

.....
Cross Cultural Competency as part of
Participant Driven Empowering research.

A paper presented to the 14th National Conference of the New Zealand
Association for Educational Research.
Deakin University, Geelong, Australia.
22-26 November 1992.

Russell Bishop, University of Otago.
Ted Glynn, University of Otago.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Jane Bradley and Keith Ballard for
their ideas and help during the preparation of this paper.

ABSTRACT

At conference in 1991 the need for a bicultural research group within
the Education Department of the University of Otago was detailed (Bishop
1991). The kaupapa of this group was to be the development of emancipatory
(empowering) research, under the control of Maori people for the betterment
of Maori people. Since then a number of projects under this kaupapa have
been initiated. In this paper the kaupapa is briefly explained again and
details of these projects are introduced. The paper then addresses one of
the crucial issues identified as affecting cross-cultural research, namely
the relationship between the researcher and the researched. In this paper
we want to focus the discussion on the role of non-Maori in bicultural
research.

CCC.

INTRODUCTION.

At conference in 1991 the need for a bicultural research group
within the Education Department of the University of Otago was detailed
(Bishop 1991a). The aim was to gather together under the kaupapa of
emancipatory research, researchers who would conduct research that would
be for the betterment of Maori people under the control of Maori people.
The kaupapa of this group seriously challenges (Bishop 1992a) methods of
research that could be classified as positivistic, interpretative and

critical action research (Carr and Kemmis 1986) by suggesting a new paradigm. The key to the new paradigm lies in the initiation process. Researchers are encouraged to become participants in the research exercise, rather than experts, and to work as a member of a whanau. Researchers are encouraged to present their ideas as koha. Maori participants can then decide whether or not to incorporate these ideas into their kaupapa. This paradigm, process of initiation and the notion of participant driven empowering research as detailed by Bishop (1992a) is incorporated in the projects carried out by Te Ropu Ranghau.

The kaupapa of the research group was presented to the Otago Maori Council (OMC), (Bishop 1992b) via its associate committee, META, the Maori Education and Training Association, in order that local Mana Whenua and Mata Waka runanga could consider the idea. Initial approval of the idea has been given, currently negotiations are underway for the appointment of a Kaumatua and a wider community based support and monitoring group.

MAORI CONCERNS ABOUT RESEARCH.

In Bishop and Glynn(1992) we detailed the serious concerns about research involving Maori people that have been raised by Walker (1979) Curtis (1983) Stokes (1985, 1987), Smith (1991) and others. These authors cautioned that research into the lives of Maori people and issues associated with Maoridom has often focussed on social pathology characteristics (Banks, 1988) on cultural 'deprivation' or functional inadequacy of minority groups. They also suggest that much research has been designed to answer research questions that have benefited the researchers and the non-Maori academic community rather than the Maori people themselves. Maori people have also become increasingly concerned over the past century about the 'capture 'of their past by others, and probably most of all Maori people resent being "dissected" with the same methodologies as used by natural scientists, of being objects of study from some 'neutral' stance outside of the people themselves.

In Bishop (1992) it is suggested that there has developed in New Zealand an ontological base (Awatere, 1981; Irwin, 1989) that is addressing these concerns by challenging the dominance of the Pakeha (European) world view. This dominance includes the paradigm that allows this belittling research to take place. Also challenged is Pakeha control over decision making processes which proscribe knowledge gathering and information processing methods and contexts. In short, biculturalism addresses the prevailing ideologies of white cultural superiority (Walker, 1990) which pervade our social, economic and political institutions. Biculturalism reasserts that two peoples created this nation when in 1840 lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the chiefs of New Zealand signed the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of the British Crown and the Maori descendents of New Zealand. The Treaty is seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision making processes of this country, for Maori determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand, who have their own distinct culture (Walker 1990).

The history of Maori and Pakeha relations since the signing of the Treaty has not been one of partnership of two peoples developing a nation, but one of domination and marginalisation of the Maori people. This had created the myth of our being 'one people' with equal opportunities. (Walker, 1990, Simon, 1990). Results of this domination are evident today in the lack of equitable participation by Maori in all positive and beneficial aspects of life in New Zealand today and by their overrepresentation in the negative aspects (Simon 1990, Pomare 1989).

In the context of educational research, Biculturalism simply states that power and control over educational research should be shared by Maori and Pakeha. At present the control is almost exclusively in the hands of Pakeha institutions and researchers. Maori people should regain control of educational research investigations and initiatives, whether these operate in Kaupapa Maori or mainstream contexts, into their lives in order to uplift the Maori population from the quagmire of economic deprivation, social degradation and political misrepresentation by handing over the decision making on Maori people to Maori people. (Ohia, 1989, p. 10). Ohia adds that ;

research which will present the Maori people with the advantages needed to address the inequalities needs to be led by Maori people. This does not stop anyone else from taking part. However it does signal the fact that Maori people are the appropriate people to establish research programmes which are needed to assist Maori people to attain their true status in this country. (p. 9).

Some groups have been so concerned at the loss of control over the research process that they have advocated a rahui on research by non-Maori. The prohibition by National Trust of Kohanga Reo on non-Maori research in Kohanga Reo illustrates this strong resistance. However, Ohia does indicate there is a role for non-Maori researchers. The relationship between Maori and non-Maori needs reevaluating from the traditional non-Maori role as initiators, controllers and interpreters of research to becoming participants.

The present authors' believe that non-Maori people should be involved

in Maori research for two reasons. Firstly, there is a cohort of highly skilled, professionally trained non-Maori who are becoming bicultural and are willing to share their work within Maori controlled contexts. Some outstanding examples include Richard Benton's language surveys in the 1970s through to 1992, Nina Benton's work in Kohanga reo, Alex Firestone's mathematics training for Kura Kaupapa Maori teacher trainees, some of the projects of Te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua and the second author's work in reading tutor training with the Tatari, Tautoko and Tauawhi procedures. These researchers are committed to the betterment of Maori people and presented their work as koha for Maori people to pick up as they see fit. The second reason why non-Maori should be involved in this area of research is simply that to encourage Pakeha researchers to leave it all to Maori people is to encourage them to abrogate their responsibilities as Treaty partners. Walker (1990) states;

the Maori as a minority of 12% of the population of three million,

cannot achieve justice or resolve their grievances without Pakeha support. For this reason, Pakeha are as much a part of the process of social transformation in the post-colonial era as radical and activist Maori. (p. 234).

The pursuit of social justice is a task that all New Zealanders must be engaged upon. The temptation to simply leave solutions to the problems of inequitable educational outcomes to Maori people themselves now that Maori educational initiatives are gaining ground is to ignore the reality of the post colonial reconstruction. To remove a people's resource base over a period of a century and a half, to deny them access to the skills necessary in the modern industrial society in which we all now live, and then to expect them to solve problems which have become systemic is to further past injustices, not to empower them. Empowerment means being able to make decisions from a position of shared strength and shared resources. Maori people should not be either cast adrift, to fend for themselves, or be forced to relinquish their language and culture in order to participate in the mainstream education.

Cross-Culturally competent educational researchers

Clearly the main task for non-Maori educational researchers is to question the paradigm within which they work. In Bishop and Glynn (1992) we suggested that irrespective of particular research strategies researchers who are committed to a Maori kaupapa (agenda) need to see their role as emancipatory (empowering). Emancipatory research implies establishing systems of power-sharing within the research process. Power sharing should encompass the choice of the research questions, the research orientation, the design and methodology of the research and even of the conduct of the evaluation of the whole project.

We considered that essential to the process of power sharing was the need for researchers in this field to work toward "cross-cultural competency" (Banks 1988, p. 37). Cross-cultural competency requires researchers to develop skills and to participate in experiences that will enable them to communicate, interact positively and comfortably within two or more cultures.

As Stokes (1987) states:

Ideally, the researcher needs to be a bicultural person, able to weigh up sometimes complex cross-cultural situations and perceive very clearly his or her own role, obligations, liabilities and responsibilities. (p. 11)

and also:

A researcher who is not only comfortable in both cultures, but who can also stand back and put both sets of cultural values (and the real and potential conflicts) in perspective, will come closest to evaluating Maori research needs. (p. 10)

It is this concept of cross-cultural competence in educational research that we wish to address. However, 'cross-cultural competency' may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for empowering research. Much 'belittling' research has been done by researchers who were indeed cross-culturally competent (for example, Reverend Maunsell, Elsdon Best,). There is a danger that the concept may address only the researcher's ability to communicate biculturally at a social level (understanding the values and

norms of the other culture). The concept may not necessarily imply

competence at the level of power sharing in the decision making processes. Therefore it is necessary to examine the concept of cross-cultural competency in the context of the paradigm of bicultural and empowering educational research.

Investigation of a Paradigm for Bicultural Research.

In a previous paper (Bishop and Glynn 1992) we noted that 'Critical theory' addresses powersharing by proposing the emancipation of people through their own thoughts and actions. A critical theory approach will; seek to offer individuals an awareness of how their aims and purposes may have become distorted or repressed and to specify how these can be eradicated so that the rational pursuit of their real goals can be undertaken. Carr and Kemmis (1986, p.136).

Critical methodology aims to "distil the historical processes which have caused subjective meanings to become systematically distorted"(p.137). Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue for a methodology that liberates individuals from the effects of these hegemonic processes of suppression of alternative views of the world. They support a methodology that will allow individuals to engage in the "critical reconstruction of suppressed possibilities and desires for emancipation" (p. 137, italics added).

We strongly endorse the methodology proposed by Carr and Kemmis. However, we believe that reconstructing suppressed possibilities and desires is not sufficient to achieve emancipation. Oppressed minorities also require access to specific research tools, techniques and information (in short a technology) in order to undertake effective emancipatory (empowering) actions within the context of the majority culture. Carr and Kemmis suggest that in some senses such "technical action research has significance within the framework of emancipatory action research" (p 205). They note that the "technical character of the action research is transcended by its location within the community context"(p.205). We believe that there is still a danger that the outside technology could overpower the agenda of the community. We suggest when the outside technology is in the hands of Maori researchers this danger is considerably reduced for Maori communities have their own systems of accountability and control. The danger remains when the outside technology is in the hands of non-Maori researchers. However, non-Maori educational researchers may still contribute their outside technology provided that they are able to operate within a research paradigm that is empowering and participant driven.

Within the context of education, we believe that in order for non-Maori educational researchers to safely contribute the necessary tools, techniques and information they need to become cross-culturally competent.

Within this framework is developed the methodology of Action Research which Carr and Kemmis (1986) define as ,

....simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices and the situation in which these practices are carried out (p. 162).

Action research differs from both positivistic and interpretative research approaches in that it suggests that practitioners are participants who attempt to change some elements of a situation for the betterment of the participants. Action Research might address Maori concerns since it tries to move beyond explanations and understandings that often suit the researcher. Action research enables participants to engage in critical reflection in order to promote change.

The problem remains of how to implement action research. Carr and Kemmis (1986) describe how initially

outside facilitators form cooperative relationships with practitioners helping them to articulate their concerns, plan strategic action for change, monitor the problems and effects of changes, and reflect on the value and consequences of the changes actually achieved (p. 203). They then go on to explain that this is not emancipatory until the group becomes self reflective.

However, it is the process of initiation and subsequent transformation that is of crucial concern. If, initially there is the need for an 'outside facilitator', when does this 'outside facilitation' disappear? Will not the goals established by this outside facilitator remain as the driving

agenda of the research? If the 'real goals' are defined by outsiders, (i.e. non-Maori) then the 'emancipation' could still be hegemonic evangelism rather than being internally driven empowerment. It would remain as a paternalistic, hegemonic relationship no matter the degree of the concern of the facilitator, or the attempts to make the group 'self-reflective. How are external facilitators to understand the needs of another culture except through experience of that culture? Besides, experience will educate researchers into the need for following Maori preferred methods of research initiation. Maori people have their own system of checks and balances when research is initiated, their own systems of referrals and permission seeking processes and consultation. Non-Maori need to be cognisant of these processes and take part in them.

Goldthorpe (1992) highlights the difficulty of achieving symmetrical dialogue between participants (Chisholm, 1990; Gitlin, 1990; Robinson, 1986) and echoes the concerns of Lather (1986) and Robinson (1989) in claiming that "the impositional tendencies of researchers using this style of research, while possibly less than those using the more traditional methodologies are still considerable" (p. 69). To persist with this model as Delpit (1988) suggests is to rely upon the development of an empowering relationship between the researchers and researchees. However this undervalues the ideological power of agenda setting and is the very critique that action research is designed to avoid. There appears to be an assumption that with enskilling of the researchee group the original researcher is able to identify and avoid any further hegemonic practices and tendencies s/he may have. This is not acceptable for this still tacitly leaves the power of decision making with the researcher and the power as to when to 'hand over the reins' remains outside of the hands of the participants. Theory and practice of critical theory and action research, developed in other places may not be adequate to empower a minority culture

within a bicultural context, where the majority culture is in control as in New Zealand. A more focussed paradigm of emancipation developed within the particular context of New Zealand is needed.

The question remains as to how should Maori and non-Maori proceed with initiating and planning research in order for the project to be truly participant driven.

Smith (1991) suggests a series of questions that need to be answered at the commencement of any project. Here it is suggested that a more specific set of questions is necessary to develop this paradigm and to acknowledge the potential dual conflict that exists relating to Maori issues. There appears to be a ready willingness to come to terms with the need for bicultural initiatives and imperatives, but because there is a limited range of bicultural 'conscientising' experiences available to people in powerful decision making positions, there is a very limited degree of comprehension about the mechanisms needed to narrow the gap between the agreed intentions to promote bicultural initiatives, and the actual changes needed to promote those initiatives. Collaboration and cooperation should be instigated prior to the commencement of the research. It is too late once the research project has commenced to challenge the objectives, and challenging the objectives later on can be a very painful process.

It is suggested that the following paradigm be considered as suitable for CCC individuals to work within.

1. Who initiates the research? and why? What are the goals of the project? Who sets the goals? Who will it benefit? Is the research for the betterment of Maori people? If so, in what way? It is very important to be specific here. The questions of initiation, goal setting and benefits are crucial and need to be answered honestly. Answers like "It will raise their self esteem" are to be treated with extreme suspicion for they are really open to the widest interpretation. Specific, measurable, participant driven goals must be set. If Maori people/students are not involved at this initial stage then there can be no valid answer to this question and the research should not proceed. The aim is to develop a working research community.

2. Who is going to design the work? This raises the questions about power relationships within the research community; is there a hierarchy where only token representation is introduced or indeed are Maori people

directly involved with the outcome of the research. Also issues of mana whenua and mata waka status need consideration. The research community must be a community of interest.

3. Who is going to do the work? Have the participants been organised hierarchically? Is there someone who gets to do work that they have not really been part of designing and of which they are not really going to be able to share in the rewards? Researchers must be research participants and participants must be researchers. If any of the participant research group don't have the skills necessary to cooperate, then this points to the need for participants to access those skills that may be of use to the community of interest. An example in the context of research into learning and

teaching is that the researcher, as part of their bicultural competence and experiences may need to take lessons, prepare resources, help with control and discipline and cleaning up messes. Cross cultural competency is necessary as well as appropriate pedagogic skills. If the researchers do not satisfy these requirements then they will impose an additional burden on the research community and will meet resistance. This again raises the question of what are the power relationships between all participants in a research project? Hierarchical? cooperative? empowering? How are decisions made? If a teacher is involved, is the teacher a co-worker/researcher? Does he/she feel part of the project? Is there a clear boss who directs operations, or is there a community of equality? This must be a community sharing the load.

4. What rewards will there be? Who gets the rewards? Who gets their name on any publications? What assessment and evaluation procedures will be used to establish rewards? Who decides on the assessment and evaluation? This must be a community where rewards are shared.

5. Who is going to have access to the research findings? This is one area in which Maori and Pakeha views may differ enormously, and present a weighty challenge to researchers. Ethical considerations affecting both cultures need to be considered at the commencement of the project. Will the findings be available to the wider educational community in a form that is readily understandable. Will the findings presented in a culturally appropriate manner within one culture, be acceptable to the other? This raises the need for a research community dedicated to communication for betterment.

6. Who is the researcher accountable to? Maori insistence that only Maori do Maori research is based upon the reality that only Maori people are truly accountable to their own people. Accountability, moreover, operates at several levels; iwi members to iwi, hapu members to hapu, whanau members to whanau. Non-Maori are just not as accountable to Maori people and can never be so. This is anathema to the western tradition which holds the belief that a researcher has an inalienable right to knowledge and truth. Smith (1991) emphasises that non-Maori have often misconstrued information about Maori society so badly as to have caused harm. These misconstructions have been ideologically generated (Simon, 1990; Belich 1987; Walker, 1990) so that critical analysis is essential. Therefore if non-Maori are to be involved in Maori research and I believe they should be, there must be the development of a community of researchers where the locus of accountability is clearly acknowledged before research is undertaken.

7. Who has the control over the distribution of knowledge, including the modes of distribution? Some Maori groups are happy to interact with non-Maori researchers and practising teachers, for example in the development of bicultural curricula. However, there needs to be clear understanding of the cultural value of certain knowledge and of the culturally preferred means of passing on such ideas, (King 1976). This issue is also one of accountability and is inexorably tied to the issue of power over knowledge. Young (1971 in Jones 1990 et al) recognised the political power that 'control of knowledge' can be turned into.

The control over what counts as knowledge and the control over the

institutions where such knowledge is practised, allows for dominant interest groups to perpetuate and maintain their positions of dominance and advantage. (p. 151).

The control exercised by the dominant Pakeha research community needs to be challenged in order that the power of research can be unleashed for the

betterment of Maori people. It has been clearly shown that in New Zealand the political, social and economic domination of Maori by Pakeha society has been and continues to be facilitated by the schooling and education system serving the needs of the dominant society, (Simon, 1990; Smith, 1990; Jones et al, 1990). Bicultural research initiatives may offer a means to counter this process. Therefore there needs to be developed a research community where the ownership of knowledge is acknowledged and guarded.
RESEARCHER\RESEARCHED RELATIONSHIP.

The key issue that then arises is of power and control over the research process. There will be a power and control dichotomy within any research relationship especially numbers increase and there is an increasing diversity of expertise. The operational question becomes that of finding ways to reduce the power and control differentials between researched and researcher. Acker Barry et al (1991) claim that it is impossible. Stacey warns that it is not just a matter of choosing correct or preferred methods. We propose to address this question in the context of our experiences of bicultural educational research in Aotearoa\New Zealand.

Our experience suggests that one effective answer is for researchers to work within a Maori controlled paradigm of educational research as discussed earlier. Researchers need to learn about important Maori values affecting education and to understand the various structures and functions of contemporary Maori society. In order to do this researchers need must be able to work within Maori contexts and settings. We now examine each of these aspects in turn, although it must be emphasised that these ideas are really part of an interlocking matrix of ideas.

MAORI VALUES AFFECTING EDUCATION.

Smith (1992) identifies this notion as Taonga tuku iho. Cultural aspirations of Maori. He justifies the inclusion of this notion by stating that it is the incorporation of these Maori cultural aspirations within education settings and processes will intervene in the educational crises affecting Maori people today and promote achievement for Maori children in educational institutions. Such values are mana motukake\tino rangatiratanga and the related issues of mana whenua and mata waka.

WORKING WITHIN MAORI CONTEXTS AND SETTINGS.

Therefore it is perhaps necessary at this point to identify three locations for bicultural research and development. Firstly there is bicultural research in Maori controlled institutions, such as Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori and Waananga Maori. Here research is without doubt within the control of the whanau, by Maori for Maori, and there will be no problem controlling who does research or in choosing appropriate models of instruction and development. The second area of bicultural education is for Maori pupils within mainstream schools, and this is the location of the

current educational crisis. It is here where Maori must gain more control and where culturally preferred methods need to be implemented. It is this location where the needs of Maori students in terms of life style enhancement and life chances development must exist. Smith (1990) claims that mainstream schools do not address this category for they concentrate on the third category, which is bicultural education for non-Maori pupils within mainstream institutions. It is suggested that this categorisation of locations is a useful strategy to enable researchers to clarify the direction of their goals and objectives.

In order to work within this paradigm, researchers need to demonstrate their cross cultural competence to Maori people in order that they may be judged as suitable and listened to. We have observed a range of responses to the imperatives of the bicultural challenge (see diagram 1). Let it be clear that this is a continuum of responses and not an ideal progression for following. The first response is to deny that there is such a thing as a majority culture. Culture is something that ethnic minorities have. The next position is of cultural sensitivity.

The consideration of acceptability of a researcher. We would suggest that a test of Maori knowledge as suggested by ... in Psych society journal is of extremely limited usefulness. The first

SUMMARY.

The Paradigm revisited

The family genealogists decided to seek their particular families heritages and to seek links with other members of the family in order to address many agendas that they wanted to pursue. These agendas changed over time. Nevertheless they were agendas tacitly agreed to by the family. The collective decision developed over a period of some twenty or thirty years. This research project is but part of a family's desire to reflect upon its heritage and what it means for our collective future. It was not thought up as a research exercise to satisfy requirements for graduation in an institution controlled by one culture in New Zealand.

The value to the participants is defined by themselves. Family members decided to seek and find their heritage. Although their numbers are vast there is also a large research group who have negotiated with their respective sub-families about the questions proposed by the study group. Ethical considerations about whether the family members were happy about the past being revealed were negotiated by members of the research group who were most closely involved. It became clear that many second generation members of the family were not happy and it was important that this question be negotiated with them. Here is a good example where the judgement as to 'betterment' is best left to the participant group. Negotiation about this aspect is necessary for without consent and cooperation a distorted picture will result.

The research exercise which is in no way finished, was designed by the interest and participation of the research group for they were a community

of interest. There were no formal 'research meetings', but there was a long drawn out series of verbal and written communications between family members that suggested avenues for research. The total work was done by the members of the research group over a period of several decades, each member bringing their own particular skills and knowledge to bear. In this sense the whakatauaki; Nau te Rourou, Naku te rourou exemplifies this process for. each to bring their own particular skills and perspectives and each is to be valued. Members of the family who had been raised as Maori and members who had been raised as Pakeha all contributed to the project.

The researcher is accountable both to the smaller research group and to the wider family. Ethical considerations differ from those of other types of research. There is the tapu or sacredness of some of the knowledge to consider. Finally the distribution of the knowledge is in the hands of the family, the usefulness to the family and to a wider audience in New Zealand being primary considerations. The rewards for the family will be determined by the family, who will also control access to the information. The variety of attitudes in the family toward uncovering the past is coalescing toward a desire to share common goals and understandings, and to pass these onto future generations.

The focus of this research was whakawhanaungatanga, finding whakapapa links. Whakawhanaungatanga includes the rediscovery of links and of rights, but it is important to understand that with rights come obligations. I used the names of my mother as the guide to the whakapapa of our family. In regard to this, our Kaumatua, Tukawekai Kereama warned me not to "pollute" my whakapapa. He said that its use in this context was acceptable but "make sure that you don't throw it away to just anyone." Whakapapa is tapu. From a Maori perspective whakapapa is not just knowledge to be collected and maintained for oneself, but for the betterment of the group, for the

knowledge belongs to the group.

Rediscovery of whanaungatanga is desired by the family members who see the tremendous benefits that such linkages have to offer. In Gramscian terms this rediscovery can be seen as a counter hegemonic activity. In Maori terms it is a reassertion of one Tapu against another, dominating Tapu. In a Maori sense to remove one's tapu is to make one noa. Noa is the state of being free from the restrictions of tapu. In certain circumstances the removal of tapu, if done according to ritualised whakanoa procedures, for example kai following a powhiri, is an acceptable process of meeting and greeting. However, in other circumstances, noa can result from a foreign tapu overcoming your own tapu. This results in the destruction of your mana. Tapu is a restriction imposed upon one's actions by one's own Atua. The mana of your Atua is manifest in your tapu. Metaphorically it is an act of enslavement (whakataurekarekatanga) to have your tapu overcome. In earlier times capture meant removal of tapu, making prisoners noa, their tapu having been overcome by the tapu of an enemy, (Shirres in Durning, 1987). The implications of this perspective for the family is well understood by many of the researched group. For them to accept the knowledge is to accept the reassertion of the tapu and to consider that the mana of the family would be reestablished. Stepping out of the taurekareka

status within the Pakeha world into the Maori world involves commitment to the other Maori world view as explained by Binney (1987). This requires a commitment to the collective value of knowledge, the perspectives of truth, the ontological basis and the sanctity of the knowledge. It is much more than genealogy research purely for interest sake.

Within a bicultural methodology communication is fundamental to understanding of the different perspectives involved in the total picture. The development of this communication will involve a new means of acknowledging, but not attempting to dominate the tapu of each perspective. This is the meaning of biculturalism for influencing our family's future, when new 'rituals of encounter' can be developed to mediate between the tapu of the two peoples.

If research is to be empowering, the research project needs to be participant driven. Therefore, full consultation with members of the 'research group' as part of the total process is essential. Allowing the research group to set the agenda, the parameters and the direction of study is an important initial step. Being one of the 'researched' group from the start helps the researcher enormously, but may not be essential. Being on the inside and being part of the study as well as being inextricably tied into the outcomes and implications is likely to satisfy these considerations. To succeed at this the research needs to be collaborative and interactive, and the researcher needs to be guided by the desires and needs of the researched.

As well as being emancipatory in its orientation, and empowering in action, the research methodology needs to ensure a high degree of interaction among the participants of the study. It should not be seen as just the work of the researcher, but rather the product is the result of the work of the participants, and the results must be shared.

References.

- Awatere, D. (1984). Maori sovereignty. Auckland: Broadsheet.
- Banks, J. (1988). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. 2nd Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Belich, J. (1987). The new zealand wars and the victorian interpretation of racial conflict. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Binney, J. (1987). Maori oral narratives, pakeha written texts. New Journal of History. 21,(2), 16-28.
- Bishop, R. and Glynn, E. (1992, in press). He kanohi kitea: Conducting and evaluating educational research. NZJES. 27, (2).
- Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical. London: The Falmer Press.
- Chisholm, L. (1990) Action Research:some methodological and political considerations. British Research Journal 16 (3) pp 249-259
- Curtis, T. (1983). A maori viewpoint related in research in maori education. Discussion Paper, Auckland College of Education.
- Cumberland,K. (1981). Landmarks. Sydney : Readers Digest

- Delpit, L. (1988) The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating other peoples children. *Harvard Education Review* 58 (3) pp280- 298.
- Durning, C. (1987). *Parau: Te ahuatanga o te taurekareka*. Unpublished paper: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Fee, M. (1989). Why c.k. stead didn't like kerri hulme's, the bone people: Who can write as other? *Australian and New Zealand Studies in Canada* , 1,
- Finney, B.R. (1979). *Hokule'a: The Way to Tahiti*. New York: Dodd, Mead
- Gitlin, A. (1990) *Educative Research, Voice and school change*. *Harvard Education Review*. 60 (4) pp443-466.
- Goldthorpe, C (1992) *Cross cultural research in New Zealand education*. in Bishop, R. Bradley, J. & Tokona, R.(eds) *Rangahau Taurira; Examples of student research*. Department of Education, University of Otago.
- Hirsch, W. (1990) *A report on issues and factors relating to maori achievement in the education system*. Auckland: Ministry of Education.
- Irwin. K. (1989) *Multicultural education; The New Zealand response, 1974-1984*. NZJES, 24 (1)
- Jones, A, McCulloch, G, Marshall, J, Hingangaroa Smith, G. and Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1990) *Myths and realities..* Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd.
- King, M. (1976). *Te ao hurihuri..* Auckland: Hicks Smiths.
- Lather, P. (1986) *Research as Praxis* *Harvard Education Review*, 56 (3) pp257-274.
- Lewis, D. (1978) *The voyaging stars*. Sydney: Collins.
- Livingstone, D.W. (1987). *Cultural pedagogy and cultural power*. Introduction by P. Freire and H. Giroux. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Middleton, S. (1985). *Feminism and education in post war new zealand: A sociological analysis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis University of Waikato.
- Middleton, S. (1988). *Women and education in aotearoa:.* Wellington: Allen and Unwin, Port Nicholson Press 11-33.
- Middleton, S., Codd, J. and Jones, A. (1990). *New zealand education policy today. critical perspectives*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Ohia, M. (1989) *Research for maori education*. Address to NZARE Conference, Trentham. Proceedings of the conference.
- Pere, R. (1988) *Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha*. In Middleton, S. ed. *Women and education in New Zealand*. (pp 6- 19) Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Pomare, E. (1987) *Hauora: Maori standards of health*. Wellington, Dept of Health.
- Robinson, V. (1986) *Doing Critical Social Science: Dilemmas of Control*. A paper presented at the annual conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Noveember 30 -December 3 1989.
- Robinson, V. (1989) *The Nature and Conduct of a critical Dialogue*. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 24 (2) pp175-187.
- Sharp. C .A (1963) *Ancient Voyages in Polynesia*. Auckland: Paul.
- Siers, J. (1977) *Taratai: A Pacific Adventure*. Wellington: Millwood Press

- Simon, J.A. (1990). The Role of Schooling in Maori-Pakeha Relations. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Auckland University.
- Smith, G. H. (1990) Taha maori: Pakeha capture. In J. Codd, R. Harker and R. Nash (Eds.), Political Issues in New Zealand Education. (pp.183- 197) Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Smith, L.T. (1991) Te rapuna i te ao marama: Maori perspectives on research in education. In Morss J.R and Linzey, T.J (Eds) The Politics of Human Learning: Human Development and Educational Research. (pp. 46-55) Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Stokes, E. (1985). Maori research and development: Discussion paper, Social Sciences Research Committee of National Research and Advisory Council.
- Stokes, E. (1987) Maori geography or geography of maoris. New Zealand Geographer, 4 (3), 118-123.
- Vennell, C.W. and Williams, S. (1976). Raglan county hills and sea : A centennial history. Auckland: Wilson & Horton for Raglan County
- Walker, R. (1979). A consumer view of research. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 14, 91-93.
- Walker, R. (1990). Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end. Auckland: Penguin

These can vary from tiaki(caring) to whangai (adoptee) to power-sharing.....(Smith 1990, P.C.)
a traditional Maori proverb that literally means 'With your food basket and with my food basket, together we will feed the people.' Figuratively this proverb (whakatauaki) is about the need to share diverse skills and experiences in order that the future will be secure.
literally, to make noa, to make someone free from tapu ofr any other restriction.

In a previous paper (Bishop and Glynn 1992) we noted that 'Critical theory' addresses powersharing by proposing the emancipation of people through their own thoughts and actions. A critical theory approach will;
seek to offer individuals an awareness of how their aims and purposes may have become distorted or repressed and to specify how these can be eradicated so that the rational pursuit of their real goals can be undertaken. Carr and Kemmis (1986, p.136).
Critical methodology aims to "distil the historical processes which have caused subjective meanings to become systematically distorted"(p.137). Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue for a methodology that liberates individuals from the effects of these hegemonic processes of suppression of alternative views of the world. They support a methodology that will allow individuals to engage in the "critical reconstruction of suppressed possibilities and desires for emancipation" (p. 137, italics added).
Within this framework is developed the methodology of Action Research which Carr and Kemmis (1986) define as ,
....simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality

and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices and the situation in which these practices are carried out (p. 162).

Action research differs from both positivistic and interpretative research approaches in that it suggests that practitioners are participants who attempt to change some elements of a situation for the betterment of the participants. Action Research might address Maori concerns since it tries to move beyond explanations and understandings that often suit the researcher. Action research enables participants to engage in critical reflection in order to promote change.

We strongly endorse the methodology proposed by Carr and Kemmis. However, we believe that reconstructing suppressed possibilities and desires is not sufficient to achieve emancipation. Oppressed minorities also require access to specific research tools, techniques and information

(in short a technology) in order to undertake effective emancipatory (empowering) actions within the context of the majority culture. Carr and Kemmis suggest that in some senses such "technical action research has significance within the framework of emancipatory action research" (p 205). They note that the "technical character of the action research is transcended by its location within the community context"(p.205).

However, Ohia's concern over initiation still remains. Carr and Kemmis (1986) describe how initially

outside facilitators form cooperative relationships with practitioners helping them to articulate their concerns, plan strategic action for change, monitor the problems and effects of changes, and reflect on the value and consequences of the changes actually achieved (p. 203). They then go on to explain that this is not emancipatory until the group becomes 'self reflective'. However, it is the process of initiation and subsequent transformation that is of crucial concern. If, initially there is the need for an 'outside facilitator', when does this 'outside facilitation' disappear? Will not the goals established by this outside facilitator remain as the driving agenda of the research? If the 'real goals' are defined by outsiders, (i.e. non-Maori) then the 'emancipation' could still be hegemonic evangelism rather than being internally driven empowerment. It would remain as a paternalistic, hegemonic relationship no matter the degree of the concern of the facilitator, or the attempts to make the group 'self-reflective. How are external facilitators to understand the needs of another culture except through experience? Besides, experience will educate researchers into the need for following Maori preferred methods of research initiation. Maori people have their own system of checks and balances when research is initiated, their own systems of referrals and permission seeking processes and consultation. Non-Maori need to be cognisant of these processes and take part in them.

Goldthorpe (1992) highlights the difficulty of achieving symmetrical dialogue between participants (Chisholm, 1990; Gitlin, 1990; Robinson, 1986) and echoes the concerns of Lather (1986) and Robinson (1989) in claiming that "the impositional tendencies of researchers using this style of research, while possibly less than those using the more traditional

methodologies are still considerable" (p. 69). To persist with this model as Delpit (1988) suggests is to rely upon the development of an empowering relationship between the researchers and researchees. However this undervalues the ideological power of agenda setting and is the very critique that action research is designed to avoid. There appears to be an assumption that with enskilling of the researchee group the original researcher is able to identify and avoid any further hegemonic practices and tendencies s/he may have. This is not acceptable for this still tacitly leaves the power of decision making with the researcher and the power as to when to 'hand over the reins' remains outside of the hands of the participants. Theory and practice of critical theory and action research, developed in other places may not be adequate to empower a minority culture within a bicultural context, where the majority culture is in control as in New Zealand. A more focussed paradigm of emancipation developed within the particular context of New Zealand is needed.

Another consideration is that the inadequacy of Action Research to adequately address the potential power and control dichotomy between researcher and researched limits its usefulness for implementing structural change. If for emancipatory action research to proceed there must be initiation from the inside, and if it is accepted that the methods of incorporating outside initiation are methodologically suspect, then it would appear that there is an artificial limitation on the size of the interested group. Often to instigate structural the "interest" group includes people who may not see themselves as part of this interest group. Surely they must be included. It is this question of consultation and collaboration for conflict resolution that Action Research appears to ignore because of any adequate means of reducing the power relationships within the potential research community. The implications for non-Maori researchers is clearly that they have to become cross culturally competent to work within Maori preferred social structures. The implication for Maori researchers is that they need a methodological paradigm that allows them to identify the entire whanau of interest who are potentially involved in a

problem. As to exclude the non-Maori from all research is to allow them to abrogate their responsibilities as Treaty partners, to ignore to part non-Maori may play either as positive partners in the research project or as powerful blocks to structural change to to ignore a crucial question facing the design of empowering research methodologies.

The question remains as to how should Maori and non-Maori proceed with initiating and planning research in order for the project to be truly participant driven, and empowering.

Smith (1991) suggests a series of questions that need to be answered at the commencement of any project. Here it is suggested that a more specific set of questions is necessary to develop this paradigm and to acknowledge the potential dual conflict that exists relating to Maori issues. There appears to be a ready willingness to come to terms with the need for bicultural initiatives and imperatives, but because there is a limited range of bicultural 'conscientising' experiences available to people in powerful decision making positions, there is a very limited

degree of comprehension about the mechanisms needed to narrow the gap between the agreed intentions to promote bicultural initiatives, and the actual changes needed to promote those initiatives.

In Bishop (1991 & 1992a)) it was proposed that the following questions and imperatives be considered.

1. Who initiates the research? and why? What are the goals of the project? Who sets the goals? Who will it benefit? Is the research for the betterment of Maori people? If so, in what way? It is very important to be specific here. The questions of initiation, goal setting and benefits are crucial and need to be answered honestly. Answers like "It will raise their self esteem" are to be treated with extreme suspicion for they are really open to the widest interpretation. Specific, measurable, participant driven goals must be set. If Maori people/students are not involved at this initial stage then there can be no valid answer to this question and the research should not proceed. The aim is to develop a working research community.

2. Who is going to design the work? This raises the questions about power relationships within the research community; is there a hierarchy where only token representation is introduced or indeed are Maori people directly involved with the outcome of the research. Also issues of mana whenua and mata waka status need consideration. The research community must be a community of interest.

3. Who is going to do the work? Have the participants been organised hierarchically? Is there someone who gets to do work that they have not really been part of designing and of which they are not really going to be able to share in the rewards? Researchers must be research participants and participants must be researchers. If any of the participant research group don't have the skills necessary to cooperate, then this points to the need for participants to access those skills that may be of use to the community of interest. An example in the context of research into learning and teaching is that the researcher, as part of their bicultural competence and experiences may need to take lessons, prepare resources, help with control and discipline and cleaning up messes. Cross cultural competency is necessary as well as appropriate pedagogic skills. If the researchers do not satisfy these requirements then they will impose an additional burden on the research community and will meet resistance. This again raises the question of what are the power relationships between all participants in a research project? Hierarchical? cooperative? empowering? How are decisions made? If a teacher is involved, is the teacher a co-worker/researcher? Does he/she feel part of the project? Is there a clear boss who directs operations, or is there a community of equality? This must be a community sharing the load.

4. What rewards will there be? Who gets the rewards? Who gets their name on any publications? What assessment and evaluation procedures will be used to establish rewards? Who decides on the assessment and evaluation? This must be a community where rewards are shared.

5. Who is going to have access to the research findings? This is one area in which Maori and Pakeha views may differ enormously, and present a weighty challenge to researchers. Ethical considerations affecting both cultures need to be considered at the commencement of the project. Will the

findings be available to the wider educational community in a form that is readily understandable. Will the findings presented in a culturally appropriate manner within one culture, be acceptable to the other? This raises the need for a research community dedicated to communication for betterment.

6. Who is the researcher accountable to? Maori insistence that only Maori do Maori research is based upon the reality that only Maori people are truly accountable to their own people. Accountability, moreover, operates at several levels; iwi members to iwi, hapu members to hapu, whanau members to whanau. Non-Maori are just not as accountable to Maori people and can never be so. This is anathema to the western tradition which holds the belief that a researcher has an inalienable right to knowledge and truth. Smith (1991) emphasises is that non-Maori have often misconstrued information about Maori society so badly as to have caused harm. These misconstructions have been ideologically generated (Simon, 1990; Belich 1987; Walker, 1990) so that critical analysis is essential. Therefore if non-Maori are to be involved in Maori research and I believe they should be, there must be the development of a community of researchers where the locus of accountability is clearly acknowledged before research is undertaken.

7. Who has the control over the distribution of knowledge, including the modes of distribution? Some Maori groups are happy to interact with non-Maori researchers and practising teachers, for example in the development of bicultural curricula. However, there needs to be clear understanding of the cultural value of certain knowledge and of the culturally preferred means of passing on such ideas, (King 1976). This issue is also one of accountability and is inexorably tied to the issue of power over knowledge. Young (1971 in Jones 1990 et el) recognised the political power that 'control of knowledge' can be turned into.

The control over what counts as knowledge and the control over the institutions where such knowledge is practised, allows for dominant interest groups to perpetuate and maintain their positions of dominance and advantage. (p. 151).

The control exercised by the dominant Pakeha research community needs to be challenged in order that the power of research can be unleashed for the betterment of Maori people. It has been clearly shown that in New Zealand the political, social and economic domination of Maori by Pakeha society has been and continues to be facilitated by the schooling and education system serving the needs of the dominant society, (Simon, 1990; Smith, 1990; Jones et el, 1990). Bicultural research initiatives may offer a means to counter this process. Therefore there needs to be developed a research community where the ownership of knowledge is acknowledged and guarded.

The Need for Cross Cultural Competencytheresearcher

~lin bicultural research, and outline some

implications for practice among the non-Maori research community.CURRENT RESEARCH

Research, course design and assessment procedures are guided by the kaupapa of the research group. Future post graduate paper design for 1993 are also based on this model. Projects already underway within the kaupapa of te Ropu Rangahau Tikanga Rua include:

1. He Whakawhanaungatanga Tikanga Rua (Bishop, 1991a). A posopographic (multiple life history) study of a family diaspora created by the impact of conflicting hegemonies during the 'crucial decades' of New Zealand's history . The initial results of this project were reported to conference in 1991 (Bishop 1991b) and returned to most of the family members who participated in the research.

2. An evaluation of the Hui Rangatahi weekend held for senior school and post-school rangatahi Maori. This hui was initiated in Dunedin by the local Runanga, and the tertiary institutions were able to display what they had to offer Maori students. The research involves investigation of the various expectations of the organisers, parents and schools, collation of an evaluation questionnaire that was completed at the end of the weekend and interviews of participants six months on. This report was a contract consultancy and presented to the sponsors earlier in the year (Bishop,

Bradley and Tokona, 1992a).

3. The investigation of Taihoa, Tautari, Tauawhi, reading tutoring procedures within Maori kaupapa contexts. The production of a training video is nearing completion and the process of collaboration and participation are to be reported to this conference (Glynn, 1992).

4. An evaluation of those characteristics of Taha Maori programmes in Otago and Southland that are indicative of success. This project is also nearing completion and results are to be presented at this conference, (Holmes, 1992)

5. An investigation of iwi-preferred school strategies and practices in Maori Education in Otago. The hui for this consultation are currently underway.

6. Te Huarahi Trust's Whanau literacy and numeracy project. This project is to record and research the development of a Maori PTE (Private Training Enterprise) using a participant driven empowering methodological framework.

7. An ongoing project is to develop the skills of research among as wide a field of students as possible. To this end the Student Practicums for Maori Studies 204 and Education 320 are conducted within the kaupapa of the research group. A monograph of examples was produced in 1992 (Bishop, Bradley and Tokona, 1992b) and a preliminary report is being made to this conference (Bishop & Kapa, 1992).

In education for example, emphasis is placed on the failure of the central government's sequential policies of Assimilation, Integration and Multiculturalism (Jones et al 1990; Irwin, 1989) and Taha Maori (Smith 1990) in promoting life chance opportunities for Maori people (Simon 1990). It is shown that these policies, while supposedly concerned for the welfare of Maori people, effectively stressed that Maori people need to subjugate their destiny to the needs of the nation state, whose goals were determined by the Pakeha majority. Self determination in the form of biculturalism in

Education has seen the development of Maori initiatives in asserting the right of Maori people to reject the dominance and promote a series of Maori controlled educational institutions. These include the Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori and Waananga Maori. In these Maori initiated and controlled educational institutions, pre-school, school and University, the locus of control is with the participants. Similar initiatives are developing in the wider social, economic and political arena in New Zealand today.

These bicultural challenges have finally been addressed in a major report commissioned by the Ministry of Education. Hirsch (1990) after wide consultation among Maori groups, identified the centrality of the need for empowerment of Maori people in order to promote social justice and racial harmony through a "shedding of the cloak of dependency" (p.29).

Hirsch noted that;

empowerment of Maori people is really the issue underlying all the others- bilingual education, the quality of teachers, the nature of schools, curriculum and resource development, the assessment of students and parent education. (p. 9)

Empowerment means Maori people having more control over decision making at the school level and at the planning level, and control over designing curriculum and resources and managing research, so that what is being done is not for Maori by Pakeha but by Maori for themselves. Thus emphasising the challenge to mainstream schooling that Maori initiatives represent, and necessarily so for it is here that the majority of Maori students will continue to be "educated."

APPLICATION TO RESEARCH.

the loss of control over the research by Maori researchers. The relationship between Maori people to pick up as they saw. In Bishop and Glynn (1992) we noted that 'Critical

theory' addresses power sharing by proposing the emancipation of people through their own thoughts and actions. A critical theory approach will;

seek to offer individuals an awareness of how their aims and purposes may have become distorted or repressed and to specify how these can be eradicated so that the rational pursuit of their real goals can be undertaken. Carr and Kemmis (1986, p.136).

Critical methodology aims to "distil the historical processes which have caused subjective meanings to become systematically distorted" (p.137).

Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue for a methodology that liberates individuals

from the effects of these hegemonic processes of suppression of alternative views of the world. They support a methodology that will allow individuals to engage in the "critical reconstruction of suppressed possibilities and desires for emancipation" (p. 137, italics added).

Within this framework is developed the methodology of Action Research which Carr and Kemmis (1986) define as ,

....simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices and the situation in which these practices are carried out (p. 162).

Action research differs from both positivistic and interpretative research

approaches in that it suggests that practitioners are participants who attempt to change some elements of a situation for the betterment of the participants. It was suggested that Action Research might address Maori concerns since it tries to move beyond explanations and understandings that often suit the researcher. Action research enables participants to engage in critical reflection in order to promote change.

We strongly endorse the hopefulness of this methodology as proposed by Carr and Kemmis. However, we believe that reconstructing suppressed possibilities and desires is not sufficient to achieve emancipation. Oppressed minorities also require access to specific research tools, techniques and information (in short a technology) in order to undertake effective emancipatory (empowering) actions within the context of the majority culture. Carr and Kemmis (1996 p.186) do suggest a method whereby this can occur where in some senses such "technical action research has significance within the framework of emancipatory action research" (p 205). They note that by using the Action Method 'moments' and methodology the "technical character of the action research is transcended by its location within the community context"(p.205).

However, this fails to address Ohia's concern about initiation. Carr and Kemmis (1986) describe how initially outside facilitators form cooperative relationships with practitioners helping them to articulate their concerns, plan strategic action for change, monitor the problems and effects of changes, and reflect on the value and consequences of the changes actually achieved (p. 203). They then go on to explain that this is not emancipatory until the group becomes 'self reflective'. However, it is the process of initiation and subsequent transformation that is of crucial concern. If, initially there is the need for an 'outside facilitator', when does this 'outside facilitation' disappear? Will not the goals established by this outside facilitator remain as the driving agenda of the research? If the 'real goals' are defined by outsiders, (i.e. non-Maori) then the 'emancipation' could still be hegemonic evangelism rather than being internally driven empowerment. It would remain as a paternalistic, hegemonic relationship no matter the degree of the concern of the facilitator, or the attempts to make the group 'self-reflective. How are external facilitators to understand the needs of another culture except through experience? Besides, experience will educate researchers into the need for following Maori preferred methods of research initiation. Maori people have their own system of checks and balances when research is initiated, their own systems of referrals and permission seeking processes and consultation. Non-Maori need to be cognisant of these processes and take part in them.

Goldthorpe (1992) highlights the difficulty of achieving symmetrical dialogue between participants (Chisholm, 1990; Gitlin, 1990; Robinson, 1986) and echoes the concerns of Lather (1986) and Robinson (1989) in claiming that "the impositional tendencies of researchers using this style of research, while possibly less than those using the more traditional methodologies are still considerable" (p. 69). To persist with this model as Delpit (1988) suggests is to rely upon the development of an empowering relationship between the researchers and researchees. However this undervalues the ideological power of agenda setting and is the very

critique that action research is designed to avoid. There appears to be an assumption that with enskilling of the researchee group the original researcher is able to identify and avoid any further hegemonic practices and tendencies s/he may have. This is not acceptable for this still tacitly

leaves the power of decision making with the researcher and the power as to when to 'hand over the reins' remains outside of the hands of the participants. Theory and practice of critical theory and action research, developed in other places may not be adequate to empower a minority culture within a bicultural context, where the majority culture is in control as in New Zealand. A more focussed paradigm of emancipation developed within the particular context of New Zealand is needed.

Another consideration is that this inadequacy of Action Research in adequately addressing the potential power and control dichotomy between researcher and researched limits its usefulness for implementing structural change. If for emancipatory action research to proceed there must be initiation from the inside, and if it is accepted that the methods of incorporating outside initiation are methodologically suspect, then it would appear that there is an artificial limitation on the size of the interested group. Often to instigate structural change the "interest" group includes people who may not see themselves as part of this interest group. Surely they must be included. It is this question of consultation and collaboration for conflict resolution that Action Research appears to ignore because of any adequate means of reducing the power relationships within the potential research community.

The implications of this position are twofold. Firstly, it is suggested that non-Maori researchers need to become cross culturally sensitive or cross-culturally safe in order for them to work within Maori preferred social structures, and within Maori controlled systems. The second implication for Maori researchers and those cross culturally competent non-Maori who are capable of becoming a participant within a research group is the need for a methodological paradigm that allows them to identify the entire whanau of interest who are potentially involved in a problem. In other words, the locus of control needs to be beyond the hands of individual researchers. The concept of a whanau is proposed for this means. A whanau is a structure. Consideration needs to be given to the notion that to exclude non-Maori from all research is to allow them to abrogate their responsibilities as Treaty partners, to ignore the part non-Maori may play either as positive partners in the research project or as powerful blocks to structural change is to ignore a crucial question facing the design of empowering research methodologies.

The question remains as to how should Maori and non-Maori proceed with initiating and planning research in order for the project to be truly participant driven, and empowering.

Smith (1991) suggests a series of questions that need to be answered at the commencement of any project. In Bishop (1991 & 1992a) it was suggested that a more specific set of questions is necessary to develop this paradigm and to acknowledge the potential dual conflict that exists relating to Maori issues. There appears to be a ready willingness to come

to terms with the need for bicultural initiatives and imperatives, but because there is a limited range of bicultural 'conscientising' experiences available to people in powerful decision making positions, there is a very limited degree of comprehension about the mechanisms needed to narrow the gap between the agreed intentions to promote bicultural initiatives, and the actual changes needed to promote those initiatives.

In Bishop (1991 & 1992a)) it was proposed that the following questions and imperatives be considered.

1. Who initiates the research? and why? What are the goals of the project? Who sets the goals? Who will it benefit? Is the research for the betterment of Maori people? If so, in what way?
2. Who is going to design the work?
3. Who is going to do the work? Have the participants been organised hierarchically? How are decisions made?
4. What rewards will there be? Who gets the rewards? What assessment and evaluation procedures will be used to establish rewards? Who decides on the assessment and evaluation?
5. Who is going to have access to the research findings?
6. Who is the researcher accountable to?
7. Who has the control over the distribution of knowledge, including the modes of distribution?

Maori social , incorporating all age ranges , interests and experiences. The whanau makes decisions by a consensus seeking method and above all power and control are vested in the whanau not in any one individual member.

as numbers increase and as there is an increase in the range and (1988, in FOnow & Cook, 1991) Who is the researcher account

4, for example ethnography which often may mask the real power dichotomy between researcher and researched ri contexts and settings. We intend to give a broad overview of the range in this paper for the scope is vast, part of an interlocking matrix Smith (1992) indicates that solving the schooling and educational crisis facing Maori people today is closely connected with the realisaion of Maori language and cultural aspirations. Tincluding the fundamental point of self determination positively Researchers need to be aware of differing loctions for which is bicultural education

Issues arising in a bicultural context. initiated under the kaupapaa crucial issuefor Theses research practice

The essential argument concerns the power and control over the research exercise. This needs to be in the hands of Maori people so as to promote Maori cultural aspirations and tino Rangatiratanga. In order to achieve tshi researchers need to work as participants within a Maori controlled methodoly. Such a methodology reduces the distance between researcher and researched by locating operational and ethical control

schools have had this issue have so far providing . Furthermore, their concentration on bicultural education for non-Maori has diverted scarce Maori teaching and community resources from meeting the more urgent language and cultural needs of Maori students.

We suggest however that non-Maori resources, and specifically non-Maori educational researchers can and should become research participants, working to improve the achievement of Maori students within mainstream schools. Non-Maori educational researchers can contribute their knowledge and resources (e.g. research technology) to identify ways of modifying mainstream educational practices so that the achievement of Maori students is enhanced.

Our own research experience suggests that in order to succeed in this complex and challenging task, non-Maori educational researchers need to increase their cultural knowledge and competence. The first is understanding important Maori values fundamental to education, and the second is understanding the operation of social structures and functions within contemporary Maori society. There is space to comment only briefly on each of these.

Perhaps the most important of Maori values affecting education is that of *Tino Rangatiratanga* or Maori autonomy and control over Maori education. It is a value frequently cited by non-Maori, but one which has yet to be addressed at the level of management by school Boards of Trustees. Nor is it addressed at the level of selecting teaching strategies and curriculum materials or implementing curriculum which integrate for example *wairua*, *hinengaro* and *tinana*.

Revitalisation of *te reo Maori* is also a paramount value in Maori education. *Te reo* should itself serve to guide non-Maori researchers in setting priorities for their own learning.

A related value is that of understanding *mana whenua* and *mata waka* locational rights and responsibilities affecting schools. This also implies an understanding of the *iwi* structure within Maori society and the desire for autonomy by *iwi* that is fundamental to *tino rangatiratanga*. This point has never been fully grasped by Pakeha since the Treaty. The fundamentally different political structure that Maori prefer needs to be understood. Confusion about this issue can lead to chaos in terms of initiating, controlling and implementing educational research. Similarly misunderstandings of *whanau*, *hapu* and *iwi* structures and their related networks of influence have led to much wasting of time, energy and resources. Non-Maori educational researchers who are uninformed have tried to use such networks to extract information without first learning to contribute to those networks.

Our experience also suggests that *nga mahi a nga tipuna* is a central Maori value that is seldom fully appreciated by non-Maori. The aspirations and achievements of the ancestors are still driving the people today. It is to their legacy of song, oratory, oral history and hospitality that Maori constantly resort to in order to establish educational priorities and goals. Educational researchers who would also be research participants need to come to terms with this dramatically different world view.

Maori perspectives and knowledge itself reflects a radical difference in values of major importance for participant researchers to understand.

Maori do not necessarily pass on knowledge and information universally. Some knowledge and expertise belongs only to certain people. Knowledge is passed on personally and the specific social contexts of transmission are critical. Orally acquired and transmitted knowledge, so frequently devalued and belittled by non-Maori educational researchers, is highly valued by Maori. Waiata and moteatea are valued not just for their entertainment but also because they are preferred means of transmitting culture and information. While a deep knowledge and understanding of these values could take a lifetime, non-Maori educational researchers will find that even a limited understanding will occasion respect and support.

The second area of knowledge and competence needed by non-Maori educational researchers is that of appreciating how Maori operate within today's society. The principle of whanaungatanga is paramount here. This principle refers to both rights and responsibilities of the individual within a group, whether an extended family group or an ad hoc working group.

have responsibilities to care for and to nurture other members of the group, while still adhering to the kaupapa of the group. The group will operate to avoid singling out particular individuals for comment and attention, and to avoid embarrassing individuals who are not yet succeeding within the group. Group products and achievement frequently take the form of group performances not individual performances. This poses major challenge for assessment.

The group will typically begin and end each session with prayer, and will also typically share food together. The group will always make major decisions as a group and then refer those decisions to kaumatua for approval, and will seek to operate with the support and encouragement of kaumatua. Experience of these whanau functions and processes is essential if a non-Maori researcher is to be an effective participant. The structure and function of a whanau serves as a model for the relationship between researcher and researched.

The cross cultural and competence obtained by researchers who are prepared to participate by supporting the whanau in this way will serve two important ends. It will lead to a deeper understanding of the kaupapa, and, we believe, to a greater respect for Tino Rangatiratanga.

tural in this way will promote a number of positive outcomes. It will also lead to a fuller experience and sharing in tikanga Maori by the non-Maori educational researcher. Finally it will lead to a diminution of the distinction between researcher and researched.

Otago was detailed (Bishop 1991). Making these choices may stills non-cultural knowledge and competence in two ways. in terms of initiating, conli

Non-Maori eon knowledgewhich are importance for parti'achieveds Most importantly, Bishop, R. (1991) Te ropu rangahau tikanga

empowering research: A preliminary investigation.

a

Acker, J., Barry, K. & Esseveld, J. (1991) Objectivity and truth: Problems
in doing Feminist Research. in Fonow, M. & Cook, J. (eds) (1991)

Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research.

Bloomington. Indiana University Press.

British Research Journal

Fonow, M. & Cook, J. (eds) (1991) Beyond methodology: Feminist
scholarship as lived research. Bloomington. Indiana University Press.

(3), 118-123.

outsid position are twofold. Firstly, tato work within

ROSS-CULTURALLY COMPETENT EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS

AARE\NZARE JOINT CONFERENCE

.....