Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

Dilemmas of the cultural self in physical education:

Problematising the research process.

George Salter

University of Waikato

Although we know that much of what counts as knowledge is socially constructed, the impact of political and economic forces on teacher education programmes in many Western societies has tended to construct "official" pedagogic discourses which marginalise or preclude other ways of knowing. In exploring how mature-aged Mäori women construct professional knowledge for physical education through their pre-service primary teacher education experiences, I have been particularly interested in how they connect cultural identity, their own lived experiences from a Mäori world view, and Western knowledge. I have drawn on the work of Foucault (1980), Lave and Wenger (1991), Giddens (1991), Hall (1996) and other postmodern theorists, to provide a framework for exploring how dilemmas of identity can be negotiated and mediated through the reflexive ordering of personal narratives. However, the research process itself presents a number of ethical and methodological issues with regard to respecting culturally appropriate ways of accessing Mäori knowledge. This paper problematises that process, and addresses issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability of the research.

Introduction.

This paper is about a number of stories, or texts, in which myself and several co-researchers explore tensions that exist at the boundaries of multiple discourses within which we position ourselves. I have been working with a small number of mature-aged Mäori (indigenous people of New Zealand) women, exploring and co-constructing narrative life history accounts to make sense out of our experiences in physical education teacher education (PETE). I have been particularly curious about the articulations and silences (see, for example, Rovegno and Kirk, 1988) in their narratives, as we have begun to deconstruct previously unexamined but clearly interwoven notions of our own identity, knowledge and participation. The stories are of priviledge and marginalisation, indignation and joy, confusion and enlightenment, as we have all begun to constitute changing representations of Self. The personal stories which we have previously told to make sense of our lives tend to have been underpinned by the coherence of grand narratives, which according to Fine (1994; p.73) have historically needed, and have served to create, Others. Widespread social adherence to these "true stories" has tended to close contradictions and obscure (or mis-represent) the Other, while priviledging the positions and investments of the tellers of those stories, so that:

> ...the Other not only sometimes ceases to be a historical agent, but is often defined within totalizing and universalistic theories that create a transcendental, rational, White, male Eurocentric subject that ...occupies the

Australian Association for Research in Education
Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998

> centre of power...the Other is shown to lack any redeeming community traditions, collective voice or historical weight - and is reduced to the imagery of the colonizer.
>
> Giroux, 1991; p.7)

To Foucault (for example, 1980) the modernist approach to understanding the world is grounded in beliefs in truth, objectivity, linearity and progress, and has constituted normality for some and marginality for others. A great deal of research following that tradition, both quantitative and qualitative, has tended to reproduce a colonising discourse of Otherness, which I have attempted in this study to move beyond. My intention in this paper is to identify a number of ethical and methodological issues with regard to respecting culturally appropriate ways to gain a sense of Mäori knowledge, and to problematise the research process itself.

Together, we (as a whäunau of interest) have been examining how the co-researchers' experiences and understandings have mediated their personal constructions of pedagogical content knowledge for teaching physical education. As a context, I provide below brief overviews of the theoretical framework underpinning that work and the methodological procedures used, and also an account of my own "positioning" whereby I "write myself into the text". I identify this latter is very important, since the "authority" with which I speak in this research context is clearly questionable for at least two reasons - firstly in that I am male, researching with women, and secondly in that I am Päkehä (European New Zealander) researching with Mäori. I do not address (my own construction of the "meanings" to be made of) the "results" to date of this research, as this is beyond the scope of this paper and will be related elsewhere. Rather, this paper identifies difficulties and problems I have experienced in the research process itself, and makes visible some of the ways I have attempted to address those. I begin by overviewing the theoretical framework which underpins the study.

Theorising the research.

Lave and Wenger (1991) propose that people engage in "legitimate peripheral participation" in "communities of practice," in such a way that they effectively experience the metaphorical equivalent of "apprenticeship" as they not only develop the skills and knowledge which underpin the practices of the community, but also learn how to be members. This approach provides a useful way of conceptualising how the researchers in this study engage in such situated learning in a number of different contexts. I propose that on entering their three-year distance teacher education programme, the researchers were already "competent" practitioners in several communities of practice, for example; in a "lived Mäori world" community, in a community of mature parents / grandparents in a whänau (wider, or extended family), in a community of long-term employed people, in a rural New Zealand community, in a community of older Mäori women, and so on. Initial entry into the teacher education programme constituted their (initially) peripheral participation in at least four new communities of practice; the community of their fellow pre-service distance education programme students (all mature-aged and female, coming to tertiary education for the first time), the community of university-based teacher education students (predominantly non-Mäori, single and recent school-leavers), the community of "the academy" (largely involved with the transmission of "Western" knowledge to equip students with the Eurocentric,

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

mechanistic skills to teach in schools), and the community of the school itself (staff, parents and wider community), to which they were attached throughout their three-year programme, and within which they were required to "apply" the knowledge and skills which they "learned" in their university courses.

Lave and Wenger (1991) suggest that identity, knowledge and competence within the community of practice are all interwoven in complex ways. Since people are involved with varying degrees of peripherality in a number of communituies of practice at any time, I draw on Hall's (1996) explanation of how identity is fashioned according to Foucauldian notions of archeology, genealogy and subjectification of the individual (see, for example, Foucault, 1977;1980). In this view, the individual is constantly engaged in production of the self as an object in the world, and this involves practices of self-constitution, recognition and reflection. According to Hall (1991; 1996), identity is constructed through a discursive focus on networks of practices which constitute subjects in shifting, multiple and contradictory sites. He suggests that a critical element of identity is the relationship between Self and Other, so that although the Self is socially, historically and politically constituted, one needs to "fix" the Other in order for this to occur (Hall, 1991; p.16). I draw also on the work of Giddens (1991), who identifies the interdependence of agency and structure which he refers to as the "double hermaneutic". He describes the construction of self-identity as a process whereby individuals reflect on ways in which they order events in their lives - the reflexive ordering of self narratives - so as to protect their ontological security (a set of understandings and beliefs about the world, which provides a degree of comfort and predictability). This security may be threatened when the individual experiences doubt or uncertainty, as when new occurrences do not fit neatly into their existing world view. Giddens (1991) describes this experience as creating "existential anxiety", as everything that was previously "known" to the individual is now open to question and challenge.

I have drawn on the work of Lyotard (1984), Goodson (1990), Shotter (1993) and other constructionists to theorise how the researchers construct pedagogical content knowledge for teaching in physical education, and the situated nature of that learning in the cultural context of the university, school and community. Interwoven with these ideas are my attempts to address the historical and cultural context which informs what the researchers are motivated to learn, and how they negotiate that process. Clearly what it means to be "knowledgable" is a complex and contestable notion, and despite the fairly recent foregrounding of "scientific" knowledge in physical education teacher education programmes (see, for example: Kirk, 1990; Evans, 1990; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995), there is in education generally a growing awareness that knowledge is socially constructed, and that other ways of knowing may be equally valid and important. The transmission of "traditional" (monocultural and monological) content and pedagogy has foregrounded and represented the history, culture and achievements of those who are young, white, privileged and male, whilst marginalising and mis-representing Others (for example, the co-researchers in this study). Students in teacher education programmes construct knowledge which reflects the *"philosophies, spiritual practices, values, beliefs and productions"* (Swartz, 1996) of specific groups, whose membership is constituted through complex and overlapping subjectivities (for example race, class, age and gender).

As well as exploring (as fully as possible from a non-Mäori perspective) what a "Mäori world view" might look like, I have drawn on two other theoretical perspectives to frame this

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

research, in an attempt to foreground the importance of the historical, social and cultural contexts in which the lives of the researchers are embedded, as women, as Mäori and as members of the generation of "baby-boomers" with extremely different values and understandings of the world than those of either their parents or their children (Mackay, 1997). I have drawn on post-colonial literature (for example, the work of Sollors, 1986; Katrak, 1989; Sleman, 1994; Goldie, 1995, and Bhabha, 1996), to explain how "Mäoriness" needs to be understood at least in part as a discourse by which European culture has been able to manage - and in the same way that Said (1978) describes with regard to Orientalism, even produce - the Mäori politically, sociologically, ideologically and scientifically. I have attempted to face the problems surrounding definition and application of post-colonial theory as a universally understood construct, by addressing the historically and socially specific context of its application to one particular New Zealand context. In taking this approach, I recognise that such application requires constant interrogation and self-reflexivity, which I have attempted by making visible the difficulties in engaging with issues such as representation, authority, identity, agency, discourse and history.

The theoretical framework outlined above is clearly based on notions of deconstruction (see for example, Kearney, 1984), and is closely allied with the body of literature related to feminisms and postmodern pedagogies (for example: Weedon, 1987; Cherryholmes, 1988; Gore, 1990; Lather, 1991 and 1992; Luke, 1998). I have used this to explore the problematic nature of the co-researchers' lived experiences regarding agency, subjectivity and identity, and to foreground the plurality of their lives in the learning process through de-mystifying teacher-student relationships, and politicalising knowledge itself. I suggest that context and meaning in everyday life are co-constructions, multiple, often fragmented and contradictory, complex and constantly changing. I have atteempted to move beyond a socially critical approach to these understandings, since there are clearly problems translating what is intended to be an emancipatory project at the outset into "appropriate" responses at the level of participation, in such a way that "empowerment" is not seen as something performed "on" or "for" the "as-yet unliberated Other" (Ellsworth, 1989). Some of the problems and limits associated with critical theory's emancipatory function, particularly with regard to voice, empowerment, dialogue, and even the term "critical" itself, seem to me to be at least partly addressed through Ellsworth's (1989; p.106) notion of needing to move from "dialogue" to "working together across differences". Given that there is "no innocent discourse of liberation" (Lather, 1992), I regard Ellsworth's work as an example of how deconstructing one's own practices can enhance one's capacity for self-emancipation. I discuss this in more detail below, in the section dealing with narrative as research methodology .

The notion that the co-researchers construct complex, fragmented and changing subjectivities within the discourses of a "lived Mäori world", underpins the ways that structure, agency, knowledge and identity are interwoven, and also provides a context within which to examine the problematic ways in which their lived experiences from within Other world views create dilemmas, contradictions and uncertainties. I want to briefly address my understandings of the notion of a "Mäori world view", primarily because I have suggested above that this forms an important cornerstone of self-indentification for the researchers in this story. I also consider it to be important that I position myself in relation to this Mäori world view, since clearly my understandings relate closely to the ways in which I myself am "inscribed" in the stories of the research whäunau.

Australian Association for Research in Education

Writing myself in the story.

Firstly, I am an outsider in the Mäori world, and always will be - this despite having been married to a Mäori woman for a quarter of a century, and having raised our two children to adulthood. My wife, our children and more recently our two mokopuna (grandchildren) are Mäori, both in their own identification through whakapapa (genealogy), and also through their embracing and acting upon a set of values, beliefs and understandings which are embedded in the tikanga (traditional customs, beliefs and attitudes). As Päkehä, it is I who is Other in relation to this lived world, for though I have immersed myself in those same traditional customs, beliefs and attitudes, and although I have talked to kuia and koroua (female and male elders, or grandparents) and also read widely about aspects of culture, learning and history of Mäori (for example, Ngata, 1940; Metge, 1990a, 1990b; Pere, 1988, 1994, 1997), I identify strongly with Rose Pere's frustration at what she describes as the *"... hermaneutic difficulty of expresing the concepts of one culture in the language of another"* (Pere, 1988; p.14). What I describe below should therefore be read as my attempt to express some of my own understandings of an epistemology and ontology of a Mäori world view, and in that I am speaking for myself rather than speaking for Mäori.

During the 170 or so years of colonisation in New Zealand, both government policies aimed at assimilation and the less obvious transmission of ideologies through public institutions have successively combined to erode traditional Mäori values and practices. Metge (1990b; p.20), for example, describes schools as institutions of enculturation, engaged in the transmission of selected aspects of a selected culture [my emphasis]. Vercoe (1997; p.42) further suggests that with the emergence of a global culture nurtured by rampant developments in technology, there has been a progressive "watering down" of the vitality of Mäori knowledge, under the weight of powerful hegemonic forces. According to Irwin (1992; p.7), much of this Mäori knowledge, along with many traditional values and practices, has been buried, while other traditional values and practices seem to have survived through adaptation. A barrier to my own understanding of both traditional (pre-colonisation) cultural practices, and those which have changed since Päkehä arrival, is that most accounts of structural and historical phenomena have been "*...Päkehä ideas...used to make observations and judgements about the Mäori world with little or no attempt to reconcile the different epistemological bases of the two cultures"* (Irwin, 1992; p.8). Marsden (1992; p.136) suggests further that *"...abstract rational thought and empirical methods cannot grasp the concrete act of existing* (for Mäori*) which is fragmentary, paradoxical and incomplete."* He believes that the subjective experiencing from within the culture of what he describes as "apprenticeship into tribal life" is the route to developing attitudes, mores and values of a Mäori world, and that the cultural milieu of this Mäori world is rooted in both the temporal world and the transcendent world (p.137).

Assertions such as these cause me to proceed very tentatively in my own "Other-cultural explorations". Firstly, I have my own understanding of a Mäori world which relate to these and other profoundly important concepts, and am developing (and constantly refining) a credo for working in such a world. I briefly overview these understandings below, in no particular order as it is clear that such constructs as land, traditions, mythology, history, family and other social relationships, are all intertwined and play important parts in constituting what might be described as a Mäori world, in which a Mäori "cultural self" might be constituted. Secondly, I do not suggest that all who identify themselves as Mäori in contemporary society either construct their own sense of self, or position themselves, with

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

any consistency or predictability within the discourses underpinning the world view I describe below. I do suggest, however, that "being Mäori" is likely to be embedded within the meaning and sense that Mäori people might make out of their lived experiences in contemporary society.

Finally, as well as attempting to position myself in relation to this Mäori world view, I believe it is important to "inscribe" myself in the story of the research process itself. In moving from a position of "researcher as tuakana" (more knowledgable, more experienced) in traditional settings to a position of "researcher as teina" (less experienced, a learner) in the research whänau of interest, I have become *"a participant in a context where power and control are located in the collective and where knowledge is created, gathered and processed for the benefit of the collective" (*Bishop, 1996; p.214). This means that my own position is congruent with those of the co-researchers, and implies connectedness, engagement, and involvement with them within their own cultural world view. In that regard I am a legitimate peripheral participant in the community of practice of their cultural world, and we are all legitimate peripheral participants in a Kaupapa Mäori community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Heshusius (1994; p.15) addresses the context within which knowledge is created, processed and gathered by suggesting the notion of "participatory consciousness". This results in the re-ordering of the relationship between the knower and what is known, between self and other, and between self and the world, and leads to what she describes (1994; p.17) as the *"recognition of the deeper kinship between ourselves and others"*. Bishop (1996; p.215) suggests that this notion of knowing in a participatory domain characterises the concepts of connectedness, engagement and participatory consciousness, and this speaks in a very real sense to the Mäori concept of whanaungatanga, which implies a focus on the group rather than on the self.

Theorising a Mäori world view

I begin with a cameo, necessarily brief and somewhat superficial but hopefully adequate for the purposes of informing this paper, of how I define and understand some important concepts of a Mäori world view. Much of this understanding comes from the work of Barlow (1991), Pere (1994; 1997) and Walker (1996), from my own lived experiences within my own whänau and whanaunga, and through talking with kuia and koroua:

Aroha (love, or affection)

Pere (1997; p 6) describes aroha *as "unconditional love that is derived from the presence and the breath of the Godhead"*It is an important concept in regard to the survival and strength of whanaungatanga (kinship ties), and is considered essential to the survival and well-being of the world community. It is believed that negative forces cannot flourish where absolute aroha exists, and that its presence allows the spirit of an individual to soar. Aroha is not talked about, but rather is seen as meaningful only when actioned. To Mäori, human needs are seen as being more important than material possessions, so that Pere provides the following example of aroha:

> One has been saving to buy a new car, and then something happens to a member of the family or someone in the tribe that requires finance, in regard to personal strife such as illness, death or the threat of losing an ancestral

> home....one does not hesitate to hand over what money has been saved up, to help out.
>
> Pere, 1997; p.6.

Caring for people and sharing are very common among Mäori who have retained the traditions of earlier times, and it is not unusual to find Mäori families looking after an elderly family member, or bringing up a relative's child in their own family. This latter practice is known as mätua whängai (foster-parenting), and in earlier times it was a very general custom for Mäori grandparents to take care of the firstborn of their mokopuna. My wife, Hinemoa, was brought up by her kuia in this way, and we are now repeating that process with our own mokopuna, Herapia.

Wairua (spiritual dimension)

For Mäori, the physical realm is immersed in and integrated with the spiritual realm, and beliefs, values and traditions ensured that both realms were recognised, sustained and nurtured together as one unit. Wairua is seen as a dimension internalised within a person from conception: *"... the seed of life which emanated from Io, the supreme supernatural influence"* (Pere, 1988; 14). In a Mäori view, every act has both physical and spiritual consequences, and a powerful belief in supernatural forces governs and influences the way one interacts with others and the environment. In everyday life, Mäori might try to invoke, appease or otherwise influence atua (spirits). Mäori believe that all things have a spirit as well as a physical body. The earth has a spirit, as do trees, animals, birds, fish, lakes, rivers and mountains.

Mauri (life force, essence)

Mauri is a special force possessed by Io (supreme being), which makes it possible for everything to move and live according to the limits of its existance (Barlow, 1991; p.83). When a person dies, the mauri no longer acts to bind the parts of existance together, and so body and spirit separate.

Mana (power, prestige or standing)

Mana is described by Barlow (1991; p.61) as *"the enduring indestructable power of the gods"* In contemporary times it has various meanings, such as the power of the gods, the power of the ancestors, the power of the land or the prestige of the individual. Pere (1997; p.14) suggests that the term is so complex it defies translation in any language other than Mäori, and that its use also includes psychic influence and control, and vested and acquired authority. This view recognises the absolute uniqueness of the individual, so that a person's mana is central to all action. This is expressed in the following whakatauki (proverb), which identifies both the treasured greenstone and children as being very precious to Mäori:

> *Ahakoa he iti* Be it ever so small

he pounamu it is as precious as the greenstone.

Tapu (sacred, set apart, restricted).

There are many meanings and conditions associated with tapu, which in its fundamental form is regarded as the influence of the gods. All things are seen to have tapu, and many rituals exist to protect that tapu against contamination by another. Barlow (1991; p.121) for example describes how in carving a house, the carvings are blessed in order to remove the personal tapu of the carvers and avoid contaminating the work. According to Pere (1997; p.40), tapu can be used as:

- a protective measure
- a way of imposing social control
- a way of developing an understanding of the implications of spirituality
- a way of developing respect for another life force, or life in general.

Pere suggests that far from being mere "native superstition", tapu is most effective as a means of social control, self-discipline, conservation and preservation for Mäori, because of its inherent protective and disciplinary qualities. Contravening tapu can lead to unpleasant physical and spiritual consequences.

Noa (ordinary, free from restriction).

Noa is the quality or condition of being free from restriction, or from spiritual influence. It is associated with warm benevolence, life-giving and constructive influences, and ceremonial purification (Pere, 1997; p.56), and is significant in the spiritual and physical well-being of the individual. The principles of tapu and noa have complementary roles to Mäori, and ensuring a reasonable balance is kept maintains mauri in harmony.

Mäori identity and identification.

> *E kore au e ngaro te käkano* And never shall disappear
>
> *i ruia mai i Rangiätea* the seed which was sown from Rangiätea

This aphorism, quoted from Buck (1949; p.37), expresses the sense of identity felt by the ancestors of present-day Mäori who settled the land they called Aotearoa from Central Polynesia, around A.D. 900 (Walker, 1996). In pre-European times, Mäori did not think of themselves as a race in contrast to other races, but rather as iwi (tribes) or hapü (extended families). Walker (1996) suggests that Mäori applied the descriptive term "tangata päkehä" (white persons) to these strangers, and conversely adopted the expression "tangata mäori" (normal, natural or ordinary persons) to distinguish themselves. As I have suggested elsewhere (Salter, 1998; p.20), personal identity and self-worth relate very closely to the image of the group with which one identifies. A sense of pride in being Mäori relates strongly to what Van Meijl (1996; p.311) describes as tradition-oriented and deeply-valued aspects of

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

ethnic identity, such as whanaungatanga (commitment to kinfolk), manäki (care of others) and utu (reciprocity).

According to Walker (1989; p.36), Mäori cultural identity is defined within a tripartite sequence of myth, tradition and history, where gods, ancestors and living people are linked through genealogical descent. Knowledge of this history is seen as taonga tuku iho (treasures passed down to the present generation from the ancestors), to be treated with great care since it is inseperable from the mana of the tribe. While the term "Mäoritanga" (things Mäori) has widespread usage to denote a common, pan-Mäori view of traditional culture, this is in fact a convenient label applied by early settlers and which still has currency in contemporary society. Tikanga, kaupapa, kawa and history itself are all tribally specific, to such an extent that it would be more meaningful to talk of "Tainuitanga" or "Te Arawatanga", for example. Tait (1988) suggests that:

> ...any idea of a national Mäori history does not exist in Mäori terms. Identity is tribal, whakapapa is tribal, as are customs and beliefs. Any attempt to look for rational commonality in detail is to impose a Päkehä desire for a simple structure which does not and did not exist.
>
> . Tait,1988; p.8

Awatere (1985) also asserts that whakapapa is the key to identity, in that it teaches people who they are in relation to their tïpuna (ancestors) who have gone before, and to the tangata whenua (Mäori, literally "people of the land") who share this space and time. She states there is no search for identity for Mäori, only the reclaiming of it as set and pre-determined, so that:

> It comes not from achievements in either the Mäori or Päkehä world, but from that part of our pito (navel; umbilical cord) which connects us to the eternity of our tïpuna and through that invisible thread which connects all whanaunga through our loins across all time and across all space.
>
> Awatere,1985; p.77

Walker (1996) further affirms the importance to Mäori of the tïpuna who have gone before, in that the past is referred to as *"nga ra o mua"* (the days in front, or ahead of). While Päkehä might look to and perhaps try to anticipate the future, for Mäori only the past and present are conceived of as being in front of human consciousness, and therefore knowable. The individual is conceptualised as standing facing the past which can be seen, and travelling backwards in time to the future with the present unfolding as a continuum into the past. Both past and present therefore constitute a single field of unified knowledge which is at the same time both historic and ahistoric, so that stories of mythology and tradition are constantly referred to in public discourse by living exponents of Mäori knowledge (Walker, 1996; p.14).

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

Manawhenua: Identification with the land.

> *Toi te kupu,* Retain the language,
>
> *Toi te mana,* Retain the prestige, and in so doing
>
> *Toi te whenua* Retain one's identity with the land.

While a Päkehä view of land may focus on its commodification and economic potential, Mäori interest in the land can only be truly understood in Mäori terms. From a Mäori view, its essence is not material but in its mauri and its *"...spirituality deeply rooted in the mythology of Papatanuku, the earth-mother, and connection with the land as tangata whenua"*(Walker, 1989; p.46). Abuse or lack of care of the land might reduce its mauri, and also its mana, which Ritchie (1995; p.52) describes as *"... the status it has acquired through all that has occurred on it - who lived there, who died there, battles, births. The history is never obliterated."* Walker (1989) suggests that these cultural differences in understanding and valuing the significance of land have contributed to polarising Mäori-Päkehä relationships, so that:

> The historic process of colonial despoilation reified Mäori and Päkehä ethnicity to the point of being identified as binary oppositions in the contest for land, resources, status and power in New Zealand. This binary opposition of Mäori and Päkehä ethnicity is as important a determinant of Mäori identity as enculturation.
>
> Walker, 1989; p.35

Land wars, intervention of British militiary forces and the more subtle but equally effective efforts of the Native Land Court reduced Mäori holdings of land in New Zealand to under 6% within the first 100 years of colonisation (Kawharu, 1977; p15). As I have indicated elsewhere (Salter 1998), a migration of Mäori from traditional tribal areas to urban areas in search of work in the economic growth period of the 1960's and 1970's, has resulted in perhaps 80% of the New Zealand Mäori population now living distant to, and often alienated from, their tribal origins. As well as the many contemporary problems (for example, economic and physical problems) surrounding Mäori disenfranchisement from tribal land, alienation from tribal roots also has other consequences. This is particularly significant, in that definition of tribal identity in relation to other tribes relies heavily on the physical, spiritual and symbolic connectedness to the land, and constitutes the basis of cultural identity for Mäori (Walker, 1989; p.41). There is no doubt that large numbers of Mäori today do not have access to the kaupapa (protocol, or traditional ways of doing things) or to the tikanga.

Methodological considerations

a) Kaupapa Mäori research

The narrative-life history methodology which I have used in this study is located within a Kaupapa Mäori research framework. This is described by Irwin (1994) as:

> ....research which is "culturally safe", which involves the "mentorship" of kaumatua, which is culturally relevant and appropriate, while satisfying the rigour of research, and which is undertaken by a Mäori researcher, not a researcher which happens to be Mäori.
>
> Irwin (1994; p.9)

Kaupapa Mäori research reflects both the desire for Mäori self-determination and a resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse, which has traditionally priveledged the researcher over the researched. Smith (1996) suggests that research has been traditionally associated with the production of Western knowledge and academic work, the production of theories which have dehumanised Mäori, and practices which have priviledged Western ways of knowing while denying the validity for Mäori of Mäori knowledge, language and culture.

Kaupapa Mäori research is a discourse which has emanated from and is legitimated from within the Mäori community, primarily because it is based on a historical precedence of culturally established validation processes (Bishop, 1996), and so validates Mäori knowledge, language and culture. Irwin (1994) too explains that Kaupapa Mäori research is epistemologically based within Mäori cultural specificities, preferences and practices. The metaphoric construct within which Kaupapa Mäori research operates is the whänau, and although this term has traditionally applied to a grouping of related family members, it is used in this context to signify a collection of individuals who have come together with a common purpose, and with a commitment to adhere to a common kaupapa (agenda) in the pursuit of its aims. This is known as a "whänau of interest", and is the specific site in which research can be shaped, carried out, analysed and disseminated (Irwin, 1994; Bishop, 1996).

The whänau is an important construct for this collaborative methodology, particularly for incorporating ethical procedures and debating issues associated with the research. The process of establishing whänau links is known as whakawhanaungatanga, and this conveys unspoken commitment to other people by identifying bodily linkage (common ancestry), engagement and connectedness (Bishop, 1996). Whakawhanaungatanga is the 'culturally constucted metaphor' for carrying out Kaupapa Mäori research (Bishop, 1996), and as a research process uses protocols similar to those used to establish relationships among Mäori. Paramount among these protocols are those that relate to power-sharing and self-determination

b) Stories and storying: The narrative research process.

Mäori was an oral culture prior to colonisation, and knowledge was traditionally transmitted in the form of stories, waiata (songs), möteatea (poetry), pakiwaitara (legends) and whakatauki (proverbs). Not surprisingly, there are strong cultural preferences among Mäori for narrative in contemporary times (Bishop, 1996; p.25), and the act of storytelling is seen as not only invoking the wairua and the mauri of the story itself, but also affording mana to the teller of the story. In exploring the "knowledge" of the researchers in this study (the act of uncovering and co-constructing their own narratives or "stories"), I made use of a number of inter-related qualitative "methodological approaches", which relied heavily as a starting point

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual
Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association
for Research in Education

on what Haig-Brown (1992; p.105) and Bishop (1996; p.31) describe as "interviews as chat". These interviews were close to everyday conversations within on-going relationships, and this provided both myself and the co-researchers opportunities to follow up or to re-visit topics in the ongoing construction and reconstruction of narratives. The theoretical ideas underpinning a narrative approach draw from the work of a variety of philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists and literary theorists. They are based on the notion of deconstructing the individual's view of reality, so that the unstated cultural assumptions that contributed to the original construction are revealed. People construct stories to understand and make sense out of their experiences, and in that process emphasise certain experiences at the expense of others, to maintain the coherence of the storyline. These stories are manufactured in a social, cultural and political context, are multi-sourced and are developed over a long period of time.

The narrative approach focusses on ways of producing ourselves differently - of re-storying the individual's earlier life - and this process promotes a re-description of the Self (Monk, 1997; p. 21). This clearly has moral and ethical implications for the co-researcher, who can no longer hide behind what Monk (1997; p.26) describes as "a truth-based theory" in accounting for ethical behaviour. It requires intentionality on the part of the researcher, though not directiveness, as according to Drewery and Winslade (1997) it is important to reject:

> ... traditional Western views which focus on personal deficits in ways that speak of failure rather than accomplishment, that produce social hierarchies (experts who are presumed to know more about people's lives than they know themselves), and that erode our sense of communal inter-dependence and common purpose.
>
> Drewery and Winslade (1997; p.33)

Although individuals put their own story together, people within a culture share a dominant set of discourses, a more-or-less coherent set of stories about the way the world should be. Some accounts dominate and others are less often heard, and new meanings and subjective positions are negotiated constantly as different discourses collide or conflict. There can therefore be no one "true story" or grand narrative, as different knowledges have different claims to relevance, validity or dominance depending on the contexts within which they rise and on their relationship to different purposes and histories. This form of epistemology is located in a very different philosphical tradition to that which produced most of Western science and technology, and which produced the traditional position of researcher as being that of the storyteller, as the person who Bishop (1996; p.23) describes as *"deciding what constitutes the narrative".* Below I describe some of the ways I have attempted to frame and to address epistemological and ethical problems associated with the research process.

Framing the research problems.

Throughout this paper, I have indicated a number of epistemological, methodological and procedural problems involved with research of this nature. I will briefly foreground those

Australian Association
for Research in Education
Paper Presented at the AARE Annual
Conference, Adelaide, 1998

problems, and discuss ways that I have attempted to address at least some of them through the protocols of Kaupapa Mäori research.

I am a Päkehä researching with Mäori, and I am also a male in contrast to all other members of our research whänau, who are women. There are other disimilarities in our biographies (and biologies), for example; country of origin, social class, economic, and geographic differences. Other significations of difference between us - such as "teacher-student" and "researcher-researched" constructions - might potentially constitute power differentials between us which are embedded particularly in more traditional discourses. Sparkes (1997; p.25) suggests that speaking to and for the interests of silenced groups that one is not a member of, raises a number of ethical and pedagogical problems. These operate in tandem to deter many who have positions of relative power and privilege from taking action to *"fracture a range of silences".* Hooks (1990) also suggests poetically (ifwith some cynicism):

> No need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself. No need to hear your voice. Only tell me about your pain. I want to know your story. And then I will tell it back to you in a new way. Tell it back to you in such a way that it has become mine, my own. Re-writing you, I write myself anew. I am still the colonizer, the speak subject, and now you are at the centre of my talk.
>
> hooks (1990; p.151-152)

As I indicated above, this idea would certainly strike a chord with many Mäori research participants, and resistance to "being researched on" is expressed by Marsden (1992), who suggests:

> ...the reality we experience subjectively is incapable of rational synthesis. This is why so many Mäori react against the seemingly facile approach of foreign anthropologists to their attitudes, mores and values, and the affective states of mind that produce them.
>
> Marsden, 1992; p.136.

The co-researchers in this study recognise tensions between the lived Mäori world and the worlds of the university and the school, and in so doing acknowledge differences between the Self and Other. I too, as the writer of this paper, acknowledge similar tensions at the boundaries of Self and Other. It is clearly problematic to involve the "white Western male" in me to explain how I understand the colonisation of Mäori minds, or the role of patriarchy and gender politics in the construction of a "Mäori cultural self". My own difficulties are in working with, but trying to not romananticise, subjugated voices. But, as we search for "moments of social justice" (Fine 1997, p.81), I am aware also of the likely residue of my own domination lingering within these co-constructed stories. Geertz (1988) comments:

> The gap between engaging others where they are, and representing them where they aren't, always immense but not much noticed, has suddenly become extremely visible. What was once technically difficult, getting their

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

> lives into our works, has turned morally, politically, even epistimologically delicate.
>
> Geertz (1988, p.130)

How I position myself with regard to participating in and reporting this sort of collaborative research is also problematic. As Bishop (1996; p.42) suggests, explanations from within the dominant discourse highlight the tension of working within an academic institution predicated on one world view - a view in which my own biography is deeply embedded - and carrying out research which is supposedly culturally safe, relevant and appropriate from another world view. My experience is that theoretical and methodological issues are addressed in the ongoing processes of the research itself. Below I highlight several of these issues, and ways I have attempted to address them. The sub-headings I use and the questions to be asked under each are suggested by Bishop (1997; p.22), and serve as a useful focus in deciding the agreed-to agenda of the project.

Initiation

Who initiated the project, and why? One summer evening a couple of years ago, my family and I, together with a group of older Mäori women who were later to become members of the research whänau, sat around the barbecue table-solving some of the world's problems over a glass of wine. The women had originally been my off-campus students in physical education and outdoor education curriculum courses, and were now staying with us while they attended yet another on-campus full-time Summer School course as they worked towards completing the B.Ed. degree. Over the two years since we had first worked together, they had become close family friends, and "adopted" aunties to my two grown-up children. My wife was able to make tribal associations through whakapapa links with them (a common occurrence in Mäori society!), so they really were "whanaunga" (extended family, or kin) in a Mäori sense. For my own part, we had been involved in several small collaborative resource development and curriculum development projects together, and had developed good personal relationships. In those projects, we seemed to be able to work well together, and were able to draw on the strengths and knowledge of each person as the need arose, without myself constantly in the position of leader.

In that quiet time - while the kids were doing the dishes - between finishing dinner and plodding off back to the books to (collaboratively) finish off an assignment, we became increasingly absorbed in stories of what life and Eurocentric schooling had been like, growing up as Mäori children in predominantly Mäori-populated rural areas of New Zealand, in the late 1950's and early 1960's. These stories became central to our conversations over the next few days, and we unearthed some moving and provocative experiences - the sorts of accounts which I had read in books and had presumed to be largely fictional, or at the least, heavily romanticised.. From somewhere came the idea that it would be really interesting to explore our own stories, to try to make sense out of how being Mäori, and mature-aged, and so on, might mean that one brought different skills and knowledge to teacher education from those brought by the single, white, middle-class, predominantly school leavers, who form the majority of the student body. And also how one might experience teacher education differently, and learn different things from it, and develop different relationships with lecturers, and so on, because of those differences. I cannot

honestly remember whose idea this was - it just seemed to appear, as if it were a story itself, wanting to be told...

What were the goals of the project, and who set them? Other than the main aim of the project as I articulated above, its driving force was really our individual and collective curiosity - for each of us, a matter of, "Where can I locate myself in these stories?" Some of the interviews were conducted and tape-recorded individually, often taking the form of "interviews as chat", and sometimes the group came together and shared thoughts and stories. At different times, different members of the group would seemingly "steer" the inquiry, and at other times what seemed to be an idle comment would send discussion racing off on tangents, as ideas were triggered and built on. The energy generated at those times was almost frightening, and the stoies literally developed a life of their own. The significant point about the "agenda" of the research was that it arose within the group, was agreed to either overtly or tacitly, and responded to the needs and interests of the members.

It was interesting also that our exploration was never linear, in that we would often cover "known" ground, sometimes on many occasions. Each re-visit seemed to unearth more information, or a slightly different understanding or insight, or prompt us to explore ideas in slightly different ways. It was clear also that the stories were never complete: For example, Mihiwould deliberatley and playfully leave me small "traps", so that when I would telephone her to check on some anomoly in her transcript, she would say something along the lines of, "I wondered whether you would pick that up!" She would then reveal another complete aspect of the story in question. Another example involves Roimata, who became so engrossed in trying to understand her parents' decisions to arrange the family's life in particular ways when she was growing up, that she rang her mother in Australia to find out. Mother didn't confirm Roimata's understanding of the situation, so she then contacted her brother and sister to check their versions of "the story". After a period of time, Roimata rang and asked me to change our written version of her story, based on her new (co-constructed) reality.

The anecdotal discussion above illustrates that within this particular Kaupapa Mäori collaborative research setting, power and priviledge are shared around the members. We acknowledge the participatory connectedness that exists between members, and this tends to remove any possibility of domination by an individual and gives rise to a jointly constructed agenda and mutual feelings of ownership of both the process and the co-constructed stories. The design of the process itself is also co-constructed and therefore likely to be embraced by the participants as culturally safe and relevant. An example of this is where one of the group telephoned me to suggest that it was about time we all met together, since I had been working with everyone individually for a while and they had decided among themselves that we should all meet and share stories. The idea of meeting together, the venue (Roimata's school classroom, early in the evening) and the agenda were all decided collaboratively by the other research whänau members (without my input, but with my agreement, of course). The hui (meeting) itself was conducted according to appropriate cultural customs: we began with a karakia (prayer), shared the food we had all brought while we caught up with the comings and goings of each other's families and working lives, and swapped gossip while Roimata cut Kataraina's hair and Mihi dubbed some of Roimata's Mäori music tapes for the work she and Kataraina were doing with their respective kapa haka (cultural performance) groups.

Australian Association for Research in Education
Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998

This sort of sharing in their professional and personal lives is very common for these women. They have whakapapa links, have come to know each other really well since the beginning of their teacher education programme, and have worked together as a collaborative study group and as a circle of close friends and whanaunga since that time. Far from any perception on my part that I should be "controlling" this research, I feel immensely priviledged (and more than a little humbled) at being included in the private worlds of these people, and to be considered an equal member of the research whänau.

Benefits

Bishop (1996; p.22) suggests that some important questions should be addressed when conducting research with Mäori to ensure that there are benefits to Mäori, and that it is also important to identify how those benefits are to be measured. Examples of such benefits might be in supporting cultural and language aspirations, or encouraging self determination. These suggestions seem sound in the light of my earlier discussion surrounding the traditional role of those who have conducted research "on" indigenous people, and imposed their own agenda, interests and concerns on the research process. I described above the tensions I have felt at being part of a research project that quite clearly sits outside the dominant discourse of the professional institution of which I am a member. There are similar tensions for me related to receiving benefits which are inscribed in a Mäori world view (for example, self-growth, an increased sensitivty to tikanga Mäori, the development of close relationships with other members of the research whänau, and so on), while also having access to benefits in the "Päkehä education" world view which my whanaunga might be denied. As I write this paper I am conscious that its publication has currency in that second world for me alone (in intellectual and professional terms), and for that reason I am priviledged over other members of the research whänau. Telling their stories through the collaborative research process offers them the sorts of personal and social benefits I mentioned above, but at face value offers little else.

I use the expression "at face value" here, because in discussion with some of my professional (Päkehä) colleagues about our research, I have been asked the question, "Yes, but what's in it for them?" The answer to that question undoubtedly lies in the values and beliefs of cultural world view of the research whänau members. They position themselves in three particular ways which encourage me to represent our collaborative efforts:

1. They see themselves clearly as kaitiaki (custodians or guardians of knowledge), rather than from the conventional (Western) perspective as teachers (transmitters of information). Any deeper understanding we can all arrive at through our own stories with regards to how Mäori children experience tensions and conflict within the (predominantly Western) schooling system, is likely to impact positively on the life chances of "our tamariki" (our - ie., Mäori - children).
2. If through the research process itself I have personally developed greater cultural sensitivity and the motivation to adjust content and/or pedagogical processes in my teacher education courses to address the needs and enhance the success of Mäori students, then this too is likely to impact positively on the Mäori community.
3. If my disseminating our stories and information about the research process itself (for example, through publications) to a wider community of university lecturers and researchers creates interest, creates greater cultural sensitivity, or enhanced

tolerance towards other world views, or stimulates another researcher to address these theoretical and methodological issues in their own work, then it may be said that we have in some small way supported the cultural aspirations of Mäori.

Representation

As Bishop (1996; p.24) suggests, story-telling in the context of this research aims to uncover the complexities and contradictions in people's lives, rather than represent an uncomplicated and generalisable truth. The social reality which our (the research whänau) research reports on and depicts through our writing (telling) of the collaborative stories is ours alone. While others may read our work and identify with some experiences or explanations, we make no claim to be speaking for all Mäori, or for other groups who might be tribally, geographically, generationally, or otherwise positioned. I addressed some important philosphical and ethical concerns about representation in the introduction to this section of the paper, and subsequent discussion has attempted to highlight that the Kaupapa Mäori research model adequately addresses concerns of setting research questions, allocating tasks, determining whose voice is heard, and so on. It does this by recognising that everyone involved in the process is a full participant, not just an informant, with their own strengths and experiences, and their own, equally valid, stories to tell.

A final comment about accountability concerns the notion of how the research "findings" are made public. As well as my occasional foray into an academic arena (such as this conference) to disseminate information, it is seen by the research whänau and by the Mäori community at large, to be far more culturally appropriate to share knowledge though hui (meetings called for a particular purpose). Through following traditional protocol at such a gathering, particularly in view of my own comparatively low level of cultural competence (I am definitely teina, or less experienced, in that setting) it is clear that power is shared and the principles of tino Rangatiratanga (self-determination) are promoted.

Legitimation

Working within these two world views can create conflicts, contradictions and tensions, as I have suggested. The "formal" legitimation requirements of the research - for example, approval from the University Ethics Committee to use "human subjects", obtaining written consent (in both Mäori and English), and so on - have been adhered to. It must be said, however, that the research whänau regards itself as autonomous in deciding who will process the data, what happens to the results, and so on. The Kaupapa Mäori model solves these sorts of ethical dilemmas by encouraging the incorporation of ethical procedures, and promoting the debate of issues associated with the research. As I have indicated above, the protocols themselves perform a sort of "quality control" function and bestow a mutually agreed legitimacy through power-sharing and self-determination. The stories themselves are co-constructed, which implies whänau sanction and definition as to what is regarded as accurate, true and complete in the text. While I personally might "do the work" of theorising the research and actually committing the stories to paper (I am regarded as tuakana, or more experienced, in that regard - those are particular skills which I bring to the collaborative effort), the meanings within the stories are always mutually agreed co-constructions, and as such represent the group's understandings.

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

I am conscious too that this latter function - the construction of meaning - can be problematic in itself. As both Connelly and Clandenin (1990) and Bishop (1996) point out, it is never enough to simply listen to and record stories of experience, because it is impossible to still our "theorising voices" (Bishop; 1996; p.23), as we constantly reflect and seek explanations for our own experiences in the stories of others. In this way, the telling of any story is likely to have impact on the listener in terms of prompting them to re-order their own self narratives (Giddens, 1991). The co-construction of meaning in the Kaupapa Mäori approach can therefore be seen to address the problems associated with legitimacy (or otherwise) of the personal subjective voice. In my writing (for example in this paper), I always emphasise at which points I am speaking for myself, and at which points I am the sanctioned narrator of our co-constructed stories.

Accountabilty

As "the researcher"in this project, I am considered accountable in a number of ways by those positioned in the traditional discourse. For example, I clearly have a responsibility to any funding agency (not applicable in this case, unfortunately!), to the University Ethics Committee, to the co-researchers themselves in ensuring authenticity and confidentiality in my "report", and so on. Beyond this however, I also accept a responsibility in ensuring that the research is culturally safe and relevant, and in this I take my guidance from the other members of the research whänau, who are much more experienced and knowledgeable than I regarding matters of protocol. In my tentative early approach to the project, when we were all very much peripheral participants in the research community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991), I suggested that we should consider including a kaumatua (Mäori elder) in the reseach whänau. This suggestion arose from several considerations:

1. I was responding to my own perceived lack of competence in a Mäori world
2. I wanted to ensure that culturally safe and appropriate protocols were followed
3. I wanted the work we were doing to be seen as legitimate by a Mäori world,
4. I was conscious of Kathie Irwin's (1992) comments regarding the inappropriateness of non-Mäori conducting Kaupapa Mäori research (see her quoted work on page 9 of this paper, and my comments under footnote #8).

We discussed the kaumatua issue at length, and it was eventually decided that we could conduct our affairs appropriately by ourselves, without a kaumatua. The decision was based on the fact that the women all occupy positions of some prestige in their local communities, and are actively involved with many traditional activities which involve adherence to tikanga Mäori, and so felt perfectly competent to address those issues of cultural safety, relevance, and so on. Secondly, by this time we had developed such close and respectful working relationships between ourselves - the participatory consciousness of Heshusius (1994; p.15) - that the mediating function of an "outsider" to the group was not seen to be a need. This is a further example of the level of power-sharing among group members when using Kaupapa Mäori research processes. Despite this (and with the knowledge and agreement of the group), for my own part I have made sure that I discussed issues and concerns with my own tuakana, Ted Glynn and Russell Bishop, who both have extensive Kaupapa Mäori research experiences. This consultation process is also two-way, of course, and provides us with another challenge in showing accountability in our work.

Conclusion.

My intention in this paper was to highlight some of the epistemological and methodological problems associated with working with groups of which one is not a member. To background the problems and illustrate the context of the research, I provided brief overviews of the theoretical framework and the methodological procedures used, and also an account of my own positioning within the research stories. The Kaupapa Mäori collaborative model has shown itself in this case to be extremely powerful in co-constructing stories, and in helping people connect self-identity, their personal lived experiences from a Mäori world view, and Western knowledge. I too am inscribed in those stories and it is clear to me that I have been very honoured and priviledged in being granted access to the processes. I thank my research colleagues for teaching me so much.

Tüngia te ururua Burn the overgrowth

kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke so the flax will develop new shoots

References.

Awatere, D. (1985). In search of identity. University of Auckland Winter Lectures: In Search of Identity, 77-83. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland Centre for Continuing Education.

Barlow, C. (1991). Tikanga Whakäro: Key Concepts in Mäori Culture. Auckland, N.Z: Oxford University Press.

Bhabha, H.K. (1996). The other question. In P. Mongia (ed.), Contemporary Postcolonial Theory. London: Arnold.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. New Zealand Journal of Education Studies, 29, **(1)**, 1-14.

Bishop, R. (1996). Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative Research Stories. Palmerston Noerth, N.Z: Dunmore Press.

Buck, P.H. (1949). The Coming of the Mäori. Wellington, New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). Power and Criticism: Poststuctural Investigations in Education. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Connelly, M. and Clandenin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative enquiry. Educational Researcher, June/July 1990, 2-14.

Drewery, W. and Winslade, J. (1997). The theoretical story of narrative therapy. In G. Monk, J. Winslade, K. Crocket and D. Epston (eds.), Narrative

Australian Association for Research in Education

Therapy in Practice: The Archeology of Hope. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Durie, M.H. (1994). Whaiora: Mäori Health Development. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the oppressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59, 297-324.

Evans, J. (1990). Defining a subject: The rise and rise of the new PE. British Journal of Sociology, 11, 155-169.

Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (1995). Reclaiming physical education in higher education through critical pedagogy.Quest, 47, **(1)**, 91-114.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. California: Sage publications.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings. New York: Pantheon.

Geertz, C. (1988). Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giroux, H. (1991). Postmodernism as border pedagogy. In H. Giroux (ed.), Postmodernism, Feminism and Cultural Politics. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Goldie, T. (1995). The representation of the indigene. In W. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (eds.), The Post-Colonial Studies Reader (1995). London: Routledge.

Goodson, I.F. (1990). Studying curriculum: Towards a social constructionist perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22, **(4)**, 299-312.

Gore, J. (1990). The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as "regimes of truth". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Americam Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1990.

Gramsci, A. (1977). Selections from Political Writings (1910-1920). New York: International Publishers.

Haig-Brown, C. (1992). Choosing border work. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 19, **(1)**, 96-115.

Hall, S. (1991). Ethnicity, identity and difference. Radical America, 3, 9-22.

Hall, S. (1996). Who needs identity? In S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds.), Questions of Cultural Identity. London: Sage.

Heshusius, L. (1994). Freeing ourselves from objectivity: Managing subjectivity or turning toward a participatory mode of consciousness? Educational Researcher, 23, **(3)**, 15-22.

hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics. Boston: South End.

Irwin, K. (1992a). Towards theories of Mäori feminisms. In R. Du Plessis (ed.), Feminist voices: Women's Studies Texts for Aotearoa / New Zealand. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irwin K. (1992b). Maori research methods and processes: An exploration and discussion. Paper presented at the joint New Zealand Association for Research in Education/ Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Geelong, Australia: November 1992.

Irwin K. (1994). Maori research methods and practices. Sites, 28, 25-43.

Katrak, K.H. (1989). Decolonizing culture: Toward a theory for post-colonial women's texts. In W. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (eds.), The Post-Colonial Studies Reader (1995). London: Routledge.

Kawharu, I.H. (1977). Mäori Land Tenure. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kearney, R. (1984). Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers: The Phenomenologic al Heritage. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kirk, D. (1990). Knowledge, science and the rise and rise of human movement studies. ACHPER National Journal, 127, 8-11.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting Smart: Feminist Research with/in the Postmodern. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1992). Post-Critical Pedagogies: A Feminist Reading. In C. Luke and J. Gore (eds.), Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy. New York: Routledge.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luke, C. (1998). Pedagogy and authority: Lessons from feminist and cultural studies, postmodernism and feminist pedagogy. In D. Buckingham (ed.), Teaching Popular Culture: Beyong Radical Pedagogy. London, UCL Press.

Lyotard, J. (1984). The Postmodern Conditions: A Report on Knowledge. *Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi.* Minnneapolis, Min: University of Minnesota Press.

Mackay, H. (1997). Generations: Baby-boomers, their Parents and their Children. Sydney: Macmillan.

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

Metge, J. (1990a). Te rito o te harakeke: Conceptions of the whänau. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 99,**(1),** p.55-92.

Metge, J. (1990b). Te Kohao o te Ngira. Culture and Learning: Education for a Multicultural Society. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Monk, G. (1997). How narrative therapy works. In G. Monk, J. Winslade, K. Crocket and D. Epston (eds.),Narrative Therapy in Practice: The Archeology of Hope. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ngata, A.T. (1940). Tribal Organization, in I.L.G. Sutherland (ed.), The Mäori People Today: A General Survey. Wellington, New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs (p. 155-181).

Olssen M (1993) In R. Bishop, Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga. New Zealand: Dunmore Press, 1996:15.

Pere, R.R. (1988). Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (ed.), Women and Education in Aotearoa. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen and Unwin.

Pere, R.R. (1994). Ako: Concepts of Learning in the Mäori Tradition. Monograph of the Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board. Wellington, New Zealand: National Library.

Pere, R.R. (1997). Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom (second edition). New Zealand: Ako Ako Global Learning Ltd.

Rangihau, J. (1975). Being Mäori. In M. King (ed.), Te Ao Hurihuri: The World Moves on. Wellington, NZ:

Rovegno, I. and Kirk, D. (1988). Articulations and silences in socially critical work on physical education: Toward a broader agenda. Quest, 47, 447-474.

Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. New York: Vintage.

Salter, D.G. (1998). Me ako ki ngä tikanga Mäori I te reo kori: Culture and learning through te reo kori.Journal of Physical Education New Zealand, 31, **(1)**, 18-21.

Shotter, J. (1993). Conversational Realities. London: Sage.

Shotter, J. and Gergen, K. (1995). Texts of Identity. London: Sage.

Sleman, S. (1994). The scramble for post-colonialism. In C. Tiffin and A. Lawson (eds.), De-scribing Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textuality. New York: Routledge.

Smart, B. (1986). The politics of truth and the problems of hegemony. In D.C. Hoy (ed.), Foucault: A Critical Reader. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide, 1998
Australian Association for Research in Education

Smith L.T. (1996). Kaupapa Mäori health research. Paper presented at Hui Whakapiripiri: Hui to discuss strategic directions for Maori health research proceedings. Hoani Waititi marae, Auckland 1996;14-30.

Sollors, W. (1986). Who is ethnic? In W. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (eds.), The Post-Colonial Studies Reader (1995). London: Routledge.

Sparkes, A.C. (1995). Writing people: Reflections on the dual crises of representation and legitimation in qualitative inquiry. Quest, 47, 158-195.

Sparkes, A.C. (1997). Ethnographic fiction and representing the absent other. Sport Education and Society, 2,**(1)**, 25-40.

Swartz, E. (1996). Emancipatory knowledge: A post-critical response to 'standard' school knowledge. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28, **(4)**, 397-418.

Van Maanen, (1988). Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Van Meijl, T. (1996). Historicising *Mäoritanga*: Colonial Ethnography and the Reification of Mäori Traditions. The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 105, (3), p. 311-346.

Vercoe, A. (1997). *He Taru Tawhiti:* Some Effects of Colonisation in Maori Reserach. Waikato Journal of Education, 3, p.41-54.

Walker, R.J. (1989). Mäori identity. In D.Novitz and W.Willmott (eds), Culture and Identity in New Zealand). Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.

Walker, R.J. (1996). Nga Pepa a Ranganui: The Walker Papers. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Weedon, C. (1987). Feminist Practice and Post-structuralist Theory. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.