

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

NEGOTIATING
BICULTURALISM
deconstructing pākehā
subjectivity

*A thesis
presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of*

Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology

at Massey University, Turitea Campus,
Aotearoa/New Zealand

bronwyn margaret campbell

2005

Tiriti o Waitangi 1840

Ko Wikitōria te Kuini o Ingarani i tana mahara atawai ki ngā Rangatira me ngā Hapū o Nu Tirani i tana hiahia hoki kia tohungia ki a rātou ō rātou rangatiratanga me tō rātou wenua, ā kia mau tonu hoki te Rongo ki a rātou me te Ātanoho hoki kua wakaaro ia he mea tika kia tukua mai tētahi Rangatira - hei kai wakarite ki ngā Tāngata māori o Nu Tirani - kia wakaaetia e ngā Rangatira māori te Kāwanatanga o te Kuini ki ngā wāhi katoa o te Wenua nei me ngā Motu - nā te mea hoki he tokomaha kē ngā tāngata o tōna Iwi Kua noho ki tēnei wenua, ā e haere mai nei.

Nā ko te Kuini e hiahia ana kia wakaritea te Kāwanatanga kia kaua ai ngā kino e puta mai ki te tangata Māori ki te Pākehā e noho ture kore ana. Nā, kua pai te Kuini kia tukua a hau a Wiremu Hopihona he Kapitana i te Roiara Nawi hei Kāwana mō ngā wāhi katoa o Nu Tirani e tukua āiane, amua atu ki te Kuini, e mea atu ana ia ki ngā Rangatira o te wakaminenga o ngā hapū o Nu Tirani me ērā Rangatira atu ēnei ture ka kōrerotia nei.

Ko te Tuatahi

Ko ngā Rangatira o te wakaminenga me ngā Rangatira katoa hoki kī hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu - te Kāwanatanga katoa ō rātou wenua.

Ko te Tuarua

Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarite ka wakaae ki ngā Rangatira ki ngā hapū - ki ngā tāngata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o ō rātou wenua ō rātou kāinga me ō rātou taonga katoa. Otiia ko ngā Rangatira o te wakaminenga me ngā Rangatira-katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wāhi wenua e pai ai te tangata nōna te Wenua - ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e rātou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mōna.

Ko te Tuatoru

Hei wakaritenga mai hoki tēnei mō te wakaaetanga ki te Kāwanatanga o te Kuini - Ka tiakina e te Kuini o Ingarani ngā tāngata māori katoa o Nu Tirani ka tukua ki a rātou ngā tikanga katoa rite tahi ki ana mea ki ngā tāngata o Ingarani.

(signed) W. Hobson Consul & Lieutenant Governor

Nā ko mātou ko ngā Rangatira o te Wakaminenga o ngā hapū o Nu Tirani ka huihui nei ki Waitangi ko mātou hoki ko ngā Rangatira o Nu Tirani ka kite nei i te ritenga o ēnei kupu, ka tangohia ka wakaaetia katoatia e mātou, koia ka tohungia ai ō mātou ingoa ō mātou tohu. Ka meatia tenei ki Waitangi i te ono o ngā rā o Pēpueri i te tau kotahi mano, e waru rau e wā te kau o tō tātou Ariki.

abstract

This thesis engages social constructionist epistemology, deconstruction and discourse analysis to constitute a reading of bicultural relations between māori and pākehā in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In the opening chapters, the theoretical and political framework of the project is developed and a critique of race/ethnicity/culture unfolds psychology as replete with eurocentrisms. Practices of biculturalism become increasingly challenging for mental health professionals (psychologists) in this context. For the most part, bicultural dialogue struggles to have an audience with pākehā. In Royal's (1998) terms, this implies that the meeting house for biculturalism is empty. pākehā mental health practitioners who were considered to be engaging in bicultural practices were interviewed about cultural identity, the meanings and practices of biculturalism, and their personal experiences of engaging in bicultural practices. The texts of these conversations were read through deconstructive discourse analysis to articulate the implications of their accounts for the future of bicultural practice in psychology. These readings consider how the kaikōrero negotiate being pākehā both within available pākehā (colonial) positions and beyond into new (postcolonial) subject positions. Taking up a postcolonial subject position puts kaikōrero in the uncomfortable and unfamiliar place of acknowledging their power. Negotiating pākehā subjectivity with a colonial past, a contemporary (pākehā) mainstream, and exploring new relationships with māori is a difficult and complicated process. In recognising the privileges of being pākehā the marginalisation of māori is mutually constructed. Some of the kaikōrero used the repertoire/metaphor of a journey when they talked of their bicultural development. Others talked of a distinct/discrete transformation of subjective experience/understanding. Discontent with the present state of biculturalism was mediated by positive aspirations for future relationships that were consultative, collaborative and collegial.

acknowledgements

EHARA TAKU TOA I TE TOA TAKITAHĪ
KO TAKU TOA HE TOA TAKITINI

There have been many weavers and many patterns which have been incorporated into this work.

The kaikōrero who generously gifted their time and kōrero to this project, without you it would not have been possible. Thank you.

To all the people who have contributed to the creation of my thesis: whānau/family, supervisors, friends, doctors, flat mates, ultimate buddies, class mates, rugby mates, coffee mates, church mates, children, mentors, teachers, listeners, and critics. I/i offer my humble thanks for your support and advice, love, guidance, patience, coffees, prayers, money, time, effort, tennis, Hemis, stuffing, photos, concern, interest, laughs, kai, korero, tautoko, and aroha. Without you this thesis would not have been completed. My condolences to the people who will now have to address me as 'Dr B.' You knew it was coming, but then, so was Christmas. And yes, I'll still be your friend.

To those that have sought out this thesis to read, thank you.

prologue

Tuia ki a Ranginui e tu iho
Tuia ki a Papatūānuku e takato nei
Tuia te here tangata

Ka rongo te pō, ka rongo te ao,

Tihei Mauriora¹

Ko Hikurangi te maunga
Ko Waiapu te awa
Ko Ngāti Porou te iwi
Ko bronwyn campbell ahau²

Ka nui te mihi ki a koutou katoa

This thesis was prepared by weaving together the various kōrero of written sources (references/citations) and of kaikōrero³ (personal communications).

There is knowledge included in this thesis that is taken for granted. This is a necessary part of any text. Mātauranga māori is frequently centralised through this/my text. Here, I/i have chosen to centralise my/our mātauranga māori and assume the reader has a similar knowledge. Where an unfamiliar

¹ This is the opening karakia. See Appendix A for english translation.

² This is my pepeha. See Appendix A for english translation.

³ *kaikōrero* were the participants in the present research: they spoke/gifted the kōrero.

term first appears an english translation/transformation is provided in the margins. Local culture is found in the vernacular that would be nonsense to an outsider: what might a Texan make of “verandahs, fish and chips, and footie on a Saturday afternoon” (Phillips, 2001, p. 334)? Such banal signs of culture often pass undetected.

Translations/Transformations are a necessary part of communicating in two languages. In order to engage in dialogue, common understandings are necessary (Hoskins, 2000). Where māori words are first introduced, a translation is included as a footnote⁴. Thereafter they are not translated. There are two reasons for this practice of footnoting. Some concepts are more accurately and appropriately referred to using māori terminology, for in translation their meaning is changed (for example, tino rangatiratanga). And secondly, as a māori woman researcher I/i am working to privilege māori voice, or more importantly to disrupt the ‘invisible’ pākehā centre. The seamless integration of te reo māori throughout this text works to problematise monolingualism when communicating about two cultures that speak different languages. This works to highlight the hegemony of common sense knowledge and to remind the reader of the multiplicity of texts.

The difficulty and disruption this creates for the monolingual english reader is entirely intentional. Without acknowledging the different epistemologies of each culture/language (for language is culture), bicultural practice is limited. Some work from the reader is required (Hoskins, 2001).

There are a number of theoretical and grammatical challenges I/i have included in this thesis. While I/i feel comfortable signifying ‘myself’ through a lower case [i] and māori/pākehā, I/i feel somewhat apprehensive applying the same rule elsewhere, for example, the Tiriti/Treaty, or other marginalised cultural groups. I/i do not wish to impose a different system simply because I/i feel theoretically righteous. Each convention privileged in this work has theoretical explanations. They are commonly used to disrupt the ‘real world’ in

⁴ Where word-for-word/literal translations (italicised) are inadequate they are supplemented with a contextual definition (non-italicised).

order to acknowledge the world constructed through dialogue (Coombes, 2000). The disruptions to the norm function to remind the reader of that which usually remains unquestioned/taken for granted.

Occasionally my conventions compromised other conventions, such as that of grammar. For instance, politically intentional decapitalisation could be masked when beginning a sentence. Usually the grammatical convention would be privileged. I/i have chosen to privilege the lower case form. The preceding period is sufficient indication of the end of a sentence.

Further semantic difficulties/differences included in the text disrupt smooth reading. These inclusions, while cumbersome, are used here to remind the reader of multiplicities of texts. For example, "I/i" is a reminder to the reader of the multiplicities of self. Multiplicity is recognised through the use of the lowercase "i" (Minh-ha, 1989). This concept is consistent with māori constructions of the self: "'Ahau', 'I' then, does not represent an internally unified autonomous self but a permeable, open self, constituted in dynamic and multiple relationships" (Hoskins, 2001, p. 24). Mention of I/i indicates multiplicity and authority. This tends to make reading complex/difficult: The inconvenience is intentional.

We all take on different faces at different times: rather than having one identity, each of us have many. I/i am constituted in many ways, as māori, as woman, as psychologist. As a student I/i was sometimes identified as māori and offered space to speak on māori issues; positioned as an 'expert' of sorts. I/i often felt obliged to supplement the knowledge that was being offered but frequently offered a disclaimer: my voice was only one of many māori voices. Constitution as a *serviceable other* (Minh-ha, 1989) limits the positions available for me to take up. What would the response have been if I/i reported back in te reo māori? Was there space for us to enter into dialogue, or was my involvement constrained to intelligibility within a (monolingual) model of psychological discourse. Donna Matakaere-Atariki (1998) speaks of a similar discomfort: "I am not to be seen as representative. Whenever I have had the opportunity to speak, to intervene in popular knowledges about Māori women,

it is precisely when the audience appears to agree, to become comfortable that I feel I have failed' (p. 72).

One of the things I/i noticed early on was my inability to articulate thoughts on the dominance of a western world view using psychological language. Seldom is *hegemony* mentioned, *cultural privilege* is silenced through talking instead about the need for *cultural sensitivity*, *cultural awareness*, *cultural competency* and *cultural safety*. Without the historical and political complex of intercultural relations it is easy to remain unaware of the culturally bounded/restricted abilities of the language of psychology. I/i now understand the cultural neutrality of science and psychology as a ruse for continuing relationships of domination.

Ruwhiu (1999) reflects on the constraints of being māori and working within western empirical conventions. As I/i worked through this project, my emotional response was tangi for the history of a people, my people, who were colonised. Colonisation is such a clinical term for a profound history and generational experiences of losses and...

The philosophical orientation, social constructionist inquiry, is relevant to all who seek an interpretation of life through words. Social constructionism disrupts the illusion of the 'real' world pulled over our eyes to blind us from our/my 'truth/s.' Ironically, one of the critiques of such approaches is that the texts orientate to those metanarratives of academia and are largely unavailable for the mainstream/layperson (hooks, 1990; Misra, 1993). The challenge for social constructionist researchers is to be accountable and intelligible to the general population (Kanpol, 1994; Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Through social constructionism I/i quickly became familiar with a new vocabulary for constructing the world. Critique at the level of epistemology/ontology was enabled and the history and politics of particular positions and relationships, even my own, were legitimately included.

Both social constructionism and cultural pluralism occupy a marginalised/compromised position in relation to mainstream psychology. Both observe the person in a social/political/cultural context, rejecting

individualism, objectivity and neutrality. Both launch a critical evaluation of mainstream assertions of ethno/eurocentrism and highlight the importance of language in such interactions. Constructionism and cultural pluralism require a radical epistemological shift (Gill, 1996; Ivey, Ivey & Simek-Morgan, 1996). The collaboration of indigenous voices with constructionism, for example, can produce formidable, albeit marginalised, critique. However, one should be careful to avoid unreflexively assuming that poststructuralist social constructionist approaches are relevant or helpful to kaupapa māori approaches. Although some writers suggest this could be a useful alliance (see for example, Hoskins, 2000) further discussion/development between tohunga and those familiar with constructionism is necessary.

In/Through exploring issues of biculturalism, the Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi is necessary. As the fabric of our 'bicultural' society in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and as a covenant that always speaks, I/i assumed a position for the document that encompasses the whole work: inside the front and back covers of this thesis. I/i understand the spirit of the Tiriti/Treaty speaks a philosophy of partnership, authority, and obligations for māori and pākehā.

The 'Tiriti /Treaty' and 'Aotearoa/New Zealand' are examples of what Jacques Derrida has called "simultaneous presence" (Derrida, 1996/1998). Derrida utilises the plurality of texts to play with meanings and to problematise the epistemological assumptions of western ways of knowing. He challenges the western tendency to dichotomise. So, rather than indicating an 'either/or' situation, the slash separating the two terms challenges the dichotomy encompassing the possibility of either/or and also both/neither. The slash suggests difference and also affinity (Meredith, 1999).

Some time ago I/i naïvely enquired about the place of language in māori epistemology and received a whakapapa stretching back to te po. Partnering social constructionist with māori epistemologies is included here only in a very superficial way. More than this is beyond the scope of the present study.

As the writer of a text I/i cannot anticipate or control reader's interpretations. However, through presenting disruptive written forms I/i hope to remind the reader of the multiplicity/plurality of meaning contained within familiar language, and pose a challenge to largely unquestioned dominant understandings. 'Scare quotes' are used to highlight particular contested terms. Derrida (1978/1988) talked of these as marking out a precaution, a problematic sign/process of signification, perhaps a hazy sign.

My research journey began with wawata⁵ of the partnership of the Tiriti/Treaty and a belief in the political necessity of biculturalism. The journey carried with it a researcher who was of the binary: divided in two by mainstream bicultural discourses but with aspirations for wholeness. She/we was to find partiality, multiplicity, and mutuality instead.

⁵ *wawata: aspirations, goals*

table of contents

	page
abstract	i
acknowledgements	ii
prologue	iii
table of contents	ix

Chapter

I	STICKS AND STONES OF LANGUAGE	1
	the constitutive power of language	3
	privilege and marginalisation: relations of power	13
	contextualising inexorably subjective knowledge	30
II	BY ANY OTHER NAME LANGUAGE SPEAKS CULTURE	37
	scientific racism: the way the truth and the light	39
	cultural deficit model	45
	race/ethnicity/culture	50
	unbearable whiteness of being	63
III	PSYCHOLOGY AS CULTURAL PRACTICE	
	BICULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY	65
	titled history: in their own words, so to speak	67
	models of biculturalism	75
	(inadequately) disclaiming eurocentrism	79
	ethical intentions	84
	training limitations	97
	workforce development: pākehā deficit	100
	<i>the partner that is not one</i>	104

IV	GETTING TO DECONSTRUCTION	106
	what am I/i?	107
	encounter: relatedness	109
	kaikōrero & kōrero	111
	<i>collecting/making kōrero</i>	112
	<i>coding</i>	113
	discursive possibilities	114
	deconstructing dichotomies and power	117
V	READING PĀKEHĀ SUBJECTIVITY: A PRELUDE	120
VI	CLAIMING PĀKEHĀ PRIVILEGE	128
	claiming pākehā culture	130
	pākehā privilege/power	135
	knowing/owning pākehā power	139
VII	PĀKEHĀ PRIVILEGE MARGINALISES MĀORI	144
	disrupting power: transforming (into) 'other'	152
VIII	HEART SUBJECTIVITY	164
IX	RELATIONSHIP PRACTICE	181
X	WHIRIWHIRI KŌRERO: DIALOGUE/POST-SCRIPT	193
	REFERENCES	199
	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A: HE WHAKAMĀRAMA	232
	Appendix B: INFORMATION SHEET	234
	Appendix C: CONSENT FORM	236
	Appendix D: TRANSCRIPTION NOTES	237