being oppressed and dominated by Westerness, in ways similar to non-western cultures are similarly dominated. At the same time, the way Pākehā can be conflated with a western identity position is able to be interpreted as Pākehā shoring up colonising and dominating power by aligning with Westerness. While the above points demonstrate how the term Pākehā shifts and moves according to context, the fourth point is particularly indicative of how Pākehā can not be assumed to be experienced or

defined as one set of orientations, or as one set of defined positions, or as having one place in relation to other cultural, political and social discourses.

Paul, seeing himself as both Pākehā with a sense of history (and in previous extracts as having responsibility to learn te reo, as respecting of Māori rights to tino rangatiratanga, as aware of his Pākehā privilege) and as Pākehā, indistinct from being American or English or Western, has importance for any essentialising tendency towards Pākehā identity. It is particularly relevant to the construction of Pākehā that aligns Pākehā identity with a consistently-postcolonial orientation. The dominance of Westerness offering all-pervasive, ubiquitous, subject positions (see Trudy's and Brian's accounts in the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource), and of whiteness as an amorphous status, are very relevant to the Pākehā -- white westerner --identity. Western as neutral and universal is part of the discursive environment's productions of subject positions that the participants negotiate. At times being western—ahistorical, universal, and 'high'-cultured—provides a subject position that participants inhabit. Yeatman has pointed to the ramifications for justice of adopting a sovereign position for self (Yeatman, 1995). The ways this positioning is played out has ramifications for how the consistency of the postcolonial orientation can be seen to be lived by participants.

A theme of how the expressions of the lived experience of the participants can be seen to contribute to understanding of a consistently postcolonial orientation continues in the analysis of the next two resources. In the *being Pākehā is limited* resource and the *Pākehā is all-encompassing* resource, participants demonstrate varying ways of negotiating personal and political identity.

In the *being Pākehā is limited* resource, participants describe fencing-off a part of themselves -- an essence, a fluidity and a depth, a true sense of self – from being available for signification by the label Pākehā. So, these participants describe holding parts of themselves separate from the label Pākehā. Other accounts of these participants have shown Pākehā to mean being defined by the Treaty as having a right to be and belong in Aotearoa-New Zealand, as being aware of the privilege Pākehā have just by being Pākehā, as being aware of the colonising history of the country, as being different from those other Pākehā who ignore privilege, who are racist, who do not respect te reo and who are ignorant or denying of history. Hence, the language-use in this resource

shows participants holding parts of themselves separate from the postcolonial orientation Pākehā signifies, an orientation of concern, engagement with and awareness about the contemporary and historical impacts of colonisation, .
.

The *Pākehā is limited* resource shows that participants' cultural and political orientation shifts according to interpersonal and intrapersonal contexts. When we talk of postcolonial Pākehā, we are talking of a cultural and political orientation that is not fixed to follow a pre-determined set of stages towards decolonisation and postcolonialism. These orientations are not necessarily linear, discrete, chronological stages as described by Nairn (2001) or consistent, as described by Spoonley (1995); but can be experienced consecutively and inconsistently within individuals according to changing contexts.

The two extracts in the *being Pākehā is all encompassing* resource accommodate a different relationship to the label Pākehā, one that is more relaxed and that does not feel there is so much at stake by claiming it as an all-encompassing label for self. These extracts suggest the possibility, if Pākehā is treated as meaning politically-aware, historically conscientised, biculturally-oriented, that the two participants are easy with accommodating the filled-out, postcolonial orientation of relationship to Māori into all parts of themselves. The position shown in this resource suggests participants see that Pākehā as a postcolonial label gives a less powerfully-determining, friendlier, more accommodating aspect towards their individualities. It suggests an easier relationship between the political orientation signified by Pākehā and the personal experience of self.

The last resource in the *Pākehā is a changeable identity* repertoire further demonstrates the way the label shifts the meaning of Pākehā around. It shows Pākehā crossing borders by identifying with Māori. The participant's identification with Māori leads her to transgress a boundary and to claim pride in Māori history, a history that is in resistance to her own forebears' history, a history which perpetrated injustice to Māori. Interestingly, Lisa's awareness of history, which it is argued elsewhere (Bell, 2004a; Turner, 1999a), is a resource for understanding of Pākehā identity, is used by her to surrender Pākehā identification. Lisa has knowledge of her antecedents' history and is

not, therefore, experiencing an ahistorical emptiness. Nor is she embracing the 'settler mythology hero-worship' or "romance of settlement" (Turner, 1999a, p. 23) which is commonly celebrated by some Pākehā and a readily available discourse in wider society (Spoonley, 1995, p. 111).

The emptiness she may be responding to, which Māori-identified positions stand in for, may be the lack of a historically-informed, Māori-connected, project of Pākehā identity in wider society (Bell, 2006). Without such a discursive project available, Lisa's lived experience as a postcolonial Pākehā, in response to Māori history, may lead her to take up a Māori-identified position. Spoonley has also identified the emergent, partial, contested nature of Pākehā identity (1995). Pākehā, then, without a dominant discursive project that acknowledges and engages with colonising history in relation to Māori, easily moves across borders in the discursive emptiness.

In this resource, Pākehā postcolonial orientation to identification with Māori and to knowledge of history can discursively be shown to be similar to discursively appropriating and colonising moves. Pākehā can also be seen as moving to a universal, human signification, which sources admiration and pride in being human from the actions of other human beings, regardless of the cultural or political heritage and relationship. In doing so, though -- as stated above -- Lisa does take up a subject position that identifies completely with the historical actions of Māori which in turn can expand the multiple meanings of being Pākehā. However, this move can only be made by appearing to ignore colonising history and by transgressing boundaries that are currently in place: a discursive boundary in the service of strategic politics in order to further justice claims for Māori, and a cultural-identity boundary that helps Māori revitalise cultural identity, post-colonisation. In the current political and social environment, postcolonial Pākehā can sometimes cross important political, strategic, discursive borders between Pākehā and Māori.

Previously, the large majority of the accounts in the resources and in the repertoires of the findings have demonstrated diversity by the participants' language-use mostly showing contrast to the dominant discourses deployed by Pākehā or else constructive of Pākehā in service of colonisation and continued dominance. Conversely, parts of this repertoire have shown how participants use language to resist subject-positions of continuous engagement with a postcolonial orientation. Hence, diversity is apparent

within and across individual participants as they describe their intrapersonal and interpersonal relationship with being Pākehā. Dynamic diversities are demonstrated by the way that participants negotiate the prevalence of Western dominance differently, by the way that they personally do or do not accommodate the Pākehā label and by the way that Pākehā as an identity statement moves across borders into Māori.

The following, final chapter brings the findings together by returning to the research aim and to aspects of the research process. The key points arising from the identified repertoires are summarised, and some of the significances of the findings of the research are pointed out.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

RETURNING TO THE RESEARCH AIM

This thesis sought the meanings that Pākehā, who had engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts, brought to being Pākehā. By interviewing a sample of six Pākehā who had learnt, before or during the research, te reo, tikanga Māori and about nga ao o nga iwi Māori, I was seeking to enrich our understanding of what being Pākehā can mean.

By taking a non-essentialist perspective on cultural identity, I studied the lived experience of Pākehā who have engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts. Using the discourse analysis tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources, I compared and contrasted discourses of Pākehāness already identified in the literature, with the discourses that emerged from this sample of Pākehā. Understanding the ways that discourse can construct dominant identities for groups by privileging particular interpretations over others, I saw this stereotyping process was applicable to Pākehā as a group, also. Some meanings attributable to being Pākehā can be marginalised, and some subject positions are more likely to be taken up by Pākehā than others. Hence, this research has demonstrated a diversity of subject positions available to Pākehā about being Pākehā. The following section briefly summarises the interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources that comprise my analysis of the sample's discourses. Some significances of the findings are then explored, and some possibilities for future research are pointed to.

RESEARCH SUMMARY: REPERTOIRES AND RESOURCES

This research identified five interpretative repertoires and sixteen linguistic resources comprising the meanings this sample of Pākehā bring to being Pākehā. The *identity through connection to Maori* repertoire showed that, despite the discursive environment that provides separate-from-Māori subject positions for Pākehā, the talk of the lived experience of the participants grouped around connection to Māori. Three patterns of talk within the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire were the *being Pākehā*

and 'do-ing' as Māori resource; the *authentic connection to Māori* resource; and the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource.

In counterpoint to the characterisation of Pākehā as one, unified, hegemonic group, resistance to stereotypical attributions of Pakeha identity was central to the participants' responses that made the next repertoire, the *resistance to the other Pākehā identity* repertoire. The smaller patterns of talk identified as belonging to this repertoire were organised into four linguistic resources: the *resisting how others perceive and identify Pākehā* resource; the *resisting a dominant and colonising Pākehā identity* resource; the *challenging those other Pākehā* resource; and the *being threatened by those other Pākehā* resource.

One of the broad patterns that the data generated from the participants' responses was talk which spoke from the subject position of Pākehā as aware of privilege; participants' talk acknowledged that being Pākehā brought privileges. This talk was organised around the *awareness of privilege* repertoire. The *awareness of privilege* repertoire data was organised into two resources: first, one that talked of how awareness of Pakeha privilege can be positive, the *being aware of Pākehā privilege is positive* resource; and second, one that spoke of awareness of privilege in Māori cultural learning contexts, the *being aware of Pākehā privilege in Māori cultural leanring context resource*. In contrast to Pākehā amongst a mono-cultural background that invisibilises privilege, being Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context can bring awareness of privilege to the fore.

In the fourth repertoire, valuing of knowledge was identified as a central pattern of the data that participants' talk generated. Two groups of patterns of talk were identified as supporting the *valuing of knowledge* repertoire: first, the *valuing of the learning of te reo and tikanga Māori* resource, and, second, the *valuing of the learning of history* resource. In contrast to Pākehā as monocultural, ignorant of te reo and as blind to history, the talk of the participants strongly validated the importance of knowledge of te reo and of tikanga Māori. The talk also deeply supported the knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand history.

The final repertoire, the *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire, was organized around data that demonstrated the way that being Pākehā is not a fixed, stable, de-contextualised identity. The *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire demonstrated that participants change and move around the construction of being Pakeha, according to context. The smaller patterns of data that were identified as constituting the *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire were organised into five resources: first, the *Pākehā as distinct from white and western* resource; second, the *Pākehā as merged with western* resource; third, the *Pākehā is limited* resource; fourth, the *Pākehā is all-encompassing* resource; and fifth, the *Pākehā crossing borders into Māori* resource.

Having briefly summarised the five interpretative repertories and sixteen linguistic resources, I will now point to some of their significance.

THE FINDINGS' SIGNIFICANCES

Primarily, Pākehā diversity has been shown by the way that the discourses in this research's interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources are in contrast to the dominating, blind to Māori, ignorant and denying of history subject positions attributed to Pākehā (McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Rather, the first four repertoires largely demonstrate subject positions that acknowledge Pākehā privilege, that acknowledge and value Māori difference and that value an understanding of the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. In contrast to Pākehā as a whiteness lived in assumed dominance, ubiquity and cohesion, participants' ways of being Pākehā were shown to be contested, not lived without tension and confusion. Accounts have shown – Trudy's and Brian's in the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource – how the discursive environment does not mirror back, reflect or amplify participants' experience as Pākehā who are connected to and respectful of Māori. This creates a lack of acknowledgement of these ways of being Pākehā. The threat and challenge participants can experience, expressed in the *resistance to the other Pākehā identity* repertoire, can add to an unvalued and unacknowledged sense of Pākehā identity. Such experiences are in contrast to the dominance stereotypically attributed to being Pākehā. This range of subject positions that can constitute Pākehā identity suggests that Pākehā are diverse.

The research has shown that the lived experience of Pākehā in connection with Māori has brought a valuable diversity to ways to be Pākehā. Participants' lived experience of

intercultural engagement, the awareness and knowledge that it brought, also created the potential for participants to be border crossers into nga ao o nga iwi Māori and bridge makers between Pākehā and Māori worlds. Involvement in the Māori cultural learning context brought participants greater awareness of contemporary Māori issues, an acute sense of Māori difference, and opportunities for reflection about their own identity as Pākehā.

As participants move between both worlds, the Pākehā and the Māori, difficulties and possibilities exist for them. Some of the difficulties for participants are negotiating the attitudes of and positioning by other Pākehā towards them; noticing how their connected-to-Māori ways of being Pākehā are not represented in the media; and struggling to find a place to belong in the discursive environment that so clearly separates Pākehā off from Māori. The participants' difficulties and possibilities resonate with some articulations by Māori of living a bicultural identity (Collins, 2004; Meredith, 1998).

That there is a range of subject positions available to Pākehā suggests that Pākehā are not a single, unitary identity. Some of the ways that participants exhibited a range of interpretations about what it meant to be Pākehā are shown in the following examples: Pākehā is an all-encompassing label for self and Pākehā is a label for parts of self; Pākehā is merged with being Western and Pākehā is distinct from Western; Pākehā is easy with separation from Māori, and Pākehā is troubled by separation from Māori; Pākehā is threatened by those other Pākehā and Pākehā challenges those other Pākehā. Māori too have been shown to be diverse, and to constitute a range of orientations and identifications, closer to conventional western and Pākehā, or closer to traditional Māori (Stevenson, 2004). So too, Pākehā comprise a range of positions and orientations, closer to western and colonial Pākehā, or closer to a connected and respectful of Māori position. By studying the range of subject positions and of discourses of participants, Pākehā have been shown to be more diverse than the stereotypical Pākehā identity suggests.

By treating cultural identity as constructed and non-essentialist, as arising in interpersonal contexts and as discursively produced, the way that individual, cultural Pākehā identity diversifies, across time, social context, geographical location,

intrapersonal context and interpersonal situation has been an object of my study. Paul's accounts have demonstrated diversity arising from the concentration on non-essentialising aspects of cultural identity. Paul's changing interpretation of and relationship with the label Pākehā, his expression of his cultural identity, of his political conscience, of his individuality in relation to his collective cultural and political identity are illustrative of how Pākehā identity is produced in contexts, shifts according to contexts, and arises and evolves in communication. Just as participants can be heard attributing Pākehā with the meaning of maintaining a respectful acknowledgement of Māori difference, participants can also attribute Pākehā to mean identifying aspects of Māori history as their own. While the accounts are shown doing identity-construction work for all the participants, negotiating subject positions, creating discourses as they do so, Pākehā identity can be seen to be dynamically diverse and constantly shifting.

This research does not *only* show Pākehā diversity in contrast to a stereotype of Pākehā as dominating, colonising, ignorant, and blind to power. The research adds diversity to the more recent identity for Pākehā also -- Pākehā as postcolonial. Pākehā as a postcolonial identity involves acknowledging the harm of colonisation, and working against that harm by supporting and connecting with Māori initiatives, and by becoming more aware of the privileges and cultural blindness inherent in being Pākehā (King, 1985, 1999; Spoonley, 1995). This postcolonial way of being Pākehā has been characterised as an identity arrived at after a period of committed, personal work which the antecedent of the coloniser, the Pākehā, undertakes in order to decolonise (Nairn, 2001) and to become postcolonial. However, my research demonstrates that a postcolonial Pākehā identity is not necessarily an arrival at a fixed point, after a series of discrete stages. Rather, within the same individual across different times and in different contexts, Pākehā identity can be constituted by a diverse range of subject positions in contrasting relations to a postcolonial position. Therefore, Pākehā as postcolonial is not a unitary identity, either.

Hence, some accounts trouble the idea of Pākehā as meaning a consistently postcolonial identity. For instance, Paul's account from the *resisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā* resource shows the way that Paul's resistance to being identified with colonising history can be seen as a similar colonising move to the denying of Pākehā involvement and responsibility for colonising history. When compared to

others of Paul's accounts, we can see the way that Paul's connection to, ownership of and acknowledgement of the colonial history of his forebears and the unjust power relations this history created permeate the current social and political environment, is a negotiated one, changing according to intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts. A comparison of Trudy's account of the meaning of Pākehā in the *valuing the learning of history* resource*,* where Trudy defines the Treaty "as a bowl […] for which the rest of our [Pākehā] living actually happens" and that "The Treaty […] definitely defines me as a Pākehā" with her account in the *Pākehā is limited* resource where Trudy defines herself as more than Pākehā, suggests that the "rest of her living" is not entirely contained by reference to the partnership of the Treaty. A comparison of these accounts further suggests the way that the relationship between individual identity, Pākehā identity and post colonial identity can be an ambivalent and negotiated one.

It is interesting to note the influential availability of Westerness as a default subject position for Pākehā as they negotiate the personal, ethical, political and cultural complexities of being a postcolonial Pākehā. Cultural identities, individuals' and groups' personal, political and social identities, are often mediated by surrounding discourses. For Pākehā, Westerness is an influential feature of the discursive environment. This research has shown that in some ways, Pākehā can be seen to be oppressed by the dominance of Westerness; in other ways Pākehā can be seen as relying on the power of belonging to the dominance of Westerness. It can be easy for non-Pākehā to conflate Pākehā with Westerness, yet Pākehā relationship with and belonging to Westerness can be more complex than the attribution suggests.

By comparing accounts, from the fifth interpretative repertoire, the *Pākehā is a changeable identity* repertoire, with other accounts in other interpretative repertoires, we can see the way that the meaning of being Pākehā can shift according to context. Thus, Pākehā diversity can be like a prism. Pākehā can be an identity that changes according to the context in which it is lived and the context in which it is viewed.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

While this research has shown the valuable impacts learning in Māori cultural learning contexts can have on Pākehā bicultural and postcolonial awareness, it has neglected to consider the impacts on Māori of Pākehā involvement in Māori cultural learning

contexts. An exploration of the impacts on Māori would fill out further considerations about Pakeha engagement in Māori cultural learning contexts.

The diverse range of subject positions that this research has demonstrated comprising Pākehā identity, suggests that, similar to Durie's model of Māori cultural identification (Stephenson, 2004), research generating a model showing the choices of Pākehā identification available, would be a useful avenue for future research.

That this research has shown the way that participants shift their positioning in relation to a postcolonial identity suggests there is a dilemmatic aspect to being a postcolonial Pākehā. Research that yields a closer understanding of this dilemmatic aspect would enrich our understandings of the tensions and conflicts involved in being a postcolonial Pākehā.

Participants have shown the way that their lived experience and their agency have informed their negotiation of and resistance to dominant discourses about what it can mean to be Pākehā. The tools of interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources have provided a means for me to convey these experiences. Offering a detailed map of some of the lived experiences of these Pākehā, the interpretative repertoires and linguistic resources provide a specific and transferable vocabulary with which the lived experiences of some Pākehā can be talked about.

This research shows that Pākehā are more diverse than the stereotype of dominant coloniser, blind to Māori difference, blind to history. By neglecting to acknowledge this diversity, potential bridges can be missed as Pākehā and Māori work together and separately, to decolonise. While disrupting the simplistic norm of Pākehā as dominant coloniser, this research also complexifies our understanding of how a postolonial orientation is lived by Pākehā. As 'ordinary' Pākehā, as bridge makers and border crossers on a journey of cultural identity making and of ethical, social and political concern and commitment, these participants have demonstrated some of the prismatic and dilemmatic aspects of Pākehā identity.

REFERENCES

Adds, P., Bennett, M., Hall, M., Kernot, B., Russell, M., & Walker, T. (2005). *The portrayal of Maori and te ao Maori in Broadcasting: The foreshore and seabed issue* Wellington: Broadcasting Standards Authority.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday.

Archie, C. (2005). *Skin to Skin*. Auckland: Penguin.

Awatere, D. (1984). *Māori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet.

Barclay, K., & Liu, J. H. (2003). Who gets voice? (Re)presentation of bicultural relations in New Zealand print media. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 32*(1), 3-12.

Barnes, A. (2006). *Taku ara, taku mahara: Pākehā family experiences of kaupapa Māori and bilingual education.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars*. Auckland: Penguin.

Bell, A. (2004a). *Relating Māori and Pākehā:The politics of indigenous and settler identities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Bell, A. (2004b). 'Cultural vandalism' and Pākehā politics of guilt and responsibility. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 89-108). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Bell, A. (2004c). Half-castes and white natives: The politics of Maori-Pakeha hybrid identities. In C. Bell & S. Matthewman (Eds.), *Cultural studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: Identity, space and place*. South Melbourne: Oxford University.

Bell, A. (2006). Bifurcation and entanglement?: Settler identity and biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Continuum, 20*(2), 253-268.

Bevan, K. (2000). *Exploring personal and political issues of identity for white Maori women.* Unpublished masters thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middelton, D., & Radley, A. (1991). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(1), 175-188.

Bishop, R. (2003). Changing power relations in education: Kaupapa maori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Comparative Education, 39*(2), 221-238.

Bowker, N. (2003). *What it means to be online for people with disability.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Bowker, N., & Tuffin, K. (2002). Disability discourses for online identities. *Disability & Society, 17*(3), 327-344.

Bowker, N., & Tuffin, K. (2003). Dicing with deception: People with disabilities' strategy for managing safety and identity online *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication, 8*(2).

Bowker, N., & Tuffin, K. (2007). Understanding positive subjectivities made possible online for disabled people. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology 36*(2), 63-71.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Butcher, M. (2003, August 2003). What is Maori? Who is Pakeha? *North & South,* 36-48.

Campbell, B. M. (2005). *Negotiating biculturalism: Deconstructing pākehā subjectivity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Chan, S. (1989). Political radicalism and radical literature: Usurpation and incorporation in the New Zealand literary world from 1969.   Retrieved 03.12, 2007, from http://www.nzepc.auckland.ac.nz/misc/chan.asp

Chateau, d. (1989). Te English? *Metro, 39*(3), 40-56.

Collier, M. J. (2006). Cultural identity and intercultural communication. In L. Samovar, J. Potter & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed., pp. 53-60). Belmont California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Collier, M. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Transforming communication about culture: Critical new directions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Collins, H. M. (2004). *Te putahitanga o nga tai e rua: The meeting of two tides-- Journeys of mixed heritage Maori/Pakeha towards identity strength.* Unpublished master's thesis, Massey University, Wellington.

Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Penguin.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Davies, B., & Davies, H. (2007). Having had, and being had by, experience or experience in the social sciences after the discursive-post-structuralist turn. *Qualitative inquiry 13*(8), 1139 -

Davies, B., & Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43-63.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana te kawatanga: The politics of Maori self-determination*. Melbourne: Oxford.

During, S. (1985). Postmodernism or postcolonialism. *Landfall*, 366-380.

During, S. (1989). Waiting for the post: some relations between modernity, colonisation and writing. *Ariel, 20*(4), 31-61.

During, S. (2000). Postcolonialism and globalism: Towards historicization of their inter-relation. *Cultural studies, 14*(3/4), 385-404.

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data* (pp. 189-228). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Evans, P. (2007). *The long forgetting: Post-colonial literary culture in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Canterbury University Press.

Fleras, A., & Spoonley, P. (1999). The cultural politics of post-colonialism: Being Pakeha. In *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pan Theon Books.

Gadd, B. (1976). *Cultural difference in the classroom*. Auckland: Heinemann Educational Books.

Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist poststructuralism and discourse analysis: Contributions to feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13*, 459-475.

Gergen, K. J. (2001). *Social constructionism in context*. London: Sage.

Haden, F. (1990, 22 April). Don't try to call me Pakeha. *Dominion Sunday Times*.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.

Harre, R., & Gillett, G. (1994). *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Harre, R., & Langenhove, V. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 21*(4), 393-407.

Hohepa, M., & Jenkins, K. (1996). Te ao tuhi - Māori literacy: A consequence of racism? *Nga Kete Korero, 4*(5), 5-11.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2004). *Intercultural communication: An Advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Huygens, I. (2002). Journeys away from dominance: Dissonance, struggle and right relationships-the journey to accepting indigenous authority. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty Work: Unpublished Material* (pp. 133-145). Manakau New Zealand: Manakau Institute of Technology.

Huygens, I., Black, R., & Hamerton, H. (2003). Reflections on Pakeha identity *Bulletin - New Zealand Psychological Society 101*, 13-16.

Jackson, M. (2004). Colonization as myth making: A case study in Aotearoa. In S. Greymorning (Ed.), *A will to survive: Indigenous essays on the politics of culture, language and identity* (pp. 95-108). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Jackson, R. L. (1999). White space, white privilege: Mapping discursive inquiry into the self. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*, 38-54.

Jellie, M. (2001). *The formation of Pākehā identity in relation to te reo Māori and te ao Māori* Unpublished master's thesis, Canterbury University, Christchurch.

Johnson, M. (2005). 'The land of the wrong white crowd': Anti-racist organisations and Pakeha identity politics in the 1970s. *New Zealand Journal of History, 39*(2), 137-157.

Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory, 49*(2), 299-316.

Jones, A. (2002). Cross-cultural pedagogy and the passion for ignorance. *Feminism and Psychology, 11*(3), 279-292.

King, M. (1985). *Being Pākehā: An encounter with New Zealand and the Māori renaissance*. Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.

King, M. (1999a). *Pakeha: The quest for New Zealand identity*. Auckland: Penguin.

King, M. (1999b). *Being Pakeha now: Reflections and recollections of a white native*. Auckland: Penguin.

Krizek, R. (2006). Finding my whiteness: A narrative of cultural identification. In L. Samovar, J. Potter & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 61-70). Belmont California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Lawson, A. (1995). Postcolonial theory and the "settler" subject. . *Essays in Canadian Writing, 56*, 20-36.

Maclean, M. (1996). The silent centre: Are Pākehā in biculturalism? *Continuum, 10*(1), 108-120.

MacPherson, C., & Spoonley, P. (2004). Mediated ethnicity: Media and the management of ethnic images in Aotearoa. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 221-246). Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Margaret, J. (2002a). *Pakeha treaty work: An annotated bibliography.* Auckland: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Margaret, J. (2002b). *Pakeha treaty work: Unpublished material.* Auckland: Manakau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2003). Intercultural communication in contexts. In (3rd ed.). Arizona: McGraw HIll.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2007). *Experiencing intercultural communication* (3rd ed.). Arizona: McGraw Hill.

Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (2002a). A dialectical approach to intercultural communication. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama & L. A. Flore (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 3-13). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (2002b). *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Mataira, P. (1995). Bicultural wisdom: navigating the bicultural seas. *Social Work Review, 7*(1), 9-10,26.

McCreanor, T. (1995). *Pakeha discourses of Maori/Pakeha relations.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auckland University, Auckland.

McGregor, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Dangerous democracy?* . Palmerston North Dunmore Press.

McGregor, J., & Comrie, M. (Eds.). (2002). *What's news? Reclaiming journalism in New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Mead, L. T. (1996). *Nga aho o te kakahu Matauranga: The multiple layers of struggle by Maori in Education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auckland University, Auckland.

Meredith, P. (1998, July 1998). *Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aorearoa/New Zealand.* Paper presented at the Te oru rangahau: Maori research and development conference proceedings, Palmerston North.

Mikaere, A. (2005). Are we all New Zealanders now? A Māori response to the quest for Pākehā indigeneity. *New Zealand Political Review, 4*(1), 33-45.

Mitcalfe, B. (1969). Maori Land Act, Parihaka. In *Writing*. Wellington: Arts Council Wellington Teachers College.

Moon, D. (1999). White enculturation and bourgeois ideology: The discursive production of good (white) girls. In T. K. Nakayama & J. N. Martin (Eds.), *Whiteness: The communication of social identity* (pp. 177-197). Thousand Oaks California: Sage.

Mulvey, A., Terenzio, M., Hill, J., Bond, M. A., Huygens, I., Hamerton, H., et al. (2000). Stories of relative privilege: Power and social change in feminist community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(6), 883-911.

Nairn, M. (1986). Pakeha: Not ethnicity but hegemony. *Sites, 13*, 17-18.

Nairn, M. (1989). Changing my mind: Transitions in Pakeha thinking. In H. Yensen, K. Hague & T. McCreanor (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 75-89). Auckland: Penguin.

Nairn, M. (2001). Decolonisation for Pakeha. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material* (pp. 203-206). Auckland: Manakau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Nairn, M. (2002). Decolonisation or denial: A case study of Pakeha responses to the trauma of colonisation. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material* (pp. 209-213). Auckland: Manakau Institute of Technology.

O'Regan, H. (1995). Post-colonialism Ko to mate kurupopo-the festering wound. *Women's Studies Journal, 11*(1-2), 53-61.

O'Regan, H. (2006). State of te reo nation: Maori language learning. In M. Mulholland (Ed.), *State of the Maori nation: Twenty-first-century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 157-168). Auckland: Reed Books.

Pearson, D. (1989). Pakeha ethnicity: concept or conundrum. *Sites, 18*, 61-72.

Pearson, D. (1990). *A dream deferred: The origin of ethnic conflict in New Zealand.* Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Pearson, D. (2004). Rethinking citizenship in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 291-314). Palmerston North: Dunmore Pres.

Pearson, D., & Sissons, J. (1997). Pakeha and never Pakeha. *Sites, 35*, 64-80.

Pihama, L. (1994). Redrawing the maps: The plural society and its futures. *Te Pua, 3*(2), 37-41.

Potter, J. (1996). Discourse analysis and constructionist aproaches: Theoretical background. In J. T. E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 125-140). Leicester: The British Psychological Society.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). From representation to repertoires. In *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage: London.

Ritchie, J. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, Daphne Brasell Press.

Rosenblatt, P. C. (2003). Interviewing at the border of fact and fiction. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 224-242). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. London: Vintage.

Samovar, L., Porter, R. E., & McDaniel, E. R. (2007). *Communication between cultures* (6th ed.). Belmont California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Schlunke, K. (2004). Unsettling whiteness. In B. McKay (Ed.), *Unmasking whiteness: Race relations and reconciliation* (pp. 173-179). Brisbane: Griffith University.

Scott, D. (1981). *Ask that mountain: The story of Parihaka*. Auckland: Reed Southern Cross.

Slack, D. (2004). *Bullshit, backlash & bleeding hearts: A confused person's guide to the great race row*. Auckland: Penguin.

Smith, L. T. (2005). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed.

Sneddon, P. (2005). *Pākehā and the treaty: Why it's our treaty too*. New Zealand Random House.

Spoonley, P. (1986). Being Pākehā: An interview with Michael King. *Sites, 13*, 6-13.

Spoonley, P. (1988). *Racism and ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University.

Spoonley, P. (1995). Constructing ourselves: The post-colonial politics of Pakeha. In M. Wilson & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and identity: Antipodean practices* (pp. 96-115). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Spoonley, P. (2007). Naming ourselves: Being Pākehā. In A. White (Ed.), *Pākehā now*. Nelson: The Suter Te Aratoi a Whakatū.

Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., & Pearson, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank Victoria: Thompson: Dunmore Press.

Stevenson, B. (2004). Te hoe nuku roa: A measure of Maori cultural identity. *He Pukenga Korero: A Journal of Maori Studies*.

Stewart- Harawira, M. (1993). Maori, who owns the definition?: The politics of cultural identity. *Te Pua, 2*(1/2), 27-34.

Taylor, S. (2002). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data* (pp. 5-48). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Tilbury, F. (1998). 'I really don't know much about it But...': A typology of rhetorical devices used in talk about Maori/Pakeha relations. *New Zealand Sociology, 13*(2), 289-319.

Tilbury, F. (1999). *"Some of my best friends are Māori but...": Cross-ethnic friendships, ethnic identity and attitudes to race relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Tremaine, M. G. (2007). *Her worship the mayor: Women's leadersip in New Zealand's local government.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Tuffin, K. (2005). *Understanding critical social psychology*. London: Sage.

Tuffin, K., & Howard, C. (2001). Demystifying disourse analysis:Theory, method and practice. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings* (pp. 196-205). London: Continuum.

Turner, S. (1999a). Settlement as forgetting. In K. Neumann, N. Thomas & H. Ericksen (Eds.), *Quicksands: Foundational histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 20-38). Canberra: University of New South Wales.

Turner, S. (1999b). A legacy of colonialism: The uncivil society of Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Cultural studies, 13*(3).

Walker, R. (1987). *Ngaa Tohetohe: Years of anger*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin.

Walker, R. (1996). *Nga pepa ranginui: The Walker papers*. Auckland: Penguin.

Wall, C. (1986). Te Pakeha: The search for white identity. *Metro,* 36-48.

Weedon, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Identity and Culture*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interviewing*. New York: The Free Press.

Wetherell, M. (2003). Discourse analysis. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand* (2nd ed., pp. 285-295). Auckland: Pearson International.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertories. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods* (pp. 168-183). London: Sage.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitmation of exploitation*. Hemel Hampstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as data*. London: Sage.

Yeatman, A. (1995). Justice and the sovereign self. In M. Wilson & M. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and identity: Antipodean practices*. Wellington: Bridget WIlliams Books.

APPENDIX B: LETTER REQUESTING A MEETING WITH MĀORI LEARNING INSTITUTION

[On Massey University Letterhead]

7 Moheke Avenue
Papaioea
Phone: 06 3594326
Email: M.Mitcalfe@massey.ac.nz
18 February 2007

Tēnā koe

I am writing to you to let you know about my intended Master research, 'Being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts'. I am a Masters student in the Department of Communication and Journalism at Massey University, Turitea campus, Papaioea. I am seeking your permission for me to come to campus to invite Pākehā learners of te reo into the research.

The research will explore the experiences of Pākehā learners in Māori cultural learning contexts. In this research, I aim to put the spotlight on Pākehā identity. By exploring Pākehā experience in Māori cultural learning contexts, I aim to help Pākehā develop self-awareness about issues of their identity in the bicultural relationship. By identifying enrichments Pākehā experience in Māori cultural learning contexts, I aim to support the importance of Pākehā engagement with Māori cultural learning contexts for bicultural relationship.

I would like to be able to meet with you in order to talk about my intended research and to hear what you think about it. I am enclosing some documentation regarding the research which has been approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, as was necessary before my being able to contact you.

I will get in touch with you in the next week to make an appointment to discuss the research further and to answer any questions.

Nāku iti nei, nā

Margi Mitcalfe

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Background on the course

What course are you involved in?

How long have you been there?

Have you done any te reo courses before? [will get details]

What made you decide to learn te reo Māori? Why are you doing the course? What motivated you to be here? [plus previous courses if appropriate]

How's it been for you on the course?

Experiencing the course

Tell me about what you're enjoying, about what you're gaining from your experience on this course, and on other courses, if appropriate. Can you remember any particular incidents when you felt that?

Is this different, do you think, from other positive learning experiences you've had? ie Do you think there is something about being in a Maori class that contributes to this feeling?

How have these positive experiences affected you as a participant on your course? Your belonging? Your learning? Your commitment? Extramural activities?

How have they, the positive experiences, affected you outside of the course? How have they influenced what you do, how you think, what you say?

Positive enrichment, relief, individual empowerment, liberation, joy, and resolution have been identified in writings by Pākehā as responses they have had to engagement with te ao Māori. To what extent and in what way could this be said to be true of you?

What other special pleasures, enjoyments, enrichments, 'good stuff' have you experienced as a Pākehā here?

When does this 'good stuff' arise?

Why do you think this 'good stuff' arises?

How have other Pākehā responded if you have talked to them about these good experiences?

How common do you think these experiences of the 'good stuff' are?

What impact do these good experiences have on your willingness to be here?

How has having these good experiences changed your way of being Pākehā?

What kind of responses have you had from people inside the course that help you to stay on the course, that help you be pleased to be there?

What kind of responses have you had from people outside the course that help you to stay on the course, that help you be pleased to be there?

Tell me about any problems or uncomfortable moments you have experienced on this course, and on other te reo courses, if appropriate. Can you remember any particular incidents when you felt that?

Is this different, do you think, from other difficult learning experiences you've had? ie Do you think there is something about being in a Maori class that contributes to this feeling?

How have these problems affected you as a participant on your course? ....Your sense of belonging? Your ability to learn? Your commitment? Extramural activities?

 How have the problems you mentioned affected you outside of the course? How have they influenced what you do, how you think, what you say?

In the literature, Pākehā reactions of fear, alienation, superiority, inferiority, insecurity, anger and defensiveness, to Māori cultural contexts, have been described. To what extent and in what way is this true of you?

Have you identified any particular problems or issues, other than those mentioned above, regarding being Pākehā here?

What are they?

When do these issues and problems arise?

Why do you think these problems and issues arise?

How do you deal with these issues and problems?

How have other Pākehā responded if you have talked to them about these problems?

How common do you think these problems are?

What impact do these problems have on your willingness to be here?

How has having or dealing with these problems changed your way of being Pākehā?

What kind of responses have you had from people inside the course that make it difficult for you to stay on the course, that make it difficult for you to be there?

What kind of responses have you had from people outside the course that make it difficult for you to stay on the course, that make it difficult for you to be there?

What barriers or challenges, external to the Māori cultural learning environment, do you need to overcome, to be on this course? It'd be good, again, if you think about these challenges specifically in relation to being Pākehā?

Being Pākehā

What does being Pākehā mean to you?

Has it always meant this?

How has it evolved?

When the term Pākehā refers to a group of people, a collective identity, what does the term mean to you?

How do you see Pākehāness or being Pākehā portrayed in wider society?

How is it different to your own sense of being Pākehā?

How is it the same?

Is your perception of yourself as Pākehā, the meaning you bring to being Pākehā, common/uncommon, the same/different to other Pākehā you know of?

Where do you ordinarily find the sources for your own sense of Pākehā identity? What have you modeled being Pākehā on?

How are the experiences you have here on the course, as a Pākehā, similar or different to notions of 'Pakehaness' portrayed in wider society?

Are you always aware of being Pākehā at the course?

When do you become aware of being Pākehā here?

How are you aware of being Pākehā?

What happens when you become aware of being Pākehā at the course?

What feelings do you have about being Pākehā here?

Why do you think you have these feelings?

How do these feelings affect your comfort levels?

Impacts the course has had on being Pākehā

What have you learnt about yourself as a Pākehā while on the course?

How has being here affected, changed, reinforced, diminished, transformed your sense of being Pakehā?

If you had not done this course, what learning/un-learning about yourself as a Pākehā would you have missed out on?

Has being on the course made you consider yourself, as a Pākehā, more similar or more different from Māori?

What points of connection have you found here between Pākehāness and te ao Māori?

In what ways do you feel 'on the inside' of the tikanga of the course, of the culture that is its kaupapa? What pleasures/ problems does this create?

In what ways do you feel 'on the outside' of the tikanga of the course, of the culture that is its kaupapa? What pleasures/ problems does this create?

When you experience yourself as 'on the inside' of the tikanga of the course, of the culture that is its kaupapa, is your 'Pakehaness' there with you? What happens to your sense of 'Pakehaness' when you feel 'on the inside'?

When you experience yourself as 'on the outside' of the tikanga of the course, of the culture that is its kaupapa, is your 'Pakehaness' there with you? What happens to your sense of 'Pakehaness' when you feel 'on the outside'?

Impacts the course has had on being bicultural

What does being bicultural mean to you?

How do you see biculturalism in Aotearoa-New Zealand? Is it failing? Is it successful? What would or does a bicultural New Zealand look like?

What do you see as the value of being on the course for being bicultural in Aotearoa-New Zealand?

What impact have the joys you mentioned before had on your sense of being Pākehā living in bicultural Aotearoa-New Zealand?

What impact have the problems you mentioned before had on your sense of being Pākehā living in bicultural Aotearoa-New Zealand?

How has what you have learnt here helped you to become bicultural?

In this interview, I've asked you to talk about 'Pākehāness', about being Pākehā. How difficult/easy is it to talk about your cultural identity in this way, to separate yourself from it and see it as a 'thing'?

Does if feel right? Constraining? Enriching?

What experiences/ meanings/ significances have been left out?

Are there any questions you'd like to re-visit?

We have an opportunity to touch base in the transcript checking meeting if you have further reflections you wish to share then…

How easy has it been to identify your responses to being Pākehā on this course?

How easy has it been to disclose these responses?

If you found it difficult, what made it so, do you think?

I'll now ask you a few further personal details, if you don't mind….

Are you New Zealand born?

How many generations have your family lived here?

What is your age?

Tell me a bit about your family background, and if you wish, how it may have contributed to your responses as a Pākehā to being on this course.
Please make any further comments you wish.

Your contribution is much appreciated. Thank you so much for sharing your time and your responses with me. Here is a small gift of a $10 petrol voucher as some recompense for your time and valuable input. Please be in touch with any questions, comments, anything further you wish to say. I will contact you when the transcript is ready for you to check over. I'll look forward to seeing you then.

[On Massey University Letterhead]

Being Pākehā.......... Learning te Reo and tikanga Māori, about te ao Māori and Māori experience in Aotearoa-New Zealand? How's it going? More excited than you've felt for years? Feeling challenged?   What have you learnt about yourself as a Pākehā?

I am interested in finding out how it's been for you to come to [Information deleted for purposes of confidentiality] and to learn te Reo and tikanga Māori. My Masters' research project focuses on the experiences of being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts. If you'd like to participate in this research, you'd need to identify as Pākehā and to be available to meet for an interview one to two hours long. Your confidentiality would be assured, and you'd receive $10.00 as some recompense for your time.

If you'd like to find out more about the research, please give me a call, text or email me: 0211864580 M.Mitcalfe@massey.ac.nz

It'd be great to hear from you.

If you want to contact my supervisors, you can phone or email them:

Marianne Tremaine	Dr.Avril Bell
Phone:3569099 ext.2390	Phone: 3569099 ext. 2619
Email: M.G.Tremaine@massey.ac.nz .	Email: S.A.Bell@massey.ac.nz

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 06/58. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Karl Pajo, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 04 801 5799 x 6929, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz.

[On Massey University Letterhead]

<u>Being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts</u>

Learnt te Reo and tikanga Māori in the past? How did it go?
Was it exciting? Challenging? Rewarding?
What did you learn about yourself as a Pākehā?

I am a Masters student of communication in the Communication and Journalism school at Massey University. For my thesis I am exploring Pākehā responses to learning te reo and tikanga Māori in a Māori cultural learning context. In researching Pākehā responses, I aim to gain an understanding of the pleasures and benefits, and the possible stumbling blocks Pākehā can face, as a result of learning te reo and tikanga Māori, of learning about te ao Māori. I will put the spotlight on Pākehā identity.

What would you need to do?

If you agree to participate in the study, we will meet for a semi-structured, one-to-one, confidential interview. I will travel to you for the interview. The interview will range in length from one to two hours. It will be held at a time and place convenient to you. You will be sent a transcript of the interview to check and I would then travel to you to discuss any changes you want made. This part of the process can also be done via email of you prefer. You will be one of a maximum of six participants who will be selected on the basis of their willingness to participate.

Confidentiality

In any stored data, your identity will be coded, and your name removed. Your name will be changed in the thesis and I will do my utmost to ensure that you will be unable to be identified in any discussions or writing, published or otherwise, arising from the research

Invitation

If you identify as Pākehā and have been engaged in a Māori cultural learning context, and you want to find out more about the research or to participate in the research I warmly invite you to give me a call, send me a text on 0211864580 or email me at <u>M.Mitcalfe@massey.ac.nz</u>. If you accept my invitation to participate, you will be able to contribute to awareness of cross-cultural communication between Māori and Pākehā.
It'd be great to hear from you.

If you want to contact my supervisors, you can phone or email them:

Marianne Tremaine   Dr.Avril Bell

Phone:3569099 ext.2390   Phone: 3569099 ext. 2619

Email: M.G.<u>Tremaine@massey.ac.nz</u> .   Email: S.A.Bell@massey.ac.nz

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 06/58. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Karl Pajo, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 04 801 5799 x 6929, email <u>humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz</u>.

APPENDIX F: INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS
[On Massey University Letterhead]

<u>Being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts</u>
Information sheet

The research project
I am a Masters student of communication in the Communication and Journalism school at Massey University. For my thesis I am exploring Pākehā responses to Māori cultural learning contexts. In researching Pākehā responses to Māori cultural learning environments, I aim to gain an understanding of the pleasures and benefits, and the possible stumbling blocks Pākehā can face, as a result of being immersed in a confident, robust Māori culture.

Invitation
If you identify as Pākehā and are engaged in a Māori cultural learning context, I warmly invite you to participate in this research. If you accept my invitation, you will be able to contribute to awareness of cross-cultural communication between Māori and Pākehā.

What would you need to do?
If you agree to participate in the study, we will meet for a semi-structured, one-to-one, confidential interview. The interview will range in length from one to two hours. It will be held at a time and place convenient to you. You will be sent a transcript of the interview to check and we would then meet to discuss it. You will be one of a maximum of six participants who will be selected on the basis of their willingness to participate.

Tape transcription
A person who has signed a confidentiality agreement will transcribe the data. I will check the transcription and I will show it to you for checking and so you can make any changes or delete any data.

The use of the interview data
The information in the transcripts will be used as a basis for a thesis. It may also be the basis for further publications or presentations. You will be provided with a summary of the research.

The storage of tapes and interview transcripts
In any stored data, your identity will be coded, and your name removed. Your name will be changed in the thesis and I will do my utmost to ensure that you will be unable to be identified in any discussions or writing, published or otherwise, arising from the research.

Unless you instruct otherwise, the data will be kept in a secure place for a minimum of five years. My supervisor, Marianne Tremaine, will then destroy the data. The tape of the interview may be returned to you if you wish; otherwise, it will be erased.

Support processes
As a result of dwelling on your responses as a Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context, you may experience some psychological discomfort. If you do become upset by

the interview, I will help you to manage the situation, but you will need to address your needs in a separate forum. Free counselling is available for all full-time and part-time students of

[information deleted for purposes of confidentiality]

Recompense
I recognise that there is a time and travel commitment involved in taking part in the research so you will receive a small gift of a $10 petrol voucher as some recompense for your time and valuable input.

Your rights as a participant
You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:
- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded;
- ask for the audio tape to be turned off at any time during the interview.

Contact details of the researcher and the supervisors
You can contact me by email, M.Mitcalfe@massey.ac.nz, or you could leave a text or a message on my cell phone: 0211864580. My supervisors are Marianne Tremaine and Dr. Avril Bell. They are contactable by phone and by email. Marianne's contact details are 3569099 ext.2390, and M.G.Tremaine@massey.ac.nz . Avril can be contacted at 3569099 ext. 2619, or at S.A.Bell@massey.ac.nz.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 06/58. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Karl Pajo, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 04 801 5799 x 6929, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz.

APPENDIX G: CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS
[On Massey University Letterhead]

<u>Being Pākehā in Māori cultural learning contexts</u>
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held for a minimum period of five (5) years

Researcher: Margi Mitcalfe

Participant's name: …………………………………………………………….

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions about the research have been answered, and I understand that I can ask more questions at any time.

I agree to the interview being audio taped. I understand that I am free to stop the interview and the tape at any time, to decide not to answer any question, and to withdraw from the research at any time.

I understand I will receive a transcript of the interview and will be able to change or delete anything in the transcript that I am not happy with.

When the tape of my interview is no longer needed, I would like it erased/ returned (Please circle your preferred option) to me at the following address:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature: ………………………………………………………… **Date:** …………………………

Full Name - printed …………………………………………………………………………………………

APPENDIX H: RESEARCH SUMMARY FOR PARTICIPANTS

[On Massey University Letterhead]

UNDERSTANDINGS OF BEING PĀKEHĀ: EXPLORING THE PERSPECTIVES OF SIX PĀKEHĀ WHO HAVE LEARNT IN MĀORI CULTURAL LEARNING CONTEXTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Margaret Mitcalfe, Department of Communication & Journalism, Massey University, Palmerston North.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people helped me to put this research together. In particular, I acknowledge the contribution of each of you six participants. Without your generosity and commitment, the research would not have been able to go ahead. I dedicate the research thesis to you (as well as to my partner) in appreciation for the contribution your words have made.

BACKGROUND

Pākehā-Māori, cross-cultural relationships are important ones, fundamental to the present and future wellbeing of Aotearoa-New Zealand. I believe studying Pākehā engagement with nga ao o nga iwi Māori is a significant task in understanding these important relationships. Having experienced being a Pākehā learner in Māori cultural learning contexts, I decided this would be a rich kind of intercultural engagement to study ways of being Pākehā through. Currently, Pākehā as an identity can tend to be stereotyped, essentialised and homogenised. By focusing on your talk, I sought to find a greater diversity of ways of being Pākehā than that dominantly represented in the literature and in discourses of wider society. You will probably notice as I share the background and context of the focus of the study with you here, that the emphasis of my research has changed. As the research evolved I moved from focusing on your responses to being Pākehā in the Māori cultural learning context itself, to focusing more generally on the meaning that you as Pākehā, who have engaged in Māori cultural learning contexts, bring to being Pākehā. This thesis sought the meanings that Pākehā, who had engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts, brought to being Pākehā. By interviewing a sample of six Pākehā who had learnt, before or during the research, te reo, tikanga Māori and about nga ao o nga iwi Māori, I was seeking to enrich our understanding of what being Pākehā can mean.

APPROACHES

In order to study ways of being Pākehā, of those who had studied or were studying currently in Māori cultural learning contexts, I selected a qualitative approach to the research. This theoretical perspective allowed me to base my research around analysis of the talk, from semi-structured interviews, of a small sample of six Pākehā. My findings don't present each of your individual experiences, but instead I use excerpts

from the interviews to give examples of widely-shared responses. There may be some things which do not resonate with your own experience, but most of you should be able to recognise a lot about your own ways of being Pākehā in this summary. After multiple re-readings of the interviews, I categorised your responses into groups of words that talked of similar things and whose language shared similar effects and consequences. The larger, shared patterns of words are named interpretative repertoires; the smaller collections of words, which help build the interpretative repertoires, are named linguistic resources. These terms come from the methodology of discourse analysis, the tool I used to analyse the interview data. In this process, I am aware that your words have been organised by me and detached from the context of the interview in which they were produced. It is my hope you do not feel misrepresented or objectified by this process.

FINDINGS
After a process of selection and interpretation, I organised your interview responses into the following five interpretative repertoires and sixteen linguistic resources.

DESCRIPTION OF INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES AND LINGUISTIC RESOURCES
Identity through connection to Maori repertoire
Despite the discursive environment of biculturalism that tends to separate Māori and Pākehā as distinct entities from each other, the identity talk of the lived experience of the participants grouped around connection to Māori. Three patterns of talk within the *identity through connection to Māori* repertoire were the *being Pākehā and 'do-ing' as Māori* resource; the *authentic connection to Māori* resource; and the *being defined by difference from Māori* resource.

Resisting the other Pākehā identity repertoire
In counterpoint to the common characterisation of Pākehā as one, unified, dominant group, the resistance to such stereotypical attributions of Pakeha identity was central to the participants' responses that made this repertoire. The smaller patterns of talk identified as belonging to this repertoire were organised into four linguistic resources: the *resisting the way others perceive and identify Pākehā* resource; the *resisting being part of dominant and colonising Pākehā identity* resource; the *challenging those other Pākehā* resource; and the *being threatened by those other Pākehā* resource.

Awareness of privilege repertoire
One of the broad patterns that the data generated from the participants' responses was talk which spoke from the subject position of Pākehā as aware of privilege; participants' talk acknowledged that being Pākehā brought privileges. This talk was organised around the *awareness of privilege* repertoire. The *awareness of privilege* repertoire data was organised into two resources: first, one that talked of how awareness of Pakeha privilege can be positive; and second, one that spoke of awareness of privilege in Māori cultural learning contexts. In contrast to being Pākehā amongst a mono-cultural background that invisibilises privilege, being Pākehā in a Māori cultural learning context can bring awareness of privilege to the fore.

Valuing of knowledge repertoire
Valuing of knowledge was identified as a central pattern of the data that participants' talk generated. Two groups of patterns of talk were identified as supporting this repertoire: first, the *valuing learning of te reo and tikanga Māori* resource, and, second,

the *valuing the learning of history* resource. In contrast to Pākehā as monocultural, ignorant of te reo and as blind to history, the talk of the participants strongly validated the importance of knowledge of te reo and of tikanga Māori. The talk also deeply supported the knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand history.

Pakeha as a changeable identity repertoire

The *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire is organized around data that demonstrates how for participants being Pakeha is not a fixed, stable, de-contextualised identity. The *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire demonstrates that participants change and move around the meaning of being Pakeha, according to context. The smaller patterns of data that were identified as constituting the *Pākehā as a changeable identity* repertoire were organised into five resources: first, the *Pākehā as distinct from white and western* resource; second, the *Pākehā as merged with western* resource; third, the *Pākehā is limited* resource; fourth, the *Pākehā is all-encompassing* resource; and fifth, the *Pākehā crossing borders into Māori* resource. This repertoire troubled the idea of Pākehā as a consistently postcolonial identity, also.

CONCLUSION

The research found that, largely, meanings participants brought to being Pākehā were in contrast to stereotypical notions of what it means to be Pākehā. Participants demonstrated that for them being Pākehā meant being connected to nga ao o nga iwi Māori; being aware of Pākehā privilege; mediating and negotiating being Pākehā with dominant notions of Pākehāness; valuing the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand, along with valuing te reo me ona tikanga. Furthermore, the research also found that the consistently postcolonial identity participants brought to being Pākehā shifted according to context, troubling the meanings of Pākehā also.

The thesis suggested three directions for future research: work that explored the impacts on Māori of Pākehā involvement in Māori cultural learning contexts; study generating a model of the choices of Pākehā identification available; and research that yielded a deeper understanding of the dilemmatic aspects of being a postcolonial Pākehā.

Your words have given me the opportunity to give attention to the diverse meanings that can comprise Pākehā identities and I am grateful for that. Thank you for participating in this research project.

GLOSSARY

ako	learning, teaching, education
hapū	group of related families
kai	food
kia ora	welcome, greetings, be well, thank you
karakia	prayer
karanga	call, call as part of marae ceremony
kuia	old woman, respected female
manaakitanga	hospitality, caring
manu	bird, birds
marae	spiritually-important building/s, meeting places, fundamental to Māori communities
mātauranga Māori	Māori knowledge
nga ao o nga iwi Māori	the many worlds of Māori
noa	ordinary, removed from spiritual influences, free from tapu
papatuanuku	earth, mother earth, earth goddess
rākau	tree, trees
tangaroa	sea, god of the sea
tangata whenua	people of the land, indigenous people of Aotearoa-New Zealand
taonga	treasure, something owned
tapu	sacred, spiritually-influenced, forbidden
te ao Māori	the Māori world
te reo	Māori language
te reo me ona tikanga	Māori language and custom

te tiriti	te reo version of the Treaty of Waitangi
tēnā koutou	greeting to more than two people
tikanga	cultural customs, lore, ways of being
tino rangatiratanga	sovereignty, full autonomy of Māori
tokotoko	walking stick
tupuna/tipuna	ancestors
tūtae	excrement
whaikōrero	speech-making
whānau	extended family