Decolonizing Methodologies

RESEARCH AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Linda Tuhiwai Smith

Contents

Gender in Women's Autobiography, eds S. Smith and J. Watson, University of Minneapolis Press, Minneapolis; and Yudice, G. (1991), 'Testimonies and Post Modernism', in *Latin American Perspectives: a Journal on Capitalism and Socialism*, Vol. 18, Nos 3–4, pp. 15–31.

4 See also Nabokov, P. (1992), *Native American Testimony*, Penguin Books, New York.

5 Rintoul, S. (1993), *The Wailing: a National Black Oral History*, Heinemann, Australia, p. 8.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

7 Bishop, R. (1996), *Collaborative Research Stories,* Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, p. 24.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 169.

9 Johnson, S. and D. Budnik (1994), *The Book of Elders*, Harper, San Francisco, p. 7.

10 Cajete, G. (1994), *Look to the Mountain. An Ecology of Indigenous Education*, Kivaki Press, Colorado, p. 73.

11 Churchill, W. (1993), 'I Am Indigenist', in *Struggle for the Land*, ed. Ward Churchill, Common Courage Press, Maine, pp. 403–51.

12 Jaimes, M.A. (1995), 'Native American Identity and Survival: Indigenism and Environmental Ethics', in *Issues in Native American Cultural Identity*, ed. M. K. Green, Peter Lang Publishers, New York.

13 Smith, G. H. (1990), 'Research Issues Related to Maori', *The Issue of Research and Maori*, ed. G. H. Smith and M. Hohepa, Research Unit for Maori Education, Monograph 9, University of Auckland, pp. 14–22.

14 Ihimaera, W. (1990), *Te Ao Marama*, Reed Books, Auckland, Vol. 1.

15 Harjo, J. and G. Bird, eds (1997), *Reinventing the Enemy's Language. Contemporary Native Women's Writings of North America*, W. W. Norton and Company, New York.

16 See, for example, Moses, D. D. and T. Goldie (1992), *An Anthology of Canadian Native Literature in English*, Oxford University Press, Toronto.

17 Mita, M. (1994), 'Trick or Treat. Issues of Feminism and Post-colonialism in Relation to the Arts', in *Te Pua Journal of Maori Women's Writing*, Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 37–41.

18 Mead, A. (1994) 'Maori Leadership', in *Te Pua Journal of Maori Women's Writing*, Research Unit for Maori Education, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 11–20.

19 Sykes, R. B. (1989), *Black Majority*, Hudson Hawthorn, Melbourne, p. 146.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 226.

21 Sykes, A. (1994), 'Constitutional Reform and Mana Wahine', in *Te Pua Journal of Maori Women's Writing*, Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 15–20.

CHAPTER 9

Responding to the Imperatives of an Indigenous Agenda: A Case Study of Maori

The following two chapters represent a case study of one indigenous development, which demonstrates how many of the issues raised in the previous chapters come together. This chapter discusses the beginnings of a different type of involvement in research by Maori. Rather than accept the position either of 'victim' or of 'object,' Maori people voiced resistance to research from the late 1960s and began to pose their own research questions. There were three incentives for this shift in approach to research: (1) the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal;[1] (2) the development of a language revitalization movement known as Te Kohanga Reo; and (3) the spaces opened up in the social sciences by more critical and reflexive approaches to research. This chapter tracks the transition from Maori as the researched to Maori as the researcher. Although this transition has occurred in the last 20 years, it would be wrong to claim either an overall change in attitudes by Maori to research or a steady progression of changes made. The intersecting spaces opened up by the development of research for the Waitangi Tribunal, the new enthusiasm shown for Te Kohanga Reo, and the critique of positivist research by feminist and critical theorists created a set of conditions from which culturally sensitive approaches to research were developed, and from which a more sympathetic Maori approach started to emerge.

There are three distinct parts to this chapter. The first part examines the creation of a set of more favourable conditions for research involving Maori. There is a brief discussion of the spaces opened up through feminist and critical critiques of positivism, followed by a consideration of the impact of the Waitangi Tribunal and Te Kohanga Reo on setting the scene for establishing Maori research priorities. The second part of the chapter picks up on issues related to research of Maori and to the ways in which research has been employed and/or represented as 'truth'. Also in the second part of the chapter there is a very brief discussion of alternative Maori claims about knowledge and

research which intersect with the assumption that research extends knowledge. The question which begins the second part asks, 'Whose knowledge has been extended by research?' This then leads into some general issues that relate to Maori views about knowing. The third part of the chapter examines the parameters of 'culturally sensitive research' which is still an essentially Western research model. It ends with a brief discussion of the limits of this model in relation to non-indigenous research of Maori.

Western Critiques of Western Research

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Western cultural archive contained within it several traditions of knowledge and rules of practice for engaging in debates over knowledge. These rules enabled systems or methods of self-critique. The notion of research as an objective, value-free and scientific process for observing and making sense of human realities is taken for granted by many social scientists. Philosophers of science refer to this attitude as 'positivism'. Differences in approach to research, however, have been the subject of continuous debate, as those engaged in attempts to understand human society grapple with the problematic nature of social science inquiry. Within the social sciences there have been a number of disputes over method, meanings and what constitutes 'good' research. Method is important because it is regarded as the way in which knowledge is acquired or discovered and as a way in which we can 'know' what is real. Each academic discipline is attached not just to a set of ideas about knowledge, but also to methodologies. Disputes over method occur both within disciplines and across disciplines. This is not surprising, considering that all academic disciplines, as defined by the West, are derived from shared philosophical foundations. Some disputes, however, have 'raged' within the scientific world and have contributed to major schisms in theoretical positions.[2] At one level, this debate has been concerned primarily with issues related to methodology and method. These issues focus upon the appropriateness of research design and analysis. Definitions of validity and reliability are of critical importance here as researchers attempt to construct and perfect scientific instruments for observing and explaining human behaviour and the human condition. At a broader level, however, the debate has been concerned with the wider aims and role of research. Social science fields of inquiry are dependent on the way society is viewed, and the body of knowledge which legitimates that viewpoint. The dispute at this level is over the validity of scientific methods within the positivist paradigm, and whether this is an appropriate paradigm for understanding human society.

It was not really until the 1960s that critical theory took hold as a theory for research, although the death camps of Nazi Germany were seen by critics of positivism as demonstrating the ultimate irrationality of science and of modernity.[3] By the 1960s fundamental questions about knowledge and power were being articulated not just through academic discourse but through social movements such as the civil rights movement, the Anti-Vietnam War movement, the second wave of feminism and widespread student unrest culminating for many observers in the student riots in Paris in 1968. In the 1960s and 1970s other social events also took place for indigenous peoples. Protests over the Treaty of Waitangi, Bastion Point, land marches, tent embassies, sit-ins and petitions were the key events for Maori.[4] These events were reflected in other parts of the indigenous world. It is at this point that the questions asked by critical theory were also being asked by people on the ground. These people were indigenous activists rather than Marxists, but were asking similar sorts of questions about the connections between power and research. Such questions were based on a sense of outrage and injustice about the failure of education, democracy and research to deliver social change for people who were oppressed. These questions related to the relationship between knowledge and power, between research and emancipation, and between lived reality and imposed ideals about the Other.

During this period social theory shifted, and in the global arena of scholarship, Marxist theorists challenged the liberal theories of modernization and development which had determined how the imperial world dealt with its former colonies. Gunder Frank and others working in the South American and African contexts reexamined ideas of development and suggested that there was a causal relationship between First World economic policies and Third World underdevelopment. In education, Marxist researchers also drew attention to the structural relationship between society and schooling, with schools viewed as agencies which systematically reproduce social inequalities.[5] The links between imperialism, education and development were drawn by theorists such as Martin Carnoy.[6] These views have been criticized for their heavy emphasis on deterministic models of analysis and denial of culture as a mediating force. The central question of power and emancipation which was raised by Marxist theorists did connect, however, with the radical aspirations of a number of indigenous communities and former colonies which were struggling for self-determination.

The Challenges of Feminist Analyses

The debate over positivism which emerged from European academic

tradition has been continued in the Anglo-American world by feminist and other radical critiques of the positivist position. While Marxism provided a powerful counter to liberal thought in the first part of the twentieth century,[7] in the latter part of this century, the second wave of feminism may have been far more important in its challenge to the epistemological foundations of Western philosophy, academic practice and research. 'Old' philosophical themes about human nature, patriarchal accounts of the past, and rules of practice taken for granted within the academy have been rigorously scrutinized and reformed by feminist theorists working across a wide range of disciplines and from a wide spectrum of philosophical orientations. Each field of study has been subject to a critique from feminist theorists.[8]

One of the more significant challenges to white feminism has come from women variously described as 'women of colour', 'Third World women', 'black women' and 'indigenous women'. These groups of women challenged the assumptions of the Western/white women's movement that all women shared some universal characteristics and suffered from universal oppressions which could be understood and described by a group of predominantly white, Western-trained women academics. The problems of 'voice' and 'visibility', 'silence' and 'invisibility', became important concerns at a concrete level, as women attended international conferences and attempted to develop international policies related to women's rights, population control, development and justice. For women interested in research and the emancipatory potential of research, there was considerable work to be done in terms of undoing or deconstructing the dominant paradigms by which most scientific research was bounded, and connecting the research enterprise to feminism and to a social reality with which feminism connects.[9] This has involved critique, the development of new methodologies, and the possibility of alternative ways of knowing or epistemologies.[10]

Part of the feminist critique has also occurred within the field of critical theory. This critique has two aspects to it. One is in terms of the failure of critical theory to deliver emancipation for oppressed groups.[11] The second aspect is in terms of the failure of critical theorists who belonged to the academy of scientists to recognize their own patriarchal practices which continued to marginalize and silence women academics. This challenge has focused on the notion of reflexivity in research, a process of critical self awareness, reflexivity and openness to challenge. Feminist scholarship has slowly moved into the academy and, in the area of research in particular, feminist methodologies are widely accepted as having legitimacy as method and as breaking new ground in terms of research and scholarship.

Patti Lather has referred to this new ground research as post-positivism, a term which comes out of poststructuralist and postmodern approaches to knowledge.[12] Lather outlines some of these approaches in Table 9.1, with categories drawn partly from Habermas's categories of prediction, understanding and emancipation, and her own addition of deconstruction.[13] This chart is useful because it sets out the different names by which various critiques of positivist science are known. These 'labels' are frequently used to describe different approaches to non-positivist research. What is significantly absent are the organic and indigenous approaches to research, which have led to the development of a world indigenous movement and to major constitutional claims on Western states by indigenous peoples. Such approaches to research are often regarded as deriving from Freirian approaches, which are seen to be 'Western'. As will be argued later, the possibility that approaches can be generated from very different value systems and world views are denied even within the emancipatory paradigm of 'postpositivism'.

Table 9.1 Postpositivist Inquiry			
Predict	Understand	Emancipate	Deconstruct
postivism	interpretative naturalistic constructivist phenomenological hermeneutic	critical neoMarxist feminist praxis-oriented educative Freirian participatory action research	poststructural postmodern post-paradigm diaspora
P Lather 1991			

The work being carried out by Western feminists has been countered by the work of black women and other 'women with labels'. In fact, the very labelling of women demonstrates the pluralism within the feminist world, and the multiple directions from which feminist theory has emerged and to which it may be heading. These Other/ed women have argued that oppression takes different forms, and that there are interlocking relationships between race, gender and class which makes oppression a complex sociological and psychological condition. Many have argued that this condition cannot be understood or analysed by outsiders or people who have not experienced, and who have not been born into, this way of life. Patricia Hill Collins has argued that 'while Black feminist thought may be recorded by others, it is produced by Black women'.[14] Further, she argues that 'Black women possess a unique

standpoint on, or perspective of, their experiences ... [and] ... while living life as Black women may produce certain commonalities of outlook, the diversity of class, region, age, and sexual orientation shaping Black women's lives has resulted in different expressions of these common themes.'[15] This position intersects with Maori attitudes to research, and the writings of African American women in particular have been useful for Maori women in legitimating, with literature, what Maori women have experienced.

The Waitangi Tribunal and Te Kohanga Reo

The significance of the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in New Zealand in 1975, in relation to research, was that it gave a very concrete focus for recovering and/or representing Maori versions of colonial history, and for situating the impact of colonialism in Maori world views and value systems. Struggles over land issues had been ongoing since the Treaty of Waitangi was signed between Maori chiefs and representatives of the British Crown in 1840 and land alienation was facilitated efficiently through the establishment of the Native Land Court in 1865.[16] Successive governments and local authorities had imposed a series of laws and regulations, which were designed to alienate Maori land from Maori people.[17] This approach continued throughout the 1950s and 1960s with what has been called a 'use it or lose it' philosophy.[18] The 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act gave limited powers to the Tribunal, which could not hear land claims that went back to 1840. Although most of the land subject to Maori discontent had been taken prior to 1975, a forum through which Maori could legitimately voice concerns was regarded positively.

The Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act 1985 broadened the scope of the Tribunal, and it is from this period that *iwi*/tribes started quite seriously to develop their own research programmes.[19] The research priorities were determined by the nature of the claim being made and driven by the sense of injustice felt by the *iwi* concerned. There were few Maori people skilled in research and many of those available to do the work were unemployed or retired. Other tribal research programmes were reliant on one skilled researcher and many young and enthusiastic trainees, some of whom had been unemployed or on job skills training programmes. Very few had university qualifications. In general these early programmes were carried out with limited funding and with few skilled researchers. This often told when the evidence was finally presented and a number of claims required further substantiation. The first level of research which needed to be done required archival research, familiarity with Land Court records, and oral histories. This

was followed by another level of interpretative research, especially over contestable issues such as establishing prior ownership of lands or resources also being claimed by other *iwi* or contested by the Crown. In this process the Crown was not and is not neutral. After 1985 the state moved rapidly into economic reforms and the privatization of state assets. It was the contention of *iwi* that most of the state's assets had been built upon Maori lands. Privatization activities have continued unabated and the Crown's activities in relationship to the Tribunal are to subsume its importance and deal with what is politically acceptable.

Although at one level there was an impetus in terms of bringing cases against the Crown, there was a much broader desire by Maori communities to regain or hold on to Maori language and cultural knowledge. This desire and mood is what Te Kohanga Reo captured and for which it provided a new and positive focus. While the claims to the Tribunal were being made on the basis of tribal interests, and even these were contested within tribes, the Te Kohanga Reo was built on the more fundamental unit of *whanau* or extended family. Te Kohanga Reo was represented and represented itself as 'the future'. As a national phenomenon, it did not depend on *iwi* structures for its credibility or financial support. Although some Te Kohanga Reo are clearly situated within tribes, their administrative centre is the National Te Kohanga Reo Trust, based in the capital city of Wellington. The two developments, therefore, the Waitangi Tribunal process and Te Kohanga Reo, were operating quite independently of each other and having an impact on communities in very different ways. Te Kohanga Reo, furthermore, discouraged research but encouraged autonomy amongst its individual units. A consequence of such autonomy is that there was space for *whanau* to solve problems for themselves and this process generated a wide range of activities, one of which was information gathering. It was also a process which committed parents to thinking far more seriously about education and the relationship between schooling and society.

Research as an Extension of Knowledge – Whose Knowledge?

The critique of positivism by feminist theorists, ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples has emerged from the experience of people who have been studied, researched, written about, and defined by social scientists. It is from the position of being the researched that Maori, too, have resisted and then challenged social science research. This challenge has confronted both methodological issues and epistemological concerns: that is, both the techniques of research and the presuppositions about knowledge which underlie research. The criticisms raised by Maori

people locate the theoretical debates of the wider world within a local New Zealand context.

Research is about satisfying a need to know, and a need to extend the boundaries of existing knowledge through a process of systematic inquiry. Rationality in the Western tradition enabled knowledge to be produced and articulated in a scientific and 'superior' way. As Europeans began to explore and colonize other parts of the world, notions of rationality and conceptualizations of knowledge became the 'convenient tool for dismissing from serious comparison with Western forms of thought those forms of "primitive" thought which were being encountered'.[20] As Salmond has argued, this view has led to 'European evaluations of Maori knowledge ... [which] have characteristically been ideological'.[21] For Maori people, European conceptions of knowledge and of research have meant that, while being considered 'primitive', Maori society has provided fertile ground for research. The question of whose knowledge was being extended by research was of little consequence, as early ethnographers, educational researchers and occasional 'travellers' described, explained and recorded their accounts of various aspects of Maori society. Distortions of Maori social reality by ethnocentric researchers overly given to generalizations were initially apparent only to Maori people.[22] While this type of research was validated by 'scientific method' and 'colonial affirmation', it did little to extend the knowledge of Maori people. Instead, it left a foundation of ideologically laden data about Maori society, which has distorted notions of what it means to be Maori.

This in turn has entrapped Maori people within a cultural definition which does not connect with either our oral traditions or our lived reality. Maori women, for example, are caught between the written accounts of white male writers and the assertions of the few Maori women who are contesting those early accounts. For example, Elsdon Best says of his research among the Tuhoe tribe, 'As in most other barbaric lands, we find that women were looked upon here as being inferior to man.'[23] Compare that with what Rangimarie Rose Pere, herself a descendant of Tuhoe Potiki, has to say: 'As a female, I have been exposed to very positive female role models from both my natural parents' descent lines. The most senior men and women ... made it quite clear from the legacy they left that men and women, adults and children, work alongside each other and together'.[24] The problem is not simply about redressing the past. Much of what was written about Maori people in the last century and in this century has become part of a body of common knowledge that is taken for granted. Hence the uphill task for Maori women seeking to reconstruct traditional roles is that they are having to challenge existing 'knowledge' which is primarily ideological

or false. Consider the following three examples:

1 Culturally, the role of women was made clear in the account of their creation. The first woman was formed out of a mound of earth and impregnated by her male creator with a life spirit. From this, woman was regarded as being a passive receptacle for the dominant male spirit.[25]

There are three points which can be made in relation to this account. Firstly, Maori would claim that we were created by a *tipuna*, of 'god-like' status, who also impregnated most other living things on earth with 'life spirits'. The problem lies in the reduction of our creation myths to a story of 'man' and 'woman', like a Judaeo-Christian account of 'Adam and Eve'. The second problem with this interpretation lies with the concept of male and female 'spirits'. Humans as well as plants, animals, stones, carvings and other animate and inanimate objects (according to Western classifications) have a 'life force' or *mauri*. In many oral accounts both male and female 'essences' reside in that life force. While the life force in people and animals may be manifested in physically 'male' or 'female' characteristics, *mauri* is not itself gendered. The third problematic aspect of this quote is the concept of a 'passive receptacle'. There are enough examples in oral histories to demonstrate that women were always considered more than 'passive receptacles'.

2 In Maori attitudes towards a woman's place, there was, on the surface, little conflict with the Victorian espousal of a limited domestic sphere.[26]

The difficulties with this quote are its comparative appeal to Victorian attitudes and the concept of a 'limited domestic sphere'. The comparison is a dangerous one in two respects: it reduces and decontextualizes Maori values and practices on one hand (in order to make the comparison), and, secondly, it poses unproblematically the normative 'reality' of notions such as 'woman's place' and 'domestic spheres'.

3 [Maori] women suffered a social oppression typical of all societies that reject the fatherhood of God.[27]

The third quotation uses a single almighty generalization to justify a new form of colonialism (fundamentalist Christianity). No sources are acknowledged for this information and, in a sense, none are required, because it is posited as 'common sense'. This has been the danger of ethnocentric research paradigms.

The extracts above were not written by Maori but by people who were informed by the research and material which has been written and recorded by other non-Maori about Maori society. The effect of a

process which tends to give greater legitimacy to written sources is that the most accessible material was not written by Maori. Therefore, the potential to reproduce colonizing ideologies and colonizing perspectives is always present. As argued by Merata Mita, however, 'paternalism doesn't work and as soon as we reject it we're the ones seen to be causing the "problem" when in fact the problem is created by whoever is looking through the microscope'.[28]

The Validity of Maori Knowledge

The reassertion of Maori aspirations and cultural practice which came about through Te Kohanga Reo, the Waitangi Tribunal and other forms of Maori activism has demonstrated a will by Maori people to make explicit claims about the validity and legitimacy of Maori knowledge. This will has been expressed through various educational and community programmes. Government policies on devolution and the retraction of state assets have also stimulated *iwi* to carry out research on their own behalf.[29] In many cases Maori organizations have been reluctant to allow research to be carried out until they have developed a sufficiently strong base.

When Cook arrived here in the eighteenth century, he found a thriving and complex society. Later voyagers and travellers, including Christian missionaries, were fascinated and heartened that Maori concepts relating to cosmology and spirituality were so sophisticated. Missionaries, for example, were reported to have had little difficulty in talking about spiritual concepts with Maori people.[30] Although later settlers saw little that was civilizing in Maori beliefs or practice, earlier visitors, including many missionaries, were appreciative of the breadth and sophistication of Maori epistemology. Because of the way Maori society was structured, because of its unique world view, and because of its strong oral tradition, knowledge itself was never held to be universally available. Maori society valued knowledge highly, to such an extent that certain types of knowledge were entrusted to only a few members of the *whanau*. Some knowledge was considered to be *tapu* and there were sanctions that ensured that it was protected, used appropriately, and transmitted with accuracy.

Maori have a highly developed story of how knowledge was gained. In one of our first 'research projects' Tane-nui-a-rangi, one of the children of the first parents, (the sky father and the earth mother) journeyed to the twelfth 'universe' to gain knowledge.[31] Two points to emphasize in this story are that Tane-nui-a-rangi sought knowledge on behalf of everyone else, and, secondly, the knowledge he gained was differentiated into three separate baskets.[32] These baskets contained

different types of knowledge. Knowledge was perceived as being highly specialized, but each aspect was essential to collective wellbeing. It was also perceived as being hierarchical. There was knowledge that all people needed to carry out their daily activities. It was acquired through observation, practice, and the guidance of *kaumatua*. Stories and proverbs show that sloppiness, laziness and the non-completion of tasks were not tolerated and earned retribution.

The whole process of colonization can be viewed as a stripping away of *mana* (our standing in our own eyes), and an undermining of *rangatiratanga* (our ability and right to determine our destinies). Research is an important part of the colonization process because it is concerned with defining legitimate knowledge. In Maori communities today, there is a deep distrust and suspicion of research. This suspicion is not just of non-indigenous researchers, but of the whole philosophy of research and the different sets of beliefs which underlie the research process. Even in very recent studies, this hostility or negative attitude to research in general has been noted.[33] Research methodology is based on the skill of matching the problem with an 'appropriate' set of investigative strategies. It is concerned with ensuring that information is accessed in such a way as to guarantee validity and reliability. This requires having a theoretical understanding, either explicitly or implicitly, of the world, the problem, and the method. When studying how to go about doing research, it is very easy to overlook the realm of common sense, the basic beliefs that not only help people identify research problems that are relevant and worthy, but also accompany them throughout the research process. Researchers must go further than simply recognizing personal beliefs and assumptions, and the effect they have when interacting with people.[34] In a cross-cultural context, the questions that need to be asked are ones such as:

Who defined the research problem?
For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so?
What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?
What are some likely positive outcomes from this study?
What are some possible negative outcomes?
How can the negative outcomes be eliminated?
To whom is the researcher accountable?
What processes are in place to support the research, the researched and the researcher?

Moreover, it is also important to question that most fundamental belief of all, that individual researchers have an inherent right to knowledge and truth. We should not assume that they have been trained

well enough to pursue it rigorously, nor to recognize it when they have 'discovered' it. An analysis of research into the lives of Maori people, from a Maori perspective, would seem to indicate that many researchers have not only not found 'truth' or new knowledge; rather, they have missed the point entirely, and, in some cases, drawn conclusions about Maori society from information that has only the most tenuous relationship how Maori society operates.[35]

The social settings of the non-indigenous world into which Maori people were compelled to move – such as the school, the health system, the welfare system, the justice system – have at the same time provided researchers with a point of entry into Maori society. Essentially, this has been crisis research, directed at explaining the causes of Maori failure and supposedly solving Maori problems. On the basis of research carried out on the sites of these encounters, researchers sometimes made huge inferential leaps and generalizations about how the rest of Maori society functioned, and which elements of this society were inhibiting successful development.[36] To return to the story of Tane-nui-a-rangi and the three kinds of knowledge, these gifts were all essential to the survival and well-being of the group. Because knowledge was conceived from the beginning as being highly specialized, it had to be distributed among the members of the group. Individuals with specialist skills held them on behalf of the group. They were also dependent on other members of the group, with other types of knowledge, to carry out the various inter-dependent activities. When a researcher uses individual informants and interviews individuals in a one-to-one context, the resulting information may be a long way from the full picture. The connection of knowledge with *mana* could mean that an informant is not going to reveal too much, is not going to admit lack of knowledge but, conversely, is going to assert influence or a picture of dominance by what is revealed, and is going to give an individual view, from an individualist perspective, of group knowledge and activities. Although many people would argue that, under the influence of the colonial society, much of this tradition has been eroded, there is still a strong belief held by many Maori people that there is a uniquely 'Maori' way of looking at the world and learning. The growth of Te Kohanga Reo would seem to bear this out. The different ways in which knowledge is perceived by indigenous and non-indigenous is complicated further by the intersection with imperial power. They are not held to be equally valid or commensurate views of reality, let alone of research.

The colonization of Maori culture has threatened the maintenance of that knowledge and the transmission of knowledge that is 'exclusively' or particularly Maori. The dominance of Western, British culture, and the history that underpins the relationship between indigenous Maori

and non-indigenous Pakeha, have made it extremely difficult for Maori forms of knowledge and learning to be accepted as legitimate. By asserting the validity of Maori knowledge, Maori people have reclaimed greater control over the research which is being carried out in the Maori field. 'Traditional' world views provide an historical example of the complexity of Maori beliefs and understandings of the world. They also provide ample examples of Maori efforts to seek knowledge, to organize it and to learn from it. It might be said that this historical knowledge is irrelevant in a contemporary context.[37] But from a Maori perspective, it is only as irrelevant as the thoughts of Western philosophers such as Plato or St Augustine, whose ideas have been of such central importance to Western epistemology. Maori knowledge represents the body of knowledge which, in today's society, can be extended, alongside that of existing Western knowledge.

Negotiating New Relationships with Non-indigenous Researchers

An illustration of the widespread ethical abuses of research is to be found in the 1988 research scandal which occurred in New Zealand over the treatment, and more especially non-treatment, of cervical cancer at National Women's Hospital in the 1980s. Similar abuses of research have been recorded – the Tuskagee project in the United States, for example, which involved a black male prison population in a project on syphilis. In brief, women with early signs of pre-cancer who were examined at the hospital were assigned to one of two groups without their knowledge or consent. One of those groups received treatment. The research came to be conducted as an ongoing project incorporated into institutional practices, almost as official policy. When two feminist journalists reported the study it produced a huge national outcry which eventually became the focus of an official inquiry. The nature of the research under investigation by the inquiry challenged the ethics of researchers in a public and dramatic way.[38] It was a moment in which the dominant non-indigenous society glimpsed some small part of a wider attitude and system of abuse by researchers with which indigenous people have been only too familiar.

Although many researchers involved in social science may confidently assert that their research does not endanger lives, many lessons can be learned from such an inquiry. Although most researchers would believe sincerely that they wish to improve the conditions of their research participants, this has not always happened. Research projects are designed and carried out with little recognition accorded to the people who participated – 'the researched'. Indigenous people and other groups in society have frequently been portrayed as the powerless victims of

research which has attributed a variety of deficits or problems to just about everything they do. Years of research have frequently failed to improve the conditions of the people who are researched. This has led many Maori people to believe that researchers are simply intent on taking or 'stealing' knowledge in a non-reciprocal and often under-handed way. The Cartwright Inquiry motivated a more public discussion of research ethics. For Maori the inquiry simply reinforced an attitude of suspicion towards research although it also provided space to negotiate research with non-indigenous researchers much more explicitly. Researchers, for example, had to distance themselves from the experimental control research model used by the medical researchers under inquiry.

Research in itself is a powerful intervention, even if carried out at a distance, which has traditionally benefited the researcher, and the knowledge base of the dominant group in society. When undertaking research, either across cultures or within a minority culture, it is critical that researchers recognize the power dynamic which is embedded in the relationship with their subjects. Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical frame-work, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate and to draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgements, and often downright misunderstandings. They have the potential to extend knowledge or to perpetuate ignorance.

Culturally sensitive approaches to research cover a wide range of attempts to take heed of the problems and issues which concern the people involved in the research. For Maori, this has involved efforts by researchers to inform the 'researched' about themselves in a way which respects people. The challenge by Maori (and other groups) to the research community, demanding that they 'keep out' of researching Maori people or Maori issues, has led to several different approaches and strategies for carrying out further research. It did not mean that academics simply took notice of Maori and stopped all research, but that they sought other ways of thinking about their projects and proceeded with far more caution when entering the domain of Maori concerns.[39] There were different ways 'around the problem'. In a previously published paper I listed some of the following strategies which characterize the shifts towards becoming more culturally sensitive.[40] These are:

1 the strategy of avoidance whereby the researcher avoids dealing with the issues or with Maori;

2 the strategy of 'personal development' whereby the researchers

prepare themselves by learning Maori language, attending *hui* and becoming more knowledgeable about Maori concerns;

3 the strategy of consultation with Maori where efforts are made to seek support and consent;

4 the strategy of 'making space' where research organizations have recognized and attempted to bring more Maori researchers and 'voices' into their own organization.

These strategies have various consequences, positive and negative, for the researchers and the researched. They all involve different ways of making changes, although the first strategy of avoidance may not be helpful to anyone. In association with other shifts in social science theory and the development of feminist critiques of research, the move towards research which is more ethical, and concerned with outcomes as well as processes, has meant that those who choose to research with Maori people have more opportunities to think more carefully about what this undertaking may mean. This does not necessarily guarantee it, however.

Graham Smith has posited four models by which culturally appro-priate research can be undertaken by non-indigenous researchers.[41] The first model he refers to as the *tiaki* or mentoring model in which authoritative Maori people guide and sponsor the research. The second model Smith refers to as the *whangai* or adoption model.[42] The *whangai* model differs from the *tiaki* model in that the *whangai* researchers are incorporated into the daily life of Maori people, and sustain a life-long relationship which extends far beyond the realms of research. Smith's third model is a 'power sharing model' where researchers 'seek the assistance of the community to meaningfully support the development of a research enterprise'. The fourth model Smith refers to as the 'empowering outcomes model', which addresses the sorts of questions Maori people want to know and which has beneficial outcomes.

All these models imply a culturally sensitive and empathetic approach, but go beyond that approach to address the issues which are going to make a difference for Maori. Russell Bishop critically discusses some of the problems associated generally with emancipatory research and empowering models of research.[43] As he has argued, espousing an emancipatory model of research has not of itself freed researchers from exercising intellectual arrogance or employing evangelical and paternal-istic practices. This applies also to methods which appear to be qualita-tive or ethnographic. These approaches may sound more sensitive in the field, but often the assumptions behind the research focus and the trans-lation into text can be just as problematic as other forms of research.

Another model of research is subsumed under the label of 'bicultural' or partnership research. Although Smith's four models could also be claimed as bicultural in some form, the latest interpretation of bicultural research involves both indigenous and non-indigenous researchers working on a research project and shaping that project together. Sometimes this involves non-indigenous researchers taking responsibility for interviewing non-indigenous participants, and indigenous researchers interviewing indigenous participants. In other projects it involves a more complex structuring of a research programme, its design and methodology. Teariki and Spoonley write that research as a partnership involves working through a process which is inevitably political.[44] They argue that research needs to be carefully negotiated, and that the outcomes of research need to be thought through before the research is undertaken.

Setting the Boundaries to Research by Non-indigenous Researchers

All of the above models assume that indigenous people are involved in the research in key and often senior roles. With very few trained indigenous researchers available, one of the roles non-indigenous researchers have needed to play is as mentors of indigenous research assistants. Increasingly, however, there have been demands by indigenous communities for research to be undertaken exclusively by indigenous researchers. It is thought that Maori people need to take greater control over the questions they want to address, and invest more energy and commitment into the education and empowering of Maori people as researchers. Some organizations, for example, have made it very clear that research is 'off limits'. The best-known of these is the Te Kohanga Reo National Trust. This anti-research stance has applied to all researchers. There are other kinds of limits also being set, as more Maori begin to work in the various fields of social science research. For example, many Maori now attend both national and international conferences and have been known to question and challenge the material of New Zealand academics on such occasions.[45] In education, there are increasing numbers of Maori academics, researchers, policy analysts and administrators who keep track of research on Maori, and who disseminate research results very quickly to the wider community. The more radical limits to non-indigenous research, however, are being set by the developing field of indigenous Maori research and the increasing numbers of Maori researchers in both the social sciences and physical sciences, and in the area of tribal histories and land claims. The development of new ways of thinking about indigenous Maori research, and approaches to the way this research should be framed, have emerged in

the last decade under the rubric of Kaupapa Maori research. The following chapter will address this topic.

What I wanted to discuss in this chapter was the shift which occurred between Maori people being viewed as research objects and Maori people becoming our own researchers. This shift, I have argued, was not simply an evolutionary development. It came about through other changes, some of which occurred within Maori cultural politics, some of which were brought about by state intervention, and some of which occurred through the spaces opened up within the field of social science. I have not addressed individual disciplinary methodologies or methods, but have kept the discussion at a broader level of social science. Clearly there were significant changes in approach, which developed out of ethnographic research and other qualitative methods.

Notes

1 This was established through the Treaty of Waitangi Act (1975) to deal with claims by Maori that actions of the Crown from 1975 onwards had been prejudicial to them and had contravened the Treaty of Waitangi. This Act was amended by The Treaty of Waitangi Act (1985) which gave the Tribunal the right to hear cases which went back to 1840 when the Treaty of Waitangi, and the Maori version, Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed. The Tribunal was expanded from three members under the 1975 Act to several teams of members who are hearing cases across the country.
2 Adorno, T. W. *et al.* (1976), *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology*, translated by G. Adey and D. Frisby, Heinemann, London.
3 For a historical summary of critical theory in relation to education, see Blackledge, D. and B. Hunt (1985), *Sociological Interpretations of Education*, Croom Helm, London; Gibson, R. (1986), *Critical Theory and Education*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
4 See Ranginui Walker's account of these events in Walker, R. (1990), *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle Without End*, Penguin, Auckland.
5 Bowles, S. and H. Gintis (1976), *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Basic Books, United States.
6 Carnoy, M. (1974), *Education as Cultural Imperialism*, D. McKay Co., New York.
7 And is itself inextricably part of the modernist project.
8 Fonow, M. M. and J. A. Cook (1997), *Beyond Methodology. Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
9 Stanley, L. and S. Wise (1993), *Breaking Out Again. Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*, second edition, Routledge, London.
10 See, for example, Reinharz, S. (1992), *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, Oxford University Press, New York. Reinharz takes the reader through feminist methods for ethnography, survey research, experimental and cross-cultural research, oral histories, case studies and action research.
11 Ellsworth, E. (1989), 'Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy', in *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp. 297–324.

12 Lather, P. (1991), *Getting Smart, Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern*, Routledge, New York.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7.

14 Collins, P. H. (1991), 'Learning from the Outsider Within: the Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought', in *Beyond Methodology, Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, eds M. Fonow and J. A. Cook, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, p. 37.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 37.

16 The Treaty of Waitangi gave pre-emptive right to the Crown to purchase Maori land – that is, before any individuals or companies. This practice ceased under pressure from companies interested in settlement by British settlers.

17 According to Asher and Naulls, 'Since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 the Maori tribal estates have declined from almost 27 million hectares to about 1.3 million. And what remains is often in the form of fragmented holdings with a multiplicity of owners, predominantly absentee.' For further background see Asher, G. and D Naulls (1987), *Maori Land*, New Zealand Planning Council, Wellington, p. 46. Legislation which was used as a device to alienate the land included the Public Works Act 1908 which authorized the taking of European land for railways and roads, with right of objection and compensation. No notice was required to take Maori land until the Native Land Act 1909, which authorized the Governor General to take Maori lands for railways and roads, with no compensation. See Temm, P. (1990), *The Waitangi Tribunal*, Random Century, Auckland. There was a series of such acts of legislation which enabled the systematic stripping of land away from its owners.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 47.

19 According to Margaret Mutu, for example, her *iwi* (Ngati Kahu) had started talking about doing their own research in the early 1980s but had no funding to help them. Their case had its first hearing in 1987 and in 1995 is still being heard. Personal communication.

20 Egan, K. (1987), 'Literacy and the Oral Foundations of Education', in *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 57, No. 4, p. 446.

21 Salmond, A. (1985), 'Maori Epistemologies', in *Reason and Morality*, ed. J. Overing, Tavistock, London p. 240.

22 Smith G. H. (1986), 'Nga Kete Wananga – Akonga Maori: Maori Teaching and Learning', Maori Studies Department, Auckland College of Education, Auckland.

23 Best, E. (1934), *The Maori As He Was*, Maori Purposes Fund Board, Wellington, p. 93.

24 Pere, R. (1988), 'Te Wheke: Whaia te Maramatanga me te Aroha', in *Women and Education in Aotearoa*, ed. S. Middleton, Allen and Unwin, Wellington, p. 9.

25 Heuer B. (1972), *Maori Women*, The Polynesian Society, A. H. and A. W. Reed, Wellington, p. 55.

26 Fry, R. (1985), *It's Different for Daughters: a History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools 1900–1975*, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington, p. 156.

27 Drake, M. (1989), *The New Maori Myth*, Wycliffe Christian Schools, Auckland, p. 20.

28 Mita, M. (1989), 'Merata Mita On ...', in *New Zealand Listener*, 14 October, p. 30.

29 Every claim to the Waitangi Tribunal requires substantial amounts of research by Maori. This research includes searching through Native Land Court records,

archival research, written accounts of *whakapapa* (genealogies of tribes traced back to ancestors who arrived in Aotearoa by canoe and even further back to the creation of the universe), and the gathering of oral histories. In most cases this requires a team of researchers who have skills in Maori language, can find their way around legal documents, already have a sound historical understanding of the context, have the means to travel, are computer literate and can interpret different sorts of data.

30 In fact some, like Kendall, became very involved in discussions about Maori spirituality. See Binney, J. (1968), *The Legacy of Guilt: a Life of Thomas Kendal*, Oxford University Press, Auckland.

31 An English language account of one version of this story can be found in Buck P. (1949), *The Coming of the Maori*, Maori Purposes Fund Board, Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd., Wellington, pp. 443–72. Buck identifies the 'baskets of knowledge' as *kete uruuru matua* (peace and goodness), *kete uruuru rangi* (prayers and incantations) and *kete uruuru tau* or *tawhite* (war, agriculture, woodwork), p. 449. Another account is to be found in the manuscript by Te Matorohanga which was translated by Percy Smith as Smith, P. (1913), *The Lore of the Whare Wananga*, Polynesian Society, Thomas Avery, New Plymouth, New Zealand.

32 As well as three kinds of knowledge, Tane-nui-a-rangi also collected two *mauri* stones, Te Hukatai and Te Rehutai.

33 Teariki, C. and P. Spoonley (1992), *Te Whakapakari Te Mana Tangata – The Politics and Process of Research for Maori*, Department of Sociology, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

34 Which is the point at which some definitions of reflexivity actually stop.

35 Which is the point made by Toby Curtis. Curtis, T. (1983), 'A Maori Viewpoint Related to Research in Education in Maori Education', republished in *The Issue of Research and Maori*, Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland, Auckland.

36 See for example, Beaglehole, E. and Beaglehole, P. (1948), *Some Modern Maoris*, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.

37 In fact, it is frequently said in letters to the newspapers that Maori knowledge, if such a thing can be said to exist, is irrelevant, heathen, backwards and wrong.

38 See for example, Coney, S. (1988), *The Unfortunate Experiment*, Penguin, Auckland. According to Coney, when this experiment was approved the ethical obligations were still framed by the Helsinki Agreement (1964, 1975, 1983) which developed in response to the clinical trials of Nazi doctors in concentration camps.

39 This is a very positive gloss as there are many anecdotal examples of researchers who just carried on with little regard for Maori concerns.

40 Smith, L. T. (1989), 'On Being Culturally Sensitive: the Art of Gathering and Eating Kina Without Pricking Yourself on the Finger', keynote address to the New Zealand Psychological Society Annual Conference, University of Auckland. Reprinted in *The Issue of Research and Maori*, Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland. A *kina* is a sea urchin, very prickly on the outside and not very attractive on the inside, except to those of us who regard them as a summer delicacy.

41 Smith, G. H. (1992), 'Research Issues Related to Maori Education', in *The Issue of Research and Maori*, Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland, Auckland.

42 Both terms, *tiaki* and *whangai*, define types of relationships which are considered

positive and appropriate under certain constraints.
43 Bishop, R. (1994), 'Initiating Empowering Research?' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies,* Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 175–88.
44 Teariki, C. and P. Spoonley (1992), *Te Whakapakari.*
45 They will also challenge academics from other countries, especially if it is thought that they have ignored the situation of indigenous people in their own countries or, worse, misrepresented them.

CHAPTER 10

Towards Developing Indigenous Methodologies: Kaupapa Maori Research

What happens to research when the researched become the researchers?

As mentioned in previous chapters, research of Maori is marked by a history that has shaped the attitudes and feelings Maori people have held towards research. Research is implicated in the production of Western knowledge, in the nature of academic work, in the production of theories which have dehumanized Maori and in practices which have continued to privilege Western ways of knowing, while denying the validity for Maori of Maori knowledge, language and culture. We have also mentioned the general impact of Western research on Maori attitudes towards theory and academic knowledge, attitudes which have led some Maori at least in the direction of rejecting *all* theory and *all* research. One of the challenges for Maori researchers working in this context has been to retrieve some space – first, some space to, convince Maori people of the value of research for Maori; second, to convince the various, fragmented but powerful research communities of the need for greater Maori involvement in research; and third, to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research, and the parameters of both previous and current approaches. What is now referred to as Kaupapa Maori approaches to research, or simply as Kaupapa Maori research, is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims. This naming of research has provided a focus through which Maori people, as communities of the researched and as new communities of the researchers, have been able to engage in a dialogue about setting new directions for the priorities, policies, and practices of research for, by and with Maori. This chapter begins by discussing the ways in which Kaupapa Maori research has become a way of structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations and priorities in research.[1]