

**School of Education**

**Investigating Factors that Influence Māori Boys as They Construct  
their Māori Identity**

**Joshua Hema**

This thesis is presented for the Degree of  
**Master of Philosophy**  
of  
**Curtin University**

**December 2020**

## **DECLARATION**

To the best of my knowledge and belief this thesis contains no material previously published by any other person except where due acknowledgment has been made.

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university.

Signature: .....

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020

## ABSTRACT

Māori identity is determined by whakapapa (genealogy) and self-identification, and is strengthened by classical markers of Māori identity that include, but are not limited to: knowledge of whakapapa (genealogy); tūrangawaewae (connections to ancestral land); te reo Māori (Māori language); and participation in various cultural activities. Identity construction is multifaceted and influenced by historical and societal factors. For Māori these include the on-going process of colonisation and marginalisation from mainstream New Zealand society. For many Māori today, identity construction can be a site of struggle. As the New Zealand census indicates, a significant number of Māori chose not to self-identify as Māori.

It is argued that a secure Māori identity is necessary to overcome various negative statistics that disproportionately impact on Maori. First, this study focused on identifying factors that influenced Māori boys, both positively and negatively, as they attempted to construct a Māori identity. Second, the study explored the way that Māori identity is generally conceived, including in essentialist terms based on the classical markers of Māori identity. Finally, it explored the salience of traditional or classical markers of Māori identity to Māori identity construction.

The study used Kaupapa Māori theory and practices combined with the qualitative research approach interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). Kaupapa Māori framed the research, identified the problem to be investigated, and highlighted the research lens and bias. Kaupapa Māori practices incorporating tikanga (cultural practices) ensured the research was carried out in a culturally appropriate and ethical way. Interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) provided the methods of data collection, primarily using semi-structured interviews, and arranging and analysing the data.

The semi-structured interviews were used to gather information by listening to the views of 12 Māori boys from one New Zealand all boys' high school. The participants were purposively selected; half of the boys were enrolled in the school's Māori unit and the other half in the school's mainstream. The participant selection criteria was changed after the 6<sup>th</sup> participant revealed that his Māori identity was

influenced by his fair skin and not looking ‘typically’ Māori. Based on this new information, five of the remaining six participants were selected and interviewed because they also did not look ‘typically’ Māori.

Data analysis involved placing the participants’ words in tables and analysing the data case-by-case to determine themes emerging from the data. A feelings scale was created to explore the participants’ feelings about the themes. The feelings scale enabled delineation between themes to determine which themes were most significant and influential to the participants and their Māori identity. Initially each participant was analysed as an individual case, and then cases were converged to conduct a cross-case analysis to determine the themes that were significant to the group overall.

The results of the study indicated that various factors, both positive and negative, influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. Factors that had a positive influence included: the influence of Māori grandparents; whānau (extended family); and upbringing. Factors that had a negative influence included: negative stereotyping of Māori; and, being excluded by other Māori. This study also found qualitative evidence about the positive affect that some classical markers of Māori identity can have on Māori identity, particularly, te reo Māori (the Māori language) and kapa haka (Māori dance).

The findings of this study have various implications for education in New Zealand schools and policy developers. This study has identified ways that schools can support Māori boys (and potentially other sub-groups of Māori such as girls) as they attempt to construct a Māori identity. This study also highlighted the need to mitigate and eliminate negative factors that influence Māori students and their Māori identity from New Zealand schools and wider New Zealand society generally.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Tuatahi – ngā mihi nunui ki ngā iwi taketake o te whēnua moemoeā. Kei a koutou te mana o te whēnua, tēnā koutou. Tuarua - ki te hunga mate kua wehe ki te pō, ko tōku Nanny – Madge Hema - e ārahi tonu ana i a mātou te whānau, haere atu Nan, haere atu rā koutou katoa – hei whetū ki te rangi. Rātou te hunga mate ki a rātou, tātou te hunga ora ki a tātou. Ngā mihi maioha ki a koutou katoa i tautoko mai i āwhina mai i ahau kia oti pai ai tēnei mahi whakahirahira. Tēnā rā koutou katoa.

First, I would like to begin my acknowledgements by greeting the indigenous people of Australia, ngā mihi nui, tēnā koutou katoa. Second, I acknowledge the contribution of an Australian Government Research Training Programme Scholarship in supporting this research.

I would like to begin my personal acknowledgements by thanking my supervisors Dr Jill Aldridge from Curtin University, and Dr Craig Rofe from Victoria University of Wellington. Dr Jill, you supported me from start to end, and through many challenges both course related and personal. This has been an immense journey, which has been both very rewarding and very difficult. When I began this course I didn't have the academic skills to sail through, and consequently it was a slog at every step. However, your belief that I could do it and your quiet reassurances gave me the confidence to do this course in the first instance, and to keep going when things got tough. I am very grateful for the many hours it must have taken you to read and decipher my work, which was from a different cultural perspective outside your own life experiences and subject specialty. Your input and feedback was insightful and crucial to the completion of this study. I remain in awe of your academic rigor, ability and excellence. Ngā mihi nui e te rangatira.

To Dr Craig Rofe, my secondary supervisor, thank you for reviewing my study and providing feedback from a Kaupapa Māori perspective. I have always trusted your advice and feedback informed by your real life experiences working ‘grassroots’ with Kaupapa Māori – as opposed to Kaupapa Māori from a solely theoretical perspective. E hoa, I also appreciate your wise counsel and continued friendship. Ngā mihi nui ki a koe taku hoa pūmau.

I would like to acknowledge and thank people at the school where this research was conducted. I have not used names in order to protect confidentiality, but people at the school who assisted with this study will know who they are. I would like to acknowledge the Principal of the school for his encouragement, and willingness to support this study, its findings, and his desire to find solutions to issues found from this study. I would like to say that although this study revealed some negative things that occurred at the school, particularly negative stereotyping of Māori, the participants felt that this issue came from other students and their homes, as opposed to the school itself or any particular teachers. My overall feeling based on my observations and feedback from the participants was that the school was a very good school, with teachers open to doing more to support Māori students.

I thank the Māori Deputy Principal and the teacher responsible for Māori achievement, who acted as primary gatekeepers and helped me to locate participants who had important things to say about their Māori identity. I would also like to thank the DP for his general support and healthy discussions about kaupapa Māori in the school. These discussions reminded me of the importance of studies such as this, and therefore helped motivate this study along.

I would like to thank the teachers of the Māori unit for their support while I not only conducted my research but also worked at the school as a relief teacher. The Māori unit was like my second home in the school, and I felt cared for and sheltered there. Finally, I would like to thank the participants who shared their voice in the hope that it would make a difference to other Māori students. Ngā mihi nui ki a koutou katoa.

This study wasn't without considerable sacrifices, but by embarking on this Master's study I have achieved what I set out to achieve, and that was to teach myself how to read and write, to learn more about and be able to engage with issues to do with Māori existentialism. Consequently, because of everything I have learned while doing this course, I believe I am more able to contribute positively to issues of concern to Māori. Therefore, despite the considerable sacrifices and challenges I encountered while doing this study, it has been thoroughly worthwhile to me personally. However, my biggest hope is that this study makes some contribution to

Kaupapa Māori research and to theorising about Māori identity in ways that are positive and inclusive.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
List of Tables .....	x
Glossary .....	xi
Prologue .....	xiii
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
1.1    Introduction .....	1
1.2    Context of this Study.....	4
1.3    Conceptual Framework / research paradigm.....	16
1.4    Research Objectives .....	31
1.5    Significance of the Study .....	32
1.6    Overview of the Thesis .....	33
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	35
2.1    Introduction .....	35
2.2    Introduction to identity and definition of identity.....	35
2.3    Western approaches to identity .....	37
2.4    Pre-European identities in New Zealand.....	44
2.5    The word Māori.....	46
2.6    Previous research on Māori identity.....	48
2.7    Typologies and measures of Māori identity: Hall, Durie, McIntosh, and Te Hoe Nuku Roa.....	55
2.8    Problematising Māori Identity .....	61
2.9    Chapter Summary.....	64
Chapter 3 Research Methods .....	66
3.1    Introduction .....	66
3.2    Research Questions .....	66
3.3    Research Design: Kaupapa Māori and Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis.....	67
3.4    Selection of Research Site, Sample and Participants .....	76

3.5	Data Collection.....	88
3.6	Data Analysis .....	93
3.7	Ensuring Trustworthiness.....	100
3.8	Ethical Considerations .....	103
3.9	Chapter Summary.....	107
	Chapter 4 Results .....	108
4.1	Introduction .....	108
4.2	The feelings of Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity ...	109
4.3	Investigating the factors that influence Māori boys as they construct their Māori identity.....	125
4.4	Examining the classical markers of Māori identity and their influence on Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity. ....	132
4.5	Chapter Conclusion .....	139
	Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusions .....	141
5.1	Introduction .....	141
5.2	Summary and discussion of major findings .....	141
5.3	Limitations of the Research .....	154
5.4	Summary of Recommendations .....	158
5.5	Significance .....	160
5.6	Concluding Remarks .....	162
	References .....	164
	Appendix 1 .....	177
	Appendix 2 .....	186
	Appendix 3 .....	189
	Appendix 4 .....	197
	Appendix 5 .....	200
	Appendix 6 .....	203
	Appendix 7 .....	205
	Appendix 8 .....	208
	Appendix 9 .....	227

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.1 Summary of Metaphysical Locations of Critical Theory, Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori .....	29
Table 3.1 ‘The School’: 2016 Attainment in National Certificate in Education Achievement (NCEA) .....	82
Table 3.2 Feelings Scale .....	91
Table 3.3 Cross Case Analysis: Table of Themes for all Participants.....	100
Table 4.1 Factors that influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction – and the average scores from the Feelings Scale .....	108

## GLOSSARY

The definitions in this glossary were verified with the online Māori dictionary located at <http://maoridictionary.co.nz>

<b>Aotearoa</b>	New Zealand
<b>aroha</b>	love
<b>awa</b>	river
<b>haka</b>	to dance, perform the haka
<b>haka pōwhiri</b>	specific dance during welcome ceremony
<b>hapū</b>	sub-tribe
<b>hori</b>	derogatory term used to describe a stereotypical Māori (and or traits that are considered by some to be stereotypically Māori)
<b>hui</b>	meeting
<b>iwi</b>	tribe
<b>kai</b>	food
<b>karakia</b>	incantation, ritual chant, or prayer
<b>kapa haka</b>	Māori performing arts
<b>kaumātua</b>	elders
<b>kaupapa</b>	topic, matter of discussion
<b>Kaupapa Māori</b>	Māori approach, Māori topic, Māori customary practice, Māori institution, Māori agenda, Māori principles, Māori ideology - a philosophical doctrine, incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society.
<b>kauta</b>	area for cooking
<b>kia ora</b>	literally ‘be well’, hello, thank you
<b>koha</b>	gift
<b>Kōhanga Reo</b>	Māori language pre-school
<b>kōrero</b>	to tell, say, speak
<b>koroua</b>	old man, grandfather
<b>kotahitanga</b>	unity
<b>kuia</b>	old woman, grandmother
<b>mana</b>	prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma
<b>manaakitanga</b>	hospitality, kindness, generosity, support - the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others.
<b>māori</b>	normal, usual, natural, common, ordinary
<b>mau rakau</b>	martial art using wooden staff
<b>marae</b>	customary village centre
<b>marae atea</b>	courtyard where formal speeches take place
<b>mātauranga</b>	knowledge
<b>maunga</b>	mountain
<b>mana</b>	power, authority
<b>manaaki</b>	to support, take care of
<b>manaakitanga</b>	to be welcoming and show hospitality
<b>mihi</b>	greetings

<b>mihimihi</b>	greetings
<b>noa</b>	normal, neutral, non-sacred
<b>pā</b>	fortified village
<b>Pākehā</b>	New Zealander of European descent
<b>pepeha</b>	tribal saying that is used to explain descent and where someone is from
<b>pēpi</b>	baby
<b>pōwhiri</b>	welcome ceremony
<b>pūrakau</b>	myth, ancient legend, story, cultural narrative
<b>Rangiātea</b>	the physical and spiritual homeland located in Hawaiki
<b>reo-a-iwi</b>	tribal dialect
<b>rāranga</b>	weaving
<b>rūnanga</b>	tribal board
<b>taiaha</b>	long wooden weapon
<b>taiapa</b>	fence
<b>tangata</b>	person/people
<b>tangata whenua</b>	people of the land, indigenous people
<b>tangi</b>	to cry or funeral
<b>tangihanga</b>	funeral
<b>tapu</b>	sacred, prohibited, restricted
<b>Te ao Māori</b>	the Māori world
<b>Te Reo Māori</b>	the Māori language
<b>tika</b>	right or correct
<b>tikanga</b>	correct procedure, cultural protocols
<b>tino rangatiratanga</b>	sovereignty
<b>tipuna</b>	ancestors
<b>tūrangawaewae</b>	place to stand
<b>urupā</b>	cemetery
<b>utu</b>	reciprocity
<b>waiata</b>	song
<b>waiata tautoko</b>	supporting song usually done to support a formal speech during a pōwhiri
<b>waka</b>	canoe, vehicle, ocean vessel used by Māori ancestors in migration to New Zealand.
<b>wāhi tapu</b>	sacred sites
<b>waka ama</b>	outrigger canoe
<b>whakairo</b>	carving
<b>whakamā</b>	shy
<b>whakamana</b>	to honour, to uplift
<b>whakapapa</b>	genealogy
<b>whakataukī</b>	proverb
<b>whānau</b>	family
<b>whanaungatanga</b>	relations
<b>whakawhanaungatanga</b>	to make family type relationships
<b>whare</b>	house
<b>wharekai</b>	house for cooking and eating
<b>wharenui</b>	carved meeting house

## **Prologue**

# **SELF-REFLEXIVE PRESENTATION: THE BASIS OF MY THEORETICAL/ RESEARCH LENS**

### **Preface to narrative**

The narrative below is drawn from a journal article written by me, the researcher, entitled “*The Whitest of Nan’s Mokos*<sup>1</sup>”. The narrative, included as a self-reflexive presentation provides insights into the basis of my research and theoretical lens. The inclusion of this self-reflexive presentation is important, given that, not only is this study concerned with the participants’ feelings, interpretations and constructions, but also is concerned with my interpretations of the participant’s constructions. It is important, therefore, to provide insight into my feelings and how I have experienced this phenomenon.

The words of Fanon<sup>2</sup> resonate with me. Fanon’s explanations of the colonial experience, and the conflict caused for colonised people, both internally and externally, can be applied equally to the New Zealand/Māori context. To give emphasis to my experience, and to portray how I felt growing up in New Zealand, I have used Fanon’s words as quotations and *written in italics*.

Quotes that are not in italics represent my language (mostly), the language that I inherited and acquired, and was exposed to in my childhood. The language that a person has and uses says something about their world, and the constructions they make. These quotes are intended to reveal something about the extent of my world, and the world I grew up in, – informative in terms of who I am now. Some of the language is explicit, reflecting the world that I come from.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hema, J. (2021). The whitest of Nan’s mokos. In K. Piahana-Wond, & S. Su (Eds.), *Ora Nui 4*. Auckland, New Zealand. Ora Nui Press & B. K. Agency

<sup>2</sup> Frantz Fanon (1925-1961) was a Black political philosopher from the French West Indian colony Martinique. His work has been influential to post-colonial studies, critical theory, and the study of race, racism and the psychological effects of colonisation.

## Narrative: The Whitest of Nan's Mokos

*Without a (Māori) past, without a (Māori) future, it was impossible for me to live my (Māoriness<sup>3</sup>). Not yet white, no longer wholly (a Māori), I was damned. (Frantz Fanon: from “Black Skin White Masks”)*

### Part 1

In my Professional Studies class at teacher’s college, in 2002, there were two Māori students, myself and one other. Near the end of the course, our tutor signalled us out, and told the class, “these two will have it the hardest....all of the Māori problems, and all of the problem Māori children, will be their problems”. Our tutor meant that sympathetically, and somehow at the same time, encouragingly. Earlier in the year, she asked us to tell the class about our upbringing, to highlight that we *were* different – a fact she believed our Pākehā counterparts were not aware of.

In my first job in a New Zealand high school, I became the Kaitiaki or guardian of Māori students. This affirmed what my teachers’ college tutor thought – that all the Māori problems would become my problems. The role of Kaitiaki (as it was conceived by some well-intentioned person), was to deal with the particular problem of Māori achievement, but put more accurately, Māori under-achievement. Learning to assert my agentic self, and my rights to self-determination, I began affirming my own definitions. I decided that my role, as Kaitiaki, was more about the care and wellbeing of Māori students.

The Deputy Principal to whom I reported to was supportive, but she also had to “deal with me”, and try to understand the basis of my assertions that us Māori shouldn’t have to always conform to the school; couldn’t the school conform to us sometimes, even just a little? Couldn’t teachers at least say our names properly? The Deputy Principal was generally receptive and did her best to get “the Māori thing”. One day, my Deputy Principal said something that really struck me. She said that I was

---

<sup>3</sup> Māori in parenthesis replaces black.

“complicated”. At first, I was taken aback, but really I can’t disagree. I am complicated. It is necessary that I at least try to explain my complication(s).

I was born Joshua Karl Browne, 1975, in Wairoa. My father is a Pākehā (family name Browne), and my mother a Māori (family name Hema). “*Injected with bastardy*”, my complications probably start here. My parents divorced when I was 7, and both left town, my father to Australia, and my mother to Wellington. My sister and I stayed behind. Initially I lived at my Pākehā grandparents’ (henceforth Nanna Browne’s), and my sister with my Māori grandparents (The Hema’s). I went between the two households “*2 poles of a world....2 poles in perpetual conflict.*”

Between the ages of 7 and 12 years, when I lived in Wairoa, and while going between family members, I was not fully aware of the things that made me Māori. “Real” or brown skinned Māori, like the rest of my Māori family, were “*over-determined from without.*” Being very white looking, I was (and am) “*overdetermined from the inside*”, where the Pākehā world has injected me with “*extremely dangerous foreign bodies*”, as you shall see.

One day, around the dining table at Nanna Browne’s, I recall, my grandfather announcing, and rejoicing in his calculation that I was, apparently in fact, only 1/8<sup>th</sup> Māori, not even a “quarter-caste!” Despite this, I was usually referred to as “a Māori”, or, “the Māori”. One day I was hiding (as Māoris do), and overheard my grandparents talking. My grandfather was telling Nanna Browne how well I had played rugby that day, even better than Allister. I remember feeling very happy about that first bit. But! Nanna Browne was astounded! How could I possibly be better than Allister? Because in her exact words....“but he’s a Māori”.

One day we were on “the veranda”, we had visitors - family from out of town. Jeremy (a cousin of the same age) was getting rowdy, and seeking too much attention. An adult suggested Jeremy should go to the town baths. Jeremy exclaimed that he didn’t want to go to the town baths because, “there are too many Māoris there.” Applause of laughter. “*I slip into corners, and my long antennae pick up the catch phrases strewn over the surface of things....I remain silent.*” Uncle Stu,

interjected, “you better be careful Jem”, he warned, “Joshie will give you a hiding.”  
“*I strive for anonymity, for invisibility*”, “*I slip into corners.*”

One day my mother visited from Wellington and explained she was moving back, and that we would be living with her in Nuhaka. Whaaat! My grandfather, enraged, fisted the table and yelled, “I will not have my grandchildren travelling on a bus with Māoris!” Oh, so I’m not a Māori then?

My mother never did move back... At Nanna Browne’s, we sat at the table, properly.

From then on..... I lived at the Hema’s.

I can’t really explain why I have more affinity to my Māori side, “*I turn away from these inspectors of the Ark before the Flood*”, or even why I would ever want to choose to be a Māori given the “*existential deviation*” and the “*metaphysical misery*”. Life at the Hema’s was hard, the differences stark. At the Hema’s, our house was small, bedrooms were full, and beds spilled out on to the living room floor. We bathed on Sundays (only) when Poppy lit the fire and boiled the water. Being the youngest, I was last, tenth, into the luke-warm water.

Food, and the eating of it, was different. At the Hema’s we rejoiced, clambered over, and got excited about food. We all helped Nan with the cooking and the “clear up”. If we asked Nan, what’s for tea? She’d say, “shit on toast!” If we complained we got a “clip around the ears”. We could eat with our fingers, pick up bones, and suck out the ngoro (bone-marrow). We could have more, “as long as we ate it all”.

At the Hema’s, we could “stay up late” (or so Nanna Browne thought), play card games, and gamble. The language we used exposed the limits of our world. We could say things like, “Uncle Pep’s done a big shit, and it’s clogged up the shit hole”... “*to make him talk pidgin is to fasten him to the effigy of him*”. People would laugh. We fought hard and fought all the time. I never heard Nan and Pop speak though - to each other. Nan yelled, and screamed, and ordered; Pop grumbled and mostly ran away. We could steal from the shop (although I never did) because “the bloody Pākehā” had stolen from us.

Everyone's photo was on the wall. There were a few I didn't know; Uncle so-and-so didn't come back from Vietnam. Uncle so-and-so (we think) is somewhere in Australia. Uncle so-and-so has gone away, "bloooody iiiidiot's in jail, agaaaiin, clooowwn!"

At some point I realised there was more than one photo of me on the wall – and Nan favoured me. I knew for sure my aunties pitied me, and were "pissed off" with my mother for "buggering off". Nan couldn't understand why she'd left, "ungrateful bitch", my father had "bought her a washing machine".

Nan would take all the photos down when someone died. She showed me things – spiritual things, signs when someone died, moving things, a kind of astral travel, mākutu - curses. Her grandfather, Haora Ngarangimataeo, was a tōhunga - a kind of Māori priest or spiritual chief. I was the whitest of all her children, Nan would say, "but the most Māori". Not sure how.

Nan's other grandfather, Haenga Paretipua, was a chief of Wairoa. Another ancestor owned the whole of the lake (Waikaremoana), and the area that is now the golf course, which the "bloody Pākehā stole", and they are still "stealing our whitebait", "bleeming huas". I sometimes went with Nan to land meetings. We went to the marae (ancestral house), directly to the wharekai (non-ceremonial eating house), where it seemed people hovered around like ghosts, and spoke in whispers about land, and what they thought they owned.

Once, when Nan was a Māori warden, she jumped in and stopped a gang fight. Another time, when Uncle Moot came home in a patch<sup>4</sup>, Nan took it off him, and burnt it, *in front of him*. I figured you didn't mess with Uncle Moot – he'd been away a few times. You definitely didn't mess with Nan. A lady did once, with a knife, and came off second best. But Uncle Moot was kind enough to me. One day I was fighting with Jamie and he broke us up and said, "stop fucking fighting". Another day, in front of all of the mobsters<sup>5</sup>, he bought me an ice cream. I licked that ice cream and "the bugger" fell off. Uncle Moot cracked up, went back in, and came out

---

<sup>4</sup> Gang regalia

<sup>5</sup> Gang members

with another, *in front of the mobsters*. But one time at a party, a mobster<sup>6</sup> took Uncle Dove's leather jacket, and Uncle Moot just stood by and watched.

One day I went to the courthouse with my favourite uncle, Uncle Dove. Uncle Dove had stolen a car – and got caught, “egg”. We took a crow bar to the courthouse, just in case we got jumped. Uncle Dove had smashed up a mobster for smashing up the stereo at a party. All the mobsters would be at the courthouse that day. And apparently, “mobsters don’t forget”.

One of my classmates was laid on the train tracks by the mobsters for “ticking up” but not paying up. He ended up with one leg, but even still he joined the mob<sup>7</sup>. Another mate, Albert Brown, the best rugby player in town, was with the Black Power<sup>8</sup> by age 12. He started scrapping with Leroy Grant, who was with the mob. We were all best friends once. My other mate Reg from down the road is in the mob. When we were four years old he stole my marbles – but he probably just won them from me. My father went down and got them back. I saw Reg at Nan’s tangi (funeral), I hadn’t seen him in 20 years. He gave me the Māori hello – slow raise of the head and slight lift of the eyebrows. I wondered if he wondered about marbles.

There is a saying from where I come from... “Wairoa – Frasertown. Cousins killing cousins.” Lucky I left when I was 12.

To Australia.

## Part 2

Australia was by no means an awakening. My best mate Timmy was an Aboriginal, and we both liked Bob Marley equally as much. White Australian kids liked Kylie Minogue. Now, doesn’t that say something? Timmy and his family, they knew what it was like, without ever talking about it. Timmy’s uncle had died in prison. I hear Aboriginals have it worse than us Māori. I couldn’t really say, but probably, because I’ve never heard of a Māori getting bashed to death in prison by the police, not lately

---

<sup>6</sup> Gang member

<sup>7</sup> Mob – short for Mongrel Mob – the main gang in my home town, Wairoa

<sup>8</sup> Black Power – gang based in Frasertown - a small town outside of Wairoa

anyway. Not since maybe Te Kooti (1868) and some of my people were jailed on Wharekauri (without trail), or Rua Kenana (1916) and his people who were shot up by the police at Maungapohatu. The New Zealand police pointed their guns at the whole of Tuhoe (a tribe) just a few years back (2007) – they just didn’t pull the triggers, “baldheads, pig shits!”

For me, Australia was some sort of sanctuary, a place where no one knew that I was Māori. It can be helpful being white. In Australia, the confusion was masked and hidden, mostly by my age and ignorance – although I could still feel the pain, deeply. I drank and smoked far too young and was way too violent. But I survived, and even finished school –the first on my Māori side to do so. When I came back to New Zealand at 17, apparently I could speak English. So, I suppose, thanks Australia.

I didn’t go home to Wairoa, but to the city, Wellington. My mother lived there, but I couldn’t stay with her – she was with yet another Pākehā man. How many was that now? Not that I cared. Fanon, tell me again why black women want white men? Was it something about an “*inferiority complex*”, or a “*wish to be white?*” Perhaps if you can’t be one, appropriating by screwing one comes close. Here’s one better, how about having a half-caste child, or what was I again, “not even a quarter caste”. Mother, what were you trying to do, be white through me? Actually I take some of that back, Nan accepted me.

I lived at a university hall. Victoria University had a marae! (Māori community area). Wow, now isn’t that choice! A place for me? Hmm, nah, not really. I was studying maths and physics, so I’m not sure why I took Māori language. Nan and Pop Hema were native speakers. Nan would sometimes watch Te Kārere, the Māori news on television, and rarely you might catch Pop hiding in the backyard speaking Māori to a mate. But everyone knows this story...

*...White society has smashed his old world without giving him a new one. It has destroyed the traditional tribal foundations of his existence and it blocks the road of the future after having closed the road of the past... (Fanon, 1952, p. 156)*

Apparently, one time, my mother visited from the city, saw Pop, and said, “kia ora” (hello) – Pop cried. He told my mother about the beatings at school for speaking Māori. When I heard this, I couldn’t believe it. Not about the beatings, but rather that he had cried. Pop, even at 70, had huge biceps, and was called Lofty for good reason. The original Lofty was a champion wrestler, and Pop like Lofty, could handle himself, and other people. Pop didn’t seem to care when Nan gave him grief, although I knew he did.

So, as it was, I didn’t know a lick of Māori, and was doing Māori 101.

I hated Victoria University and the marae there. Supposedly I did learn something though. I learned about the things that should make me Māori. I should be able to sing (I was stuffed from here), haka (dance), play guitar, play rugby, speak Māori, speak on the marae, handle my booze, and damn, look brown.

I was at the university pub in my first year, still 4 years underage. I saw a Māori in the toilet and said, “Bro, got any dope?” He looked down at me, like he was looking down on me, and said slowly, deliberately, “I’m not your bro”. *“I attach myself to my brothers..... to my horror, they too reject me”*. I wish I could fight like the rest of my Māori family – I would’ve punched that arsehole in the face.

I’m not sure where my salvation came – or if it ever has. I like women, but I loved watching my history lecturer Jamie Belich strut (back in Wairoa, I once stood between a homophobe, his butcher knife, and a gay man). I had a history lecturer who openly derided Belich. Belich was a “wog” (I learned this word in Australia) or something, which must’ve made him sympathetic. He told a different story, as he strutted around. He told us that Māori resisted, and resisted superbly well, won (but ultimately lost), and that at times we were ingenious. Titokowaru<sup>9</sup> proclaimed, “I Shall Not Die”, until his people ditched him, right before the final victory, for perhaps being a paedophile, a faggot, or maybe sleeping with another chief’s wife. Who knows? Jamie! Did you ever ask Titokowaru’s people? Not that they’d ever tell you – and not that I hold it against you - for being a sympathetic Pākehā. Make

---

<sup>9</sup> Titokowaru led mostly successful war campaigns against colonial troops between 1868-1869 and is considered one of the most successful opponents of British colonisation anywhere.

up all the history you want, if you want to, – that's what Pākehās do anyway – to keep New Zealand's “*mythology intact*”. Jamie, stuff it – keep strutting!

Perhaps Titokowaru was just a savage Māori after all....

Despite my formal education's shortcomings, there had been some peripheral learning. I read Ranginui, the distinguished gentlemanly Māori scholar, who seemed way too gentle to be so radical. His book told us about our struggles, and that it was a struggle without end. Moana Jackson, the intelligent intellectual, told us about the treaty, tino-rangatiratanga, and our sovereign rights, that we NEVER ceded. Moana told us that we Māori had marched and occupied ever since Te Whiti<sup>10</sup>. I thought, damn! How about we blow some shit up? I met people, and lived with Bruce Stewart, the freedom fighter, who built his own urban marae. I wondered if Bruce ever got his freedom, before he died. I met Eva Rickard, the activist, at Bruce's. I kissed her on the cheek, as I thought was acceptable. She pierced me sternly; “What's wrong with my nose?” she said. “*From the opposite end of the white world a magical (Māori) culture was hailing me.*” I learned to hongi (rub-noses).

“*Unable to assimilate he associates with the dead*”. There is an idea in Māori that we move backwards into the future, confidently presumably, by (learning about and) looking back at the past. I experience this more like a spinning, like trying to catch something while off-balance. When I look back, or rather stumble off balance backwards (or was it forward), I learn about death, then fall forward, more death, and my own, shedding of white skin – a death, that is coming. Is it time to take the photos down? In 1865, my people were murdered at Omaruhakeke. A year later, the New Zealand government confiscated, but a better word is stole, our land, despite most of my people being loyalists, but more accurately materialists. I have been learning, but now I'm frozen, .....and I still can't sing.

And, I'm not even started. There is so much more to tell you, for you to know what it is like, frozen, cold, spinning backward, falling forward, nauseous, spewing, vomiting things I'm told, but just don't feel. But I'm just too tired, and tired of it, to

---

<sup>10</sup> Te Whiti o Rongomai led a passive resistance movement at Parihaka against the New Zealand government's stealing of land. Te Whiti was arrested without trial and jailed for 2 years.

talk about it any longer, to confront it and struggle with it any further; the contradiction that exists in New Zealand society, Māori this and Māori that.

In a “*society that makes his inferiority complex possible*”, a place that “*brings about the emergence of a mass of illusions and misunderstandings*. ” In New Zealand, it’s like this. When in, say a park, speaking Māori to my kids, “staunch” Māori accept me. Most Māori shy away, almost frightened, hide away from me. Good-natured Pākehā morons (a higher percentage than you might think), curious, may hypothesise something like, “oh, they’re from Spain, speaking Spanish”, until they gain the courage to ask, and I tell. Now confused and no longer curious they slip away, not into corners, but into spaces they dominate, just not mine, clearly. In a professional context, like a school (you might think), when I speak Māori, and I do, and I will....I know... “ka mate ka mate.....it’s death, it’s death”

.....that I will probably never have an authentic conversation with a Pākehā in that context, ever again. This is how it is. “*To state reality is a wearing task*”, and I feel the weight of New Zealand bearing down on me. I’m tired, dying of tiredness, from being Māori – but I can be thankful, for being white – at least security doesn’t follow me around the supermarket, right?

“Ka ora ka ora.....it’s life, it’s life”

... but what kinda life is this?

## **Chapter 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

This thesis reports a study that investigated the factors that influenced the Māori identity construction of 12 Māori boys at one New Zealand all boys' high school. The concept of 'identity' is well documented in Western research, but there is limited research by Māori about Māori identity. Much of what we (Māori) know about Māori identity comes from the life experiences of kaumātua (elders), including cultural experts and writers such as, John Rangihau, Rose Pere, Ranginui Walker, Tīmoti Kāretu, and Apirana Ngata (to name a few). However, the life experiences of kaumātua are from a different time and context to most Māori today. Subsequently, the way we conceive Māori identity and strive to construct a Māori identity can be inauthentic for some Māori. This causes what Fanon (1952) alludes to as a dilemma of authenticity, which can contribute to identity crisis.

New Zealand census data (described further below) indicates that Māori have specific challenges regarding identity choices, and the census highlights that some Māori choose not to self-identify as Māori. Toon van Meijl (2006, p. 928) suggests that self-identifying as Māori can be a "fragmenting" experience, claiming that some Māori have "to internalise a public discourse of culture ... not considered a part of their self". Taonui (2017, n.p), discussing Māori identity in relation to Māori youth suicide, describes Māori youth as "compressed... between a past they do not understand, [and] a present that does not understand them". As Pihama (2010, p. 7) notes, identity is a "site of struggle" for many Māori.

The struggle that some Māori have with identity is exacerbated by the dominant regime in New Zealand that marginalises Māori. Māori are over-represented in various negative national statistics. For example, Māori make up approximately 15% of New Zealand's population but make up 51% of the prison population (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Māori make up 27% of the unemployed, 29% of those in severe housing deprivation, and 61% of children taken into state care (Statistics New

Zealand, 2013). Māori youth are three times more likely to be arrested, convicted and jailed than Pākehā (non-Māori, typically of British descent). The Māori youth suicide rate is double that of non-Māori (Taonui, 2017). In education, far more Māori leave school without formal qualifications than non-Māori (Pihamo, Cram, & Walker, 2002; Bishop, 2012; Ross, 2020). Māori inequality and the conditions that many Māori experience remains alarming.

A solution frequently advocated to address Māori inequality and the ‘existential deviation’ that some Māori experience is the reclamation of Māori culture and the affirmation of Māori identity (Houkamau, 2006; Houkamau & Sibley, 2011; Hokowhitu, 2010; Cooper, 2012). And yet, as Linda Smith (2015, p. 49) explains, Māori identity is complex and “has psychological and political meanings for individual Maori, often positioning them in an insider/outsider quandary or state of confusion”. Also, there appears to be uncertainty about aspects that should make up Māori identity because many Māori have been displaced from traditional markers of Māori identity that were established through whakapapa (genealogy), kin groups and connection to land. As a result the relevance of traditional markers of Māori identity and Māori culture are not the same for all Māori (Durie, 1995, 1999; Houkamau, 2010; Giorgio & Houkamau, 2021). This seems to have caused confusion and uncertainty about who should be considered Māori.

This uncertainty around Māori identity was highlighted in Ian Pool’s (1963) progressive article - “When is a Maori a Maori?”<sup>11</sup> (Kukutai, 2011). Underlining the need for a better definition of Māori in the census, Pool (1963) highlighted problems with the then contemporary definition of Māori based on blood quantum and degree of Māori blood. He insisted ‘Māori’ should not be determined by “some biological trait that is impossible to measure accurately” and advocated for a definition based on self-determination and by an individual's affinity to cultural group (Pool, 1963, p. 210). According to Pool, a new definition should be based on “the personal belief

---

<sup>11</sup> In 1963 Pool spelled the word ‘Maori’ without a macron, which was the norm at the time. Conventions regarding the spelling of Māori words has changed over time and today māori is spelled with a macron over the ‘a’ to indicate a long ‘a’ vowel sound. Also, in this thesis, when māori is used as a common noun it is not capitalised. When it is used as a proper noun to describe Māori people it is capitalised.

that one is a Maori” (Pool, 1963, p. 209). To date, it seems unclear for some Māori, when, how, and under what conditions a person can believe that he or she is Māori.

Contributing to the uncertainty about Māori identity, successive New Zealand governments have struggled to define Māori. By the 1960s there were at least 10 statutory definitions (Robson & Reid, 2001). From the first census in which Māori were included, in 1857, up until 1981, Māori were defined as people with half or more of Māori blood, and ‘half-castes’ living as Māori (Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Robson & Reid, 2001). Biological based definitions were problematic nonetheless because many Māori “overstated their degree of Māori blood” (Robson & Reid, 2001, p. 10); and because race-based definitions do not relate to Māori self-concepts and how Māori view themselves (Kukutai, 2011). Eventually, heeding the suggestions of Pool, the census definition of Māori was expanded in 1981 to include ancestry and self-identification with ethnic group (Gillion, Cormack & Borell, 2019). However, because these measures are not the same, in 2013, 668,724 said they had Māori ancestry, while 598,605 said they were Māori based on ethnic identity - a discrepancy of 70,000 (Borell, 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Statistics New Zealand, 2013; Giorgio & Houkamau, 2021).

The impetus for the present study was borne out of the uncertainty about Māori identity, and the need to find out more about the factors that influence, support or inhibit, Māori people as they attempt to construct a Māori identity. As Māori perspectives continue to be under-represented in research, this study sought to learn about Māori identity from Māori and used the research framework Kaupapa Māori to achieve this aim. Kaupapa Māori privileges Māori knowledge and uses tikanga (cultural practices) to carry out research in a culturally appropriate and ethical way. This study used Kaupapa Māori to give a voice to the participants in a bid to gather information and to increase understanding about Māori identity.

This chapter introduces the study and is organised under the following subheadings:

- Context of this Study (Section 1.2)
- Conceptual Framework / Research paradigm (Section 1.3)
- Research Objectives (Section 1.4)

- Significance of this Study (Section 1.5)
- Overview of this Thesis (Section 1.6)

## **1.2      Context of this Study**

This section provides a broader context to this study by describing some of the factors that contribute to Māori identity and the way it is generally conceived today. This includes a description of factors that contribute uncertainty about Māori identity and in some cases unclarity about who should be considered Māori. It starts with Section 1.2.1, which describes colonisation as an overarching theme from which the other factors that influence Māori identity emerge. Then, Section 1.2.2 briefly describes the writing of New Zealand's history as a discursive practice that has assisted colonisation and the marginalisation of Māori. Next, as this study was carried out in a New Zealand school, Section 1.2.3 describes how the New Zealand education system has aided colonisation and contributed to the fracturing of Māori identities. To add further context to this study, Section 1.2.4 describes how Māori identity has been articulated by Māori academics and cultural experts in essentialist terms. This section introduces and highlights a generally held view that whakapapa (genealogy) and traditional (classical) markers of Māori identity are considered constituent elements of Māori identity. Finally, Section 1.2.5 describes the predominant way Māori identity has been theorised in dialectical terms and in opposition to Pākehā identity – and suggests that this theorising impacts negatively on how many Māori experience their Māori identity.

### ***1.2.1    Colonisation***

Identities emerge from the historical, social, and political contexts in which they are embedded (Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh & Teaiwa, 2005; Poata-Smith, 1996; Houkamau, 2010). There are various overlapping historical and contemporary factors that influence and impact on Māori identity. Colonisation is a main overarching factor because it ended Māori sovereignty in New Zealand and resulted in (many) Māori losing control over their identity choices (Ross, 2020). Consequently, Māori identity has become overly determined by factors residing outside of Māori control, including the way in which Māori identity has been theorised in dialectic opposition

to Pākehā identity<sup>12</sup> and/or in essentialist terms fastened to unauthentic aspects of traditional culture (Hokowhitu, 2010; Mercier, 2020). Colonisation and Māori loss of sovereignty has also resulted in Māori losing control of the structural elements of New Zealand society (Sommer, 2011). These structures include, discourse and discursive practices that perpetuate Pākehā dominance and continue to marginalise Māori in New Zealand (McIntosh, 2005).

Colonisation is a determining and causal factor in Māori lived experiences, in what Hokowhitu (2010) calls our ‘facticity’, and in the way in which we experience our Māori identity. The beginnings of colonisation extend to first contact with Europeans and their early settlement in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This period of New Zealand’s history brought profound social, economic and material changes to Māori society (Ross, 2020). In terms of identity, this period changed how Māori lived and separated Māori from the “determining elements upon which the identity of their ancestors had rested” (Fitzgerald et al., 1996, p. 35).

Yet, this early period did not deprive Māori political control, nor did it amount to a loss of Māori sovereignty. If anything this period advanced Māori sovereignty as Māori exercised sovereignty over traders, missionaries and first European settlers. In 1835, the extant of Māori sovereignty was recognised with the signing of the Declaration of Independence (1835) between northern chiefs and British representative James Busby. The impact of colonisation on Māori identity would not be realised until Māori lost sovereignty and political control in New Zealand, which occurred as an aftermath of the New Zealand wars of the 1860s.

Colonisation can be defined as the “domination of people from another culture” (Sommer, 2011, p.189). Citing Osterhammel, Sommer (2011) explains various elements of colonisation. First, colonisers completely deprive the colonised any “potential for autonomous development” (Sommer, 2011, p. 189). Second, there is a structural component, and involves society being completely reconfigured to accommodate the colonisers. Third, the colonisers and the colonised are permanently divided by a cultural gap. And fourth, colonisation establishes and maintains

---

<sup>12</sup> Pākehā is a Māori term to describe non-Māori of European, typically British, descent.

ideological supremacy of the colonisers, which serves to justify and legitimise (in the coloniser's mind at least) colonial expansion.

Sommer (2011) explains colonisers as unwilling to assimilate into the indigenous culture due to missionary doctrines and ideas of cultural superiority. These ideas make up the ‘consistent ideology’ of the colonisers and become the dominant discourse of the colonised country, which further serve the needs and interests of the colonisers. The ‘cultural gap’ is a result of a “persistent unwillingness on the part of the colonisers, to accommodate...the culture of the colonised”, and the cultural gap becomes demarcated by people “clearly defined as the bearers of distinct cultural and ethnic identities” (Sommer 2011, p189-190).

Sommer’s ideas give insight to the New Zealand context where Pākehā, the colonisers, became the dominant group having complete ideological and political control over colonised Māori. Māori have become powerless and without the ability to configure New Zealand society and the organising features upon which identities are constructed. As a result, colonisation of Māori caused rupture, “thwarted optimal identity development”, and changed how Māori “perceived themselves as people” (Houkamau, 2006, p.ii & p.v). Colonisation has caused confusion (for some) about what it means and is to be Māori with many Māori unable to construct their Māori identity based on traditional constructs (Durie, 1995, 1999; Houkamau, 2010). Colonisation has marginalised Māori and has resulted in Māori being “out of place” in their own country (McIntosh, 2005; Penetito, 2009; Mercier, 2020). As Penetito (2009, p.10) notes “no one experiences out of place more sharply than those who are colonized”. Fanon (1961) goes further describing colonised people as the “Wretched of the Earth”.

Furthermore, as a result of colonisation and the powerlessness that Māori experience, Māori identity is overly influenced by factors located outside of Māori individuals and beyond the sphere/s of Māori control. These factors are numerous and include; government attempts to define Māori (for example in legislation and for the New Zealand census); dominant discourse and discursive practices that include biased historical accounts (see next section); academic research and theorising about identity which has frequently positioned Māori in binary opposition to Pākehā

(explained further below in Section 1.2.5); and ‘essentialist’ prescriptions of Māori identity by ‘cultural experts’. Colonisation has marginalised Māori and resulted in Māori voices being absent in the literature on Māori identity. As a result, little is known about how Māori people interpret, respond to these factors and how these factors actually influence their Māori identity. This research aims to fill this research gap.

### ***1.2.2 How New Zealand history misrepresents Māori identity.***

The sociological perspective on identity proposes that identities are historically contingent (Liu et al., 2005; Poata-Smith, 1996; Houkamau, 2010). From this perspective, New Zealand’s history, and the retelling of New Zealand’s history has shaped and determined Māori identity (Poata-Smith, 1996). New Zealand’s history has been described as a process born out of “historical amnesia” and by a “learned forgetting” (Penetito, 2009, p. 19). Liu (2005, p.70) writes that historical narratives “are a crucial ingredient in the knowledge structures necessary to produce societal cohesion”, and yet history “is a story about the making of an in-group”. The retelling of New Zealand’s history has been complicit in ‘outing’ Māori. In pre-colonial Aotearoa<sup>13</sup>, Māori were normal or ordinary and Pākehā were different, but New Zealand’s history has resulted in Māori being made different, ‘othered’, and pushed to the margins of New Zealand society (Ormond, Cram & Carter, 2006).

New Zealand history is also characterised by myths and the making-up of peoples (Belich, 1996). Some common assumptions about what constitutes a Māori have been based on the writings of early anthropologists and missionaries, and Durie (1995) explains that these constructs have been romanticised and often bear little resemblance to actual common Māori experiences. Some common (mis)conceptions about what constitutes a Māori are also based on myths that mis-represent Māori. Popular myths include ‘the moriori’ myth, and ‘the great fleet’ (Penetito, 2009; Belich, 1997). These and other myths contribute to “collective identities of Māori and Pākehā” and were used (and continue to be used) to justify the colonisation and subjugation of Māori (Penetito, 2009, p. 19; Fulcher, 2015; Wall, 1997). Other myths bore out of a process of racialisation, which have positioned Māori as inferior to

---

<sup>13</sup> New Zealand

Pākehā (Fulcher, 2015; Wall, 1997). A. Durie (1997, p. 153) writes that Māori children in schools were subjected to “myths and legends of a colonial presence which presumed European superiority and denigrated Māori”. New Zealand’s history, and specifically the selective and subjective rewriting of New Zealand’s history, has contributed to a lack of clarity about Māori identity by perpetuating false representations of Māori.

### ***1.2.3 The New Zealand education system and Māori***

The New Zealand education system has been a part of New Zealand’s colonisation machinery that has “promulgated the ongoing colonisation of Māori” and contributed to the breakdown of Māori society (G. Smith, 2017, p. 82; Mead, 1996; Mercier, 2020). New Zealand schools have sought to “civilize, assimilate and integrate Māori” and in doing so have undermined Māori knowledge and facilitated the decline and loss of Māori language and culture (Pihama et al., 2002, p.40; G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017). This has disrupted Māori epistemologies and resulted in Māori existing in what Cooper (2012) describes as ‘epistemic wilderness’. As Penetito (2009) notes, New Zealand schools have been unhappy places for many Māori, and education in New Zealand has been underpinned by deficit theories assuming Māori as “lacking, ... inadequate and problematic” (Smith, 1991; 2012, p.11). This is epitomised by a generation of Māori children who were beaten in New Zealand schools for speaking Māori. According to Pihama et al. (2002), New Zealand schools have failed most Māori who have passed through them. In this way New Zealand schools have contributed to the marginalisation and colonisation of Māori, and the fractured nature of Māori identity.

As a result, there is a significant disparity between Māori and Pākehā educational achievement (Bishop, 2012; G. Smith, 2017; Cliffe-Tautari, 2019; Ross, 2020; New Zealand Government, 2020). According to Bishop (2012), compared to Pākehā achievement, Māori education achievement is low, and more Māori leave school without formal qualifications. Drawing on government figures, in 2016, 34 per cent of Māori left school without NCEA<sup>14</sup> level 2 and this is compared to 20 per cent of all school leavers (a figure which includes Māori) (New Zealand Government, 2020).

---

<sup>14</sup> NCEA stands for National Certificate of Education Achievement

In New Zealand schools Māori are over-represented in suspensions, lower stream classes, and special education programmes for behavioural issues (Smith, 1991; Bishop, 2012).

More recently, coinciding with international trends, identity has become popular in the New Zealand education curriculum. In the 2007 New Zealand revised curriculum document, identity is mentioned 15 times (Ministry of Education, 2007). However, little guidance is given as to what identity actually means or how learning around identity might occur in the classroom (Siteine, 2013). Teachers are encouraged to “make interpretations in response to the particular needs, interests, and talents of individuals and groups of students in their classes” (quoted in Siteine, 2013, p.100). Mason Durie’s Te Whare Tapa Wha model of wellbeing is taught in most New Zealand schools, and makes a strong correlation to identity and wellbeing. Durie’s model also corresponds to the claim that Māori identity is a corollary for the many social problems that Māori experience. Durie contends, and it is generally accepted, that a ‘secure’ identity is a prerequisite to a person’s wellbeing, and a secure ‘Māori’ identity is crucial for a Māori person’s wellbeing (M. Durie, 1997, 1999; A. Durie, 1997; Webber, 2011). These assumptions are made despite growing concerns that prescriptions of Māori identity are unauthentic, and awareness that some Māori struggle to form a Māori identity. For example, based on data collected from Te Hoe Nuku Roa, a longitudinal study of Māori households, Durie (2003) stated that two thirds of Māori fail to form a ‘secure’ Māori identity.

The challenges associated with Māori identity have been exacerbated by essentialism and the advancement of a prescribed Māori identity type in both Māori domains and in government policy, including in schools. These identity prescriptions have been criticised as being unauthentic and as a barrier to Māori development because they do not address the structural conditions that perpetuate Māori marginalisation (Hokowhitu, 2010; Toon van Meijl, 2006; Poata-Smith 1996). Despite these growing criticisms the essentialist identity is the received and accepted view of Māori identity, and the view of Māori identity promoted in schools. Cooper (2012) challenges this approach because of the underlying and erroneous assumption that Māori are producers of ‘culture’ and not producers of knowledge. This view presupposes that Māori are epistemically defunct, existing in the ‘epistemic

wilderness' and have no epistemological function or basis. This leaves Māori no alternative but to conform to Pākehā forms of knowledge, which further entrenches Pākehā ontology as the only viable version of 'real and true' knowledge. This essentialist view of Māori identity is also the dominant view promoted in wider Māori society, despite growing accounts that this view of Māori identity does not resonate with some Māori and their everyday life experiences.

This study is firmly located within this context and seeks a broader and authentic understanding of Māori identity based on the perspectives and life experiences of (actual) Māori people. Therefore, the primary orientation of this study is to find out more about Māori identity, and the factors that predict and or might limit Māori identity construction.

#### ***1.2.4 Māori academic theorising on Māori Identity: Whakapapa and the classical markers of Māori identity***

Due to the way in which Māori have been misrepresented (especially by others) and Māori identity has been misconceived, Māori scholars have responded by explaining constituent elements of Māori identity (A. Durie, 1997; Durie, 1999; Rangihau, 1992; Karetu 1990; McIntosh 2005; Borell, 2005; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Rata, 2012).

Māori scholars have theorised that the determining factor of Māori identity is whakapapa (Bishop, 1998; Karetu, 1990; Mahuika, 2008; O'Carroll, 2013; Newman, 2012; Webber, 2011). Whakapapa usually means genealogy and is one's connections to the ancestors (ira tangata), and beyond to cosmology and the Māori Gods (ira atua) (A. Durie, 1997; Newman, 2012). Whakapapa also connects a Māori to their ancestral lands and gives a place to stand (tūrangawaewae) (Durie, 1999; Karetu, 1990; Newman, 2012; Rata, 2012). Whakapapa gives Māori the right to say they are Māori (Grootveld, 2013; O'Carroll, 2013). However, it is clear from the literature, that whakapapa alone is not enough to form a secure Māori identity, as whakapapa alone does not lend to automatic acceptance in a Māori community (Newman, 2012). What increases one's acceptance, feelings of belonging, and therefore strengthens

one's identity, is conformity to certain classical markers of Māori identity (A. Durie, 1997; Borell, 2005; Newman, 2012; O'Carroll, 2013)

Sir Apirana Ngata's famous maxim indicates the pervasiveness of ethnic markers or cultural attributes to Māori identity. Around the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Sir Apirana said; "ki te kore e mōhio ki te kōrero Māori, ehara koe i te Māori"; which translates, "if you do not speak Māori, you are not a Māori" (Houkamau & Sibley, 2010, p. 10). Sir Apirana's statement stipulates that te reo Māori (the Māori language) is considered (by some) to be a pre-requisite of Māori identity. In the literature, Māori scholars identify other elements of Māori identity considered essential to being Māori (Cram, 2006; Durie, 1999, 2003; Penetito, 2009; Rangihau, 1992; Karetu, 1990). For the purposes of this study these cultural elements are referred to as the 'classical markers' of Māori identity, and this section highlights the classical markers of Māori identity considered important to Māori identity.

Concurring with Sir Apirana, most Māori scholars claim that te reo Māori (the Māori language) as crucial to Māori identity (Durie, 2003; Karetu, 1990; Penetito, 2009; Kukutai, 2010). Karetu (1990) is a particularly strong advocate of te reo Māori as a constitutive factor of Māori identity explaining that Māori language is essential because it connects people to their tūrangawaewae (place to stand). Karetu (1990) also argues that te reo Māori gives credibility to being Māori – particularly to those who assume roles, such as kaumātua (elder), within Māori communities. Penetito (2009) describes te reo Māori as a pillar of Māori survival into the 21<sup>st</sup> century (along with iwi, marae and tikanga).

Links to land and the concept of tūrangawaewae (place to stand) are acknowledged in the literature as important to Māori identity (Karetu 1990; Durie, 1999; Rangihau 1992; Rata, 2012). Durie (1999) writes that because most Māori have lost access to traditional lands, marae (meeting grounds including ancestral houses) are the only tangible link to land for many Māori. Marae therefore assume particular importance for Māori and to Māori identity in terms of tūrangawaewae and place to stand. Marae have been described as the 'basis of Māori communities" (Durie, 1999, p. 352). Other authors describe the importance of marae to Māori identity (Cram, 2006; Durie, 1999; Penetito, 2009). Cram (2006, p.30) describes marae as the "physical

place of our culture” and discusses marae as important to the transmission of knowledge, culture, and the “establishment of identity”.

Some scholars claim the social groupings whānau (extended family), hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe) as critical to both traditional and contemporary Māori identity (Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Rata, 2012; A. Durie, 1997). Traditional (pre-European) Māori identity was derived from these social groups where membership was established through genealogical ties that affirmed belonging (A. Durie, 1997). In pre-European New Zealand these social groupings were paramount, and today for some, an iwi or tribal identity is (still) more meaningful and significant than a Māori identity (Robson & Reid, 2001). For Rangihau (1992) his tribal (Tūhoe) identity is a prerequisite to his Māori identity; he chooses to identify as Māori but identifies as Tūhoe first. When accused of being a Pākehā and not Māori Sir Tipene O'Regan replied that he was not Māori but Ngāi Tahu (of the tribe Ngāi Tahu) (Robson & Reid, 2001)

Some Māori scholars, such as Rangihau (1992), Karetu (1990), and A. Durie (1997) highlight upbringing as an aspect of Māori identity. Rangihau (1992) describes upbringing as living together as “part of an extended family”, where learning occurs by others’ experience (p.183). Rangihau (1992) also highlights the importance of socialisation and being brought up in a Māori community, saying:

My feeling of identity and commitment to Māori things is the result of history and traditions, and the fact that I grew up in a Māori community. In this community there was always a sense of the value of land and the emotional ties Māori have to it (Rangihau, 1992, p. 183).

More recent studies have found that Māori cultural engagement is a positive predictor of Māori identity, and that Māori identity is a predictor of positive psychological wellbeing (Webber, 2011; Rata 2012). For example Webber (2011) identifies two research studies that found a positive influence of kapa haka (performance) to students’ Māori identity, their self-esteem and achievement in school. These studies find that engagement in Māori cultural activities encourage and

support Māori identity construction, but more research is required to find out if there is variance between cultural activities, that is, if certain cultural activities are more likely to predict positive Māori identity construction than others.

In summary the classical markers of Māori identity include, but are not limited to: knowledge of whakapapa; knowledge of and membership to whānau (family), hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe); knowledge of and active connection to tūrangawaewae including, ancestral lands, wāhi tapu (sacred places) and marae (ancestral houses); proficiency in te reo Māori (Māori language); knowledge of and ability to follow and perform tikanga (cultural protocols); and participation in a form of Māori cultural activity, such as kapa haka (performance), taiaha (Māori martial arts), waka ama (outrigger canoeing), raranga, (weaving) and whakaairo (carving). Most Māori scholars claim that whakapapa is the determining factor of Māori identity (Rata, 2012; Bishop, 1998; Karetu, 1990; Mahuika, 2008; O'Carroll, 2013; Newman, 2012; Webber, 2011). A few others such as, Arohia Durie (1997) and Kukutai (2011) suggest that whakapapa alone is not enough to claim a Māori identity, but that what is also required is conformity to and proficiency in at least one of the classical markers of Māori identity. A. Durie (1997, p.142) explains that proficiency in classical markers of Māori identity strengthens identification as Māori and gives a “vitality of spirit...capable of expressing... all that is excellent about being Māori”.

This research explores the salience of the classical markers of Māori identity to the participants and their Māori identity construction. It adds to what we know about Māori identity by moving beyond academic prescriptions of Māori identity and by capturing the views of Māori participants drawn from their life experiences.

### ***1.2.5 Māori identity theorised in opposition to Pākehā identity***

This section aims to describe the way in which Māori identity is commonly theorised in binary opposition to Pākehā identity. It aims to highlight that theorising Māori identity in this way is detrimental to Māori existentialism (the very existence of Māori people) and to self-determining, authentic expressions of Māori identity.

The idea that Māori identity exists in binary opposition to Pākehā identity has whakapapa<sup>15</sup> (can be traced) to Hegel's theory of dialectics that proposes that an idea or category exists in relation to an opposite category. Meaning becomes relative and exists in relation to the opposite category. The first category is termed the thesis and its opposite the antithesis. The opposing categories exist in what is called 'contradiction' but resolve to a new or higher category called the synthesis. The theory of dialectics has been influential in philosophical thinking and in particular fields such as, Critical theory, but some theorists such as, Fanon (1952), Freire (1970) and Satre (quoted in Fanon, 1952) argue the theory is flawed when applied to 'races' of human beings.

Fanon (1952, p.32) critiqued the theory of dialectics arguing that human beings positioned in this way become "two poles of a world in perpetual conflict". Fanon challenges dialectic theorising quoting Satre:

...Māori appears as the minor term of a dialectical progression:  
 The theoretical and practical assertion of the supremacy of (the) Pākehā is its thesis; the position of Māori as an antithetical value is the moment of negativity. But this negative moment is insufficient by itself, and the Māori who employ it know this very well; they know that it is intended to prepare the synthesis or realization of the human in a society without races. Thus Māori-ness is the root of its own destruction, it is a transition and not a conclusion, a means and not an ultimate end (quoted in Fanon, 1952, p. 111<sup>16</sup>).

Fanon (1952) goes further, and applying his reasoning to Māori/Pākehā, dialectical theorising is erroneous because:

1. Pākehā identity is a constant force acting to submerge Māori identity.

---

<sup>15</sup> Used in this way 'whakapapa' is used as an analytical tool to make connections between ideas – see Section 1.3.3 for further explanation.

<sup>16</sup> The words Māori and Pākehā replace the words 'negritude' or 'Negroes', and 'white man' respectively.

2. Human beings conceived and or constructed (either by themselves or by others) as having a Māori identity can oscillate or assimilate towards Pākehā identity and be Pākehā. Pākehā can never be Māori.

Fanon's argument highlights the limits of dialectics when applied to human beings. For example, he suggests, the Māori/Pākehā binary is not a true dialectic because the opposing categories cannot synthesise, and therefore, Māori identity conceived in this way exists in an unresolvable contradiction. This limits Māori existentiality, and the ability of Māori to exist authentically and unbridled as Māori.

Some New Zealand theorists such as, Pool (1963), Poata-Smith (1996), Hokowhitu (2010), Bargh (2013), Mercier (2020) and Giorgio and Houkamau (2021), have challenged theorising Māori identity in dialectical terms. Pool (1963, p. 210) calls the Māori/Pākehā dialectic a nonsensical “racial dichotomy”. Poata-Smith (1996, p. 112) explains that Māori identity theorised in binary terms necessitates “an apocalyptic struggle between the very existence of Pākehā...” Hokowhitu (2010) suggests that Māori identity bound in opposition to Pākehā identity renders Māori in an enduring struggle (Mercier, 2020).

Drawing on these arguments, Māori identity theorised in dialectical terms is problematic, perhaps even fatalistic, because Māori identity exists as a contradiction or an unstable category not requisite in and of itself. Theorising Māori knowledge, and all things Māori, as the antithesis, positions Māori knowledge as inferior and invalid when considered against Pākehā knowledge. Dialectical theorising then positions Māori forms as inherently deficient, in contradiction, with only one option, which is to resolve towards or assimilate towards Pākehā forms. This is an unresolvable contradiction. Hokowhitu (2010) links theorising Māori in dialectic terms to a ‘struggle’ to be Māori. Drawing attention to Ranginui Walker’s important text, Hokowhitu (2010, p. 220) highlights the struggle that many Māori people have with their Māori identity describing this as a “struggle without end” (Walker, 1990; Mercier, 2020).

Freire (1970) uses the theory of dialectics in his pedagogy and offers a synthesis to the oppressor–oppressed contradiction by means of critical education, praxis and a

dialogical process initiated by the oppressed. Freire (1970) offers some hope that we can free ourselves from this contradiction. This study explores Māori identity with the aim of highlighting alternative ways of conceiving, constructing and experiencing Māori identity.

### **1.3 Conceptual Framework / research paradigm**

Research paradigms make underlying metaphysical assumptions about the nature of reality, knowledge and truth (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). These assumptions then guide the research process in terms of decisions around research design, including decisions about methods used to gather and analyse information, the type of data sought, and the types of questions asked. This study is located within a Kaupapa Māori framework. Kaupapa Māori is used by Māori (as an alternative to Western research and practices) to investigate issues that concern Māori. Yet, Kaupapa Māori research has various and, at times, competing aims that can be contradictory, making Kaupapa Maori's theoretical and metaphysical assumptions unclear (Eketone, 2008, Mahuika, 2008). This section begins with a general introduction to Kaupapa Māori, Section (1.3.1) and, then, due to theoretical inconsistencies, clarifies the metaphysical assumptions of Kaupapa Māori (Section 1.3.2). This section proposes that Kaupapa Māori's metaphysical position aligns to social constructivist principles. As part of the conceptual framework this study incorporates Māori concepts and analytical tools such as, whakapapa, explained in Section (1.3.3).

#### **1.3.1 *Kaupapa Māori Framework and the Current Study***

This study was undertaken from within a Kaupapa Māori framework. Kaupapa Māori has been described as less and more than a research framework or research paradigm (L. Smith, 1999, 2015, 2017). Within a research context, Kaupapa Māori incorporates ideas of theory, praxis and methodology, and a way of “structuring assumptions, concepts, orientations and priorities” in research (L. Smith, 1999, p.183). The word kaupapa embodies notions of foundations; and these come from Māori philosophical and theoretical tradition, and Māori epistemologies including conceptions of Māori knowledge and ways of knowing (Pihama et al., 2002; Cram, 2006). Kaupapa Māori assumes, without reservation, the validity and legitimacy of

Māori epistemology, and therefore a central and privileged place for Māori knowledge, language and culture (G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017). Kaupapa Māori has a clear political intent and assumes Māori indigenous rights of tino rangatiratanga or sovereignty as guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi (Pihama, 2010; G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017). Kaupapa Māori has orientations and priorities in research that are by Māori, for and with Māori (Cram, 2006; Forster, 2003; L. Smith, 2015, 2017; Mercier, 2020). Kaupapa Māori research is critical and actively challenges unequal power relations and institutions that promote Pākehā hegemony (Mahuika, 2008; G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017). Kaupapa Māori is also anti-colonial and is therefore concerned with emancipation, transformation, and better outcomes for Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Forster, 2003; Cram 2006; Mahuika, 2008; Mercier, 2020). Kaupapa Māori is the foundation and framework for this study. Kaupapa Māori locates and positions the researcher, establishes the critical lens, indicates research bias, and critically validates and gives a platform for Māori lived realities and experiences (Pihama et al., 2002).

As discussed above, Kaupapa Māori research can be summarised in the mantra, research by Māori, for Māori and with Māori (Forster, 2003, p. 12; Pihama et al., 2002; L. Smith, 2015; Mercier, 2020). Kaupapa Māori research was developed in response to the dominant positivist paradigm, which can be described as research by Pākehā, on and about Māori, for Pākehā. Kaupapa Māori also developed from grassroots struggles to create an alternative education system that accepted, affirmed and asserted Māori rights to be Māori, and as a counter to Pākehā education that was unfairly and grossly failing Māori children (G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017).

Western research by Pākehā in New Zealand has been labelled “scientific colonialism” because of its role in dismantling and replacing Māori knowledge with Pākehā knowledge (Cram, 2006, p. 32). Lee (2009, p. 1) describes Pākehā research as “codified with ideologies such as imperialism and colonialism”. Bishop and Glynn (1999) describe Pākehā research and knowledge as perpetuating colonial values and ideologies of Pākehā superiority. Much research in New Zealand has also described Māori in deficit terms and as a problem to be fixed (Kukutai, 2011, G. Smith, 2012). Consequently, there is a general distrust and dissatisfaction amongst Māori of research, with some Maori “rejecting all theory and all research” (L. Smith, 1999,

2017, p.183). Some Māori feel there is little or no benefit of research, that has too often misrepresented Māori lived realities (Keefe et al., 1999; L. Smith 1999, 2017; Pihama, 2010). Kaupapa Māori research emerges from this dissatisfaction that Māori have of being researched, and from the transformative praxis of Māori, particularly in the area of Māori education (G. Smith, 2012, 2017).

Māori researchers and scholars from Auckland University, including Graham Hingangaroa Smith and Linda Smith's early writings on Kaupapa Māori theory was the precursor for Kaupapa Māori as a research approach that can be applied across various fields (Pihama et al., 2002). Graham Smith (1991, 2012, 2015, 2017) relates the emergence of Kaupapa Māori to the transformative praxis of Māori struggling for educational change and the right for Māori children to be educated in schools amenable to, and not abhorrent to Māori cultural aspirations. This grassroots movement lead to the establishment of Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa and Whare Kura and later Whare Wānanga – education from pre-school to tertiary level where Māori language is prioritised, and where Māori culture and values are normal and taken for granted. By describing Māori struggles for educational change as transformative praxis, G. Smith (1991, 2012, 2015, 2017) purposefully draws on Freire's canon "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", and thus locates Māori as oppressed in New Zealand, and Freire, drawing explicitly on Hegel's dialectic, Pākehā as oppressor. Praxis is defined as, "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970, p. 25). Māori praxis in the context of struggle for educational change for Māori children was consciousness-raising, some Māori realising their own failure in Pākehā education was not a failure of themselves but rather a failure of the system itself (Pihama et al., 2002). This growing awareness of Pākehā domination and structural impediments that were subjugating and inhibiting Māori efforts, and perpetuating Māori failure in New Zealand society, stimulated the desire to seek solutions to problems that were adversely affecting Māori – and this extended into areas of research.

Dissatisfaction with research on Māori by Pākehā initiated a growing interest in research by some Māori (Pipi et al., 2004). According to Bishop (1998, p. 199), research by Māori is an attempt to free "ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research" (Bishop, 1998, p. 199). Kaupapa Māori research has grown from this

context alongside other emancipatory projects articulated by marginalised groups, such as, indigenous peoples worldwide, feminists and African Americans (Pipi et al., 2004, p.141). Kaupapa Māori thus has a clear political intent and has been described as an emancipatory theory (Pihamā et al., 2002; Pipi et al., 2004), a decolonisation theory (Cooper, 2012; Mercier, 2020), a resistance theory (Mahuika, 2008), a localised form of critical theory (Pihamā, 2010; G. Smith, 2012, 2015, 2017) and a theory of transformation (Bishop, 1999).

The present study uses Kaupapa Māori as the research paradigm because it is ‘by Māori and for Māori’ and because it is suitable to meet the aims of this inquiry (Forster, 2003, p. 12; Pihamā et al., 2002; L. Smith, 2015; Mercier, 2020). Kaupapa Māori is an adaptable research approach “transportable to a range of sites of inquiry” in order to advance the causes of Māori (Smith, 2012, p. 11). Lee (2009) describes Kaupapa Māori as a bricoleur approach to research, and Pihamā (2010, p.48) adds that Kaupapa Maori “is neither fixed nor rigid. It is open-ended, it is ethical, systematic and accountable. It is scientific, open to existing methodologies, informed and critical. BUT, it comes from tangata whenua<sup>17</sup>”. Issues of theory become peripheral to the main aim of Kaupapa Māori, which is the survival of Māori people.

Kaupapa Māori was also used as the paradigm of this study because it indicated the research bias, and the perspective from which this study was undertaken. As Hohepa (2015, p.118) identifies, Kaupapa Māori treats bias and subjectivity as needing to be “openly acknowledged and demonstrated”. By choosing this research paradigm, this study acknowledges Kaupapa Māori as an evolving and fluid research paradigm, and the right of Māori to develop our own research frameworks and theories to investigate issues that concern us (Pihamā, 2010). By choosing Kaupapa Māori this study aims to contribute to the ongoing development and credibility of Kaupapa Māori research.

### **1.3.2 *Kaupapa Māori Metaphysical Assumptions***

The aim of this section is to clarify the theoretical basis of Kaupapa Māori and the ontological and epistemological assumptions advanced within a Kaupapa Māori

---

<sup>17</sup> Tangata whenua means people of the land – and is used to describe Māori people

research paradigm. This is necessary because the metaphysical assumptions of research paradigms determine and guide the research process in terms of research design and methodological choices (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994). Kaupapa Māori, like other post-positivist paradigms, is a developing research paradigm, and as theory of research is in its formative stages (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994; Pihamo, 2010). As a theory Kaupapa Māori is incomplete (Eketone, 2008); and its metaphysical assumptions are at-times ambiguous, for various reasons, including the following:

1. Kaupapa Māori presumes a ‘cultural thesis’ element that is paradoxical and contradictory to the constructivist knowledge claims advanced within the literature on Kaupapa Māori.
2. There is ambiguity within Kaupapa Māori theory about whether Kaupapa Māori is a discrete research paradigm, complete with its own metaphysical assumptions, and whether or not Kaupapa Māori can be independent from Western research paradigms.
3. Kaupapa Māori theory is influenced by, and many Kaupapa Māori researchers draw from, different Western research paradigms (particularly in terms of theory and methodology), that in some cases have divergent metaphysical assumptions. Sometimes these divergent metaphysical assumptions appropriated within Kaupapa Māori research designs are incommensurable, as identified by Guba and Lincoln (1994).

This section clarifies Kaupapa Māori’s metaphysical assumptions, and proposes a theoretical position for Kaupapa Māori and this study.

#### *1.3.2.1 Kaupapa Māori and cultural thesis – ontological contradiction*

Kaupapa Māori places a strong emphasis on Māori culture and includes a “cultural thesis” element as identified by Cooper (2012). The cultural thesis element (also referred to as cultural nationalism, particularly by Poata-Smith) proposes the rediscovery of Māori culture identity as the remedy for vast social problems that disproportionately affect Māori (Poata-Smith, 1996). Recent government education programmes, such as Te Kotahitanga and Ka Hikitia, aimed at addressing the ‘crises of Māori underachievement’ employ cultural thesis ideologies where teachers are

expected to learn the culture of Māori students to help them learn and achieve, however, Cooper concedes these ‘cultural’ strategies “may be counter to how they (Māori students) might know and understand the world” (Cooper, 2012, p. 71). Cooper (2012, p. 71) goes so far as to describe the cultural thesis position as “an assimilationist agenda through integrating ‘Māori culture’ into schooling”.

Within Kaupapa Māori the cultural thesis issue is exemplified further by the use of the term “Māori” within the definition of Kaupapa Māori (Mahuika, 2008). This raises issues of authenticity, “indigeneity and identity in the application of Kaupapa Māori” (Eketone, 2008, p. 3). The cultural thesis position has a totalising affect on Māori, advancing a universal, static and essentialist view of Māori identity. This is problematic for various reasons, including, as Bishop (2012, p. 43) identifies, a static view of culture can cause teachers, for example, to be confused “about the culture of the Māori child”.

Similarly and also related to this, is the position of te reo Māori (the Māori language) within theorising, application and participating in Kaupapa Māori research either as a researcher or participant. The inimitable position of te reo Māori again totalises Māori and according to Mahuika (2008, p. 8);

“raises issues of authenticity and challenges the identity claims and authority of those Māori who are unable to speak the language. Moreover, these views hold the potential to dis-empower and disenfranchise those who may already be marginalised within the mainstream because they are Māori, yet struggle to find acceptance from within their own culture because they are not Māori enough”.

Essentialist type views of Māori identity, or a “frozen identity” as described by Belich (1997, p.10), presume a realist, singular, static, and absolute view of reality (and Māori identity), and therefore by extension deny multiple constructions of reality and identity. This ontological position therefore excludes diverse Māori epistemologies (or constructions of knowledge), making it contradictory to the constructivist aims of Kaupapa Māori as advanced in some Kaupapa Māori research literature.

### *1.3.2.2 Kaupapa Māori as a discrete research paradigm, or alignment with Western research paradigms*

When considering the metaphysical location of Kaupapa Māori the following questions must be considered:

1. What are Kaupapa Māori's metaphysical assumptions?
2. A sub-question to the above is, does Kaupapa Māori advocate a metaphysical position based on 'traditional' Māori epistemologies/frameworks, or based on diverse epistemologies that Māori construct from actual contemporary, every day experiences?
3. Can Kaupapa Māori be a discrete research paradigm, independent from Western research paradigms?

In developing Kaupapa Māori theory, many Māori academics cite Nepe (for example; Mahuika, 2008; Pipi, et al., 2004, Pihama, 2010) and state that Kaupapa Māori has its own metaphysical assumptions and unique Māori epistemologies. Nepe (cited in Mahuika, 2008) acknowledges the importance and intertwined relationship between Māori language and the development and formation of Māori epistemologies. From this point of view, Māori language is also important, if not necessary, to developing and articulating the metaphysical position that Kaupapa Māori presumably claims. Few if any writers explain Kaupapa Māori's metaphysical assumptions and the implications those assumptions have for research. Some suggest that Kaupapa Māori is incommensurable to Western paradigms because Kaupapa Māori is based on mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) and not Western knowledge, and therefore have divergent metaphysical positions (Pihama, 2010). However, and despite this, some Kaupapa Māori researchers (in describing their research design) draw from Western frameworks and their associated methodologies irrespective of whether incommensurable to a Kaupapa Māori metaphysical position or not (whatever that might be/however explicitly stated). Mahuika (2008) succinctly points to this contradiction by posing: Can Kaupapa Māori be anti-colonial and critical?

A discrete Kaupapa Māori paradigm with its own “Māori” metaphysical assumptions constructed from within the Māori language, and independent and discrete from Western paradigms, although possible, is unlikely. Given the fact that traditional or pre-colonial Māori epistemologies experienced rupture due to colonisation, and few Māori actually speak Māori, this could be considered a more utopian vision. Only about 5% of Māori speak Māori “very well” (not necessarily fluently), and nearly 50% of Māori people know no more Māori language than a few words or phrases (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). The loss of Māori language has left many Māori, in what Cooper (2012) refers to as an ‘epistemic wilderness’. As a result of being in this epistemic wilderness, Māori metaphysics or ways of conceptualising reality, and knowledge, are irrevocably influenced by Western metaphysics, knowledge, and ways of conceptualising reality. Therefore, it is problematic to assume that Kaupapa Māori (from an epistemological standpoint) operates outside of, and in a way not influenced by, the metaphysical assumptions of Western research paradigms developed and articulated in the English language.

Therefore what is premised in this research is an alignment of Kaupapa Māori to a Western research paradigm (or paradigms) that best fit with the aspirations and aims of Kaupapa Māori and this research study. Specifically that is to listen to Māori boys to investigate the factors that influence their Māori identity construction.

#### *1.3.2.3 Kaupapa Māori Metaphysical Assumptions: Influence of divergent Western theories - Critical theory and constructivism*

Kaupapa Māori theory draws on and is influenced by different and divergent research paradigms – particularly Critical theory (see for example, Eketone, 2008; Mahuika, 2008; Pihamā, 2010; Smith, 1997; Hohepa, 2015); and constructivism (see for example, Eketone, 2008; Mahuika, 2008). This is because Kaupapa Māori has multiple aims or purposes, and these different paradigms are drawn on to meet and achieve those varying purposes. One main purpose of Kaupapa Māori is to critique and challenge power and Pākehā hegemony, social institutions and structures that marginalise Māori (G. Smith 2017), an aim advanced and promulgated through a critical theory framework (as noted by, Eketone, 2008; Mahuika, 2008; Pihamā, 2010; L. Smith, 2017; G. Smith, 1997, 2017). Another primary aim of Kaupapa

Māori is to ‘take for granted’ Māori epistemologies and diverse Māori realities, with the assumption that Māori are creators of knowledge rather than just producers of culture, as argued persuasively by Cooper (2012). This aim aligns to constructivist principles and theories of knowledge. The various and multiple aims within Kaupapa Māori, and the drawing on different paradigms to achieve those aims, can lead to ambiguity about the ontological and epistemological assumptions of Kaupapa Māori that must be clarified in order to advance a methodical research design appropriate to investigate issues of importance to Māori.

In order to describe the metaphysical assumptions of the paradigms critical theory and constructivism, and to clarify the position of Kaupapa Māori, this section draws heavily on Guba and Lincoln (1994), and their explanation of the different metaphysical assumptions of four main research paradigms, including critical theory and constructivism, and the implications for each in terms of methodological choices in research.

### Ontology: Critical Theory and Constructivism

Ontology is about perception of the nature of reality, and what can be known about it (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994). There are two viable positions; the first is that reality is real, the realist position, or that there is no real reality - the relativist position. Critical theory presumes that there exists a ‘real’ reality that is historical, dynamic and evolving over time by the convergence of, for example; social, cultural, political and economic factors (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994); and this is called historical realism (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994; Freire, 1970). Constructivism, however, assumes a multiple and relativist position of reality. There is not one real reality, but rather multiple realities and realities are intangible mental constructions manufactured as individuals construct meaning about and within a specific context. Realities are also alterable as individuals continue to adapt meaning and make new constructions through continued and sustained interaction with the world (Eketone, 2008). The ontological positions of critical theory and constructivism are considered incommensurable because there is either a real reality or not (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994).

### Epistemology: Critical Theory and Constructivism

Epistemology is about knowledge, what can be known, and the relationship between what can be known and a potential knower (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994). According to Guba and Lincoln (1994) the epistemological assumptions of critical theory and constructivism are commensurable, and are described by them as being “transactional and subjectivist” (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994, p. 111). This means that there is a transactional, interactional or dependant relationship between what can be known and the potential knower. What can be known is subjective and dependent and mediated by a person’s world-view and value position. Also, subjectivism implies that people, as subjects (and not merely objects) are actors, who are acting in the world in order to transform it (Freire, 1970).

### Methodology: Critical Theory and Constructivism

The divergent ontological assumptions of critical theory and constructivism have implications for research design in terms of choice of methodological and methods used to gather and analyse information. Critical theory uses methods that are “dialogic and dialectical”; constructivism uses methods that are “hermeneutical (or interpretive) and dialectical” (Guba, & Lincoln, 1994, p. 111).

Critical theory methods are dialogical, which signals a dialogue between subjects (the researcher and participant, or a subject with their world) that involves a “thematic investigation” of themes or ideas in dialectical interaction with their opposites. Critical theory is influenced heavily by Hegel’s theory of dialectics that proposes that reality, which is historical, has an underlying dialectical structure. Within this structure, every idea or thesis has a contradictory idea called the antithesis. Antagonism between the two opposing ideas resolves to a new idea called the synthesis. In a dialogical exchange (for example between researcher and participant, a teacher and student), the goal is transformation by “revealing the reality” and learning to perceive its inherent contradictions (Eketone, quoting Smith, 2008, p. 2; Freire, 1970).

Constructivism's methods are hermeneutical (or interpretive) and again dialectical. "Dialectical" again refers to Hegel's underlying dialectic structure. Within constructivism the aim of investigation is not (necessarily) to transform the multiple constructions that people make, but rather to understand them. Constructivism's dialectical methodology signals a logical, meaning or form making process moving to more "sophisticated" meanings and constructions. In constructivism, knowledge is created when constructions reach consensus within a group, and are considered useful (Eketone, 2008).

#### *1.3.2.4 The Apotheotypical Position – Advanced for Kaupapa Māori*

This study advances a Kaupapa Māori theoretical framework and ontological position that is inclusive and supports diversity of Māori epistemologies, knowledge, culture and experience. Therefore, this study proposes a repositioning of Kaupapa Māori researchers to align to constructivist principles in order to listen to and understand the diverse realities of Māori, and how Māori construct knowledge and reality from experience. Also this study proposes a modified methodology in order to move Kaupapa Māori away from dialectical theorising inherent in critical frameworks. This study proposes a new 'apotheotypical' (adj. of the word apotheosis) position that maintains that an individual's constructions of reality (and a researcher's secondary interpretations of those) are unique, valid, legitimate, and not derived from or in opposition to another form. This is a theoretical attempt to move Kaupapa Māori from dialectical theorising that normally positions Māori (and all things Māori) as other and in opposition to Pākehā.

Bishop (1998), signals a move away from critical theory theorising, particularly that positions Māori in binary opposition, to constructivist principles when he points out there is:

"no longer need to seek to give voice to others to empower others, to emancipate others, to refer to others as subjugated voices, but rather to listen to and participate with those traditionally 'othered' as constructors of meaning of their own experiences and agents of knowledge" (Bishop, 1998, p. 207)

Therefore, what is argued here is that an appropriate methodology for Kaupapa Māori should be able to capture Māori voices that have been excluded by Western research. Kaupapa Māori methodology should also view diverse Māori perspectives as valid constructions of Māori knowledge and representations of diverse Māori epistemologies.

#### *1.3.2.5 Kaupapa Māori metaphysical assumptions and alignment to the sociological approach to ethnic identity*

As stated above, Kaupapa Māori draws on Western paradigms, their metaphysical assumptions, and related methodologies in order to investigate problems of concern to Māori. In order to avoid nebulous and ambiguous research designs, in a study of identity, Kaupapa Māori's metaphysical position should also consider alignment (or not) to Western theorising about ethnic identity. Therefore this section will briefly consider Western theorising about ethnic identity (which is explained further in Chapter 2 Section 2.3) and potential alignment to Kaupapa Māori.

There are two main 'Western' approaches to theorising about ethnic identity from the fields of psychology and sociology (Siteine, 2013). The psychological approach focuses on the psychological workings of the mind, and views ethnicity as fixed. The sociological approach views ethnic identity as socially constructed and related to the societal context in which individuals live (Houkamau, 2010). The sociological approach supposes that ethnic identity is multiple, changeable and influenced by macro - wider societal level factors (Houkamau, 2010). Like the sociological approach to ethnic identity, Kaupapa Māori presumes a relativist view of reality and therefore identity construction. (However, even though the sociological approach supports Kaupapa Māori presumptions about the nature of reality and identity construction, this study privileges Kaupapa Māori and Māori ways of knowing, researching and investigating problems that affect Māori.)

*1.3.2.6 Summary: Metaphysical Location of Kaupapa Māori (for this study)*

The following table summarises the metaphysical assumptions and their associated methodological implications for critical theory and constructivism. The final row introduces the theoretical basis and metaphysical assumptions for Kaupapa Māori (for this study). It should be noted that there is a strong alignment between the Kaupapa Māori framework used in this study to that of constructivism.

Table 1.1 Summary of Metaphysical Locations of Critical Theory, Constructivism and Kaupapa Māori

Paradigm	Ontology	Epistemology	Methodology
<b>Critical Theory</b>	Historical realism	Transactional and Subjectivist	Dialogic and Dialectical
<b>Constructivism</b>	Relativist	Transactional and Subjectivist	Hermeneutical and Dialectical
<b>Kaupapa Māori (KM)</b>	<p>Relativist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple realities</li> <li>• No universal truth (Mahuika, 2008)</li> <li>• Realities constructed through experience</li> <li>• Constructions are contextual and emerge from a context</li> <li>• Relationship between constructions, language and experiential practice.</li> </ul>	<p>Transactional and Subjectivist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject and objects interactively linked (as are researcher and participant)</li> <li>• What can be known is value laden and mediated by the position and prior knowledge/experience of the would be knower.</li> </ul>	<p>Hermeneutical and Apotheotypical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation is from a KM perspective that includes KM interpretive lens</li> <li>• Uses tikanga – culturally appropriate methodology</li> <li>• Aim is to interpret and understand an individual's unique constructions of reality – understanding is made from a KM “emic” position of having been exposed to similar context to that of research participant.</li> <li>• Constructions are valid, independent and not in opposition</li> <li>• A position (construction) can be altered through culturally mediated strategies that first accept the original construction as epistemically valid</li> <li>• Interpretations are sympathetic</li> </ul>

Information for critical theory and constructivism from Guba and Lincoln (1994).

In summary, this section has clarified the metaphysical assumptions of the Kaupapa Māori research paradigm (for this study). This can be summarised as a relativist ontology and an epistemology that is transactional and subjectivist. This metaphysical location has implications for methodology and these can be described as hermeneutical and apotheotypical. The apotheotypical methodology is a new position advanced for Kaupapa Māori (and this study) that views the constructions made by Māori as valid constructions of knowledge independent and not in dialectic

opposition to other (particularly Pākehā forms). It is important to note that even though Kaupapa Māori aligns closely to the metaphysical assumptions and methodology choices of constructivism and to Western sociological theorising about ethnic identity, this study privileges Kaupapa Māori and Māori ways of knowing, researching and investigating problems that affect Māori.

### **1.3.3 Whakapapa**

Kaupapa Māori privileges mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) including its application in research. Pihama (2010) purports that mātauranga Māori is created by whakapapa; where whakapapa helps Māori to understand the world and relationships. Whakapapa is used in this thesis in two main ways. First, whakapapa is referred to and used in its usual sense – and means genealogy (Barlow, 2008). In this way whakapapa connects people to other people and to ancestors (ira tangata), and beyond to cosmology and Māori Gods (ira atua) (A. Durie, 1997; Barlow, 2008). Whakapapa also connects Māori to papatūānuku (mother earth), ancestral lands, and gives a place to stand (tūrangawaewae) (Durie, 1999; Newman, 2012). Penetito (2009, p. 12) observes that whakapapa provides “the depth and significance to one’s presence, rather than simply the self”. Whakapapa is considered by many (in the research literature on Māori identity) as a determining factor of Māori identity – to be Māori, a person must have whakapapa (Karetu, 1990; Mahuika, 2008; O’Carroll, 2013; Newman, 2012; Webber, 2011).

Barlow (2008, p. 173) states the whakapapa “is the basis for the organisation of knowledge”; and Keefe et al, (1999) that whakapapa is a broad term that influences the way in which Māori think. Others have described whakapapa and its use as a research model (Pihama et al., 2002). Whakapapa is an analytical tool, a way of categorising and arranging ideas and making connections between ideas. Considered in this way, whakapapa is similar to how Foucault uses the concept of genealogy to uncover ‘the order of things’ to reveal how reality is shaped by the discourses in which they are embedded (as noted by Wandel, 2001). Whakapapa is analytical thinking in a Māori way and, therefore, is an important component of the research paradigm of this study.

Māori identity at a conceptual level has whakapapa (or links) to Māori epistemology, Māori knowledge and ways of knowing. Māori epistemologies have undergone rupture due to colonisation, the subjugating of Māori knowledge and the privileging of Pākehā knowledge. Consequently, Māori knowledge and perceptions of reality are unassailably influenced by Pākehā knowledge, and conceptions of reality. For this reason, even though Kaupapa Māori privileges Māori knowledge, Kaupapa Māori cannot reject Pākehā knowledge – for to do so would be to reject itself. The influence of Pākehā knowledge and conceptions of reality cannot be separated from how Māori identity is constructed either from within an individual, or from various forms located outside individuals; such as, Māori cultural discourse, Pākehā individuals (and how they perceive Māori identity) and Pākehā discourse – the dominant discourse in New Zealand. This thesis aims to use whakapapa as an analytical tool to locate ideas within New Zealand’s discourse that determine and/or influence Māori identity.

In the study reported in this thesis, whakapapa was used as an analytical tool to examine and explore the concept of positioning. Whakapapa (in and of itself) is a way of positioning Māori within a Māori social structure. Identity is also about positioning and power, and positioning in relation to power. This thesis is concerned with how Māori are positioned in New Zealand society, by whom and for what purpose. And to what extent are Māori able to determine our own positions in New Zealand society. Fanon (1952, p.4) employs positioning as a concept and applied to the Māori-Pākehā binary involves a “juxta-positioning that as caused a physcho-existential complex”. In research whakapapa is a way of positioning researchers as insiders (Keefe et al., 1999). Pipi et al. (2004) describe how Māori researchers are able to use whakapapa to mediate space and power to position themselves in relation to and (as insiders) to research participants (Pipi et al., 2004). Whakapapa is the concept that positions the researcher (as a Māori) firmly and as an insider within this investigation of Māori identity.

#### **1.4 Research Objectives**

The overarching aim of this research was to learn more about Māori identity from Māori boys, a sub-group of Māori, largely absent in the literature on Māori identity

and in research in general. This was achieved by listening to Māori boys from one New Zealand high school, and by exploring their feelings as they discussed their Māori identity. This gave insight into various factors that influenced their Māori identity construction.

Another important aim of this research was to facilitate and increase Māori boys' agency and tino rangatiratanga (self-determination). This was achieved using the research framework Kaupapa Māori to give them a voice and validate their life experiences.

This study also aimed to critique the way that Māori identity is generally conceived, including in essentialist terms based on the classical markers of Māori identity. This study aimed to explore the salience of classical markers of Māori identity to Māori identity construction. This study also aimed to explore other ways of conceiving Māori identity liberated and unbridled from binary attachment to Pākehā identity.

The objective was also to use Kaupapa Māori theory and practices to conduct research in a way that utilises Māori knowledge and culture, and contributes to the on-going validation of Kaupapa Māori research as a thorough and rigorous research framework.

The specific research objectives of this study were to:

1. Explore the feelings of Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity.
2. Identify factors that influence Māori boys and their Māori identity construction.
3. Examine the classical markers of Māori identity and explore their relevance and salience to Māori identity construction.

## **1.5      Significance of the Study**

This study is significant for the following reasons:

- First, although there is a large volume of research on identity, there is scarce research about Māori identity drawn from the perspectives of

Māori, including Māori boys and how they feel as they construct a Māori identity.

- Second, this research revealed factors that influenced Māori boys and their Māori identity construction. These included factors that supported the Māori boys face as they constructed their Māori identity, and factors that inhibited their Māori identity construction. Understanding these factors has the potential to help Māori boys and their construction of a Māori identity.
- Third, the diversity of Māori experience outside of prescriptions of Māori identity are not well documented (Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Houkamau, 2010), therefore, the results of this study add to this growing body of research.
- Fourth, the findings have the potential to inform Māori scholarship about Māori identity, including the factors that influence Māori identity construction, both positively and negatively, and the growing need for more flexible definitions of what it means to be Māori.
- Finally, this research contributes to the growing body of research conducted within a Kaupapa Māori research framework, and advocates Kaupapa Māori as a thorough and rigorous research framework.

## **1.6 Overview of the Thesis**

This thesis is organised in five chapters. This chapter, Chapter 1, gave background information and started by claiming that there is some uncertainty about Māori identity and that some Māori find it difficult to construct a Māori identity. It also gave the context of this study describing the current state of Māori identity as a condition of colonisation and New Zealand's education system. This chapter proposed that Māori identity is ‘fractured’ and unauthentic for some Māori and presupposes that this identity crisis contributes to negative life experiences for some Māori. This chapter gave the conceptual framework and introduced Kaupapa Māori as the research paradigm of this study. It clarified the metaphysical assumptions of Kaupapa Māori as these predict the research methods appropriate for this study. This chapter concluded by stating the research objectives and the significance of this study.

Chapter 2 reviews literature that informs this study. It begins with a general introduction to the concept of identity, and then reviews the two dominant Western approaches to identity. It then reviews literature that describes ‘traditional’ Māori identity, and how Māori identity changed as a result of colonisation. The chapter then reviews literature that describes how Māori identity is articulated in contemporary New Zealand. The review concludes by focusing on literature that problematises Māori identity as it is currently conceived, and by doing so it sets the scene for this research and the need for further research into more authentic articulations of Māori identity.

Chapter 3 explains the research design and methods used to conduct this investigation into Māori identity. This chapter outlines the specific research questions, then the research design and methods used for collecting and analysing the data are explained in detail. This chapter concludes by explaining the measures taken to ensure trustworthiness and how the research was conducted in an ethical way and in line with Kaupapa Māori research practices.

Chapter 4 presents the results of this study. This study found numerous factors that influenced the participants and their Māori identity. The results of this study include the factors that were most significant to the group of participants overall – and these are presented in three parts and arranged around the research objectives. The first part presents the factors that were ‘priority concerns’ of the participants. These factors were negative to the participants Māori identity construction. The second part presents factors that the participants felt were positive influences to their Māori identity. The third part presents results about the classical markers of Māori identity in relation to participants’ Māori identity.

Chapter 5 summarises and discusses the main findings in relation to the research objectives and the literature related to Māori identity. This chapter also presents the limitation of this research, gives recommendations, and explains how this study makes a significant contribution to research on Māori identity.

## **Chapter 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides a review of literature that informs understanding about Māori identity. The chapter starts with a general introduction to the concept of identity, and provides a definition applicable to this study (Section 2.2). Then, a review of two dominant Western approaches to identity from the fields of psychology and sociology is provided, along with a consideration of these with respect to this study on Māori identity (Section 2.3). In Section 2.4, literature describing ‘traditional’ or pre-European Māori identity is reviewed, and then, in Section 2.5, a review of literature related to the word Māori and its use to describe the indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand is provided. In Section 2.6, studies that move beyond description of Māori identity in essentialist terms to studies that attempt to explain factors that influence Māori identity construction are reviewed. In Section 2.7, additional literature that informs Māori identity, including typologies that describe diverse Māori identities, are reviewed. This chapter concludes with Section 2.8 by reviewing literature that critiques Māori identity theorised in essentialist terms by ‘cultural experts’. In this section, Māori identity is problematised and gaps in the literature are identified. This establishes the platform for the present study by highlighting the need for new ways of conceptualising Māori identity based on how Māori people construct their Māori identity in relation to their life experiences.

#### **2.2 Introduction to identity and definition of identity**

In this section, a general introduction to the concept of identity is provided, and then a definition applicable to this study is afforded. Research on identity is extensive and multi-disciplinary and, as Moeke-Pickering (1996, p. 1) wrote, “the study of identities is an enormous and complex undertaking”. Discussing how the concept of identity is precariously espoused in the New Zealand curriculum, Siteine (2013, p. 100) writes “identity has reached a level of generality that conceals its complexity”. Siteine (2013, p. 100) suggests that identity has become so common in modern usage

that it can be assumed that identity has a “long established history”, but, as Gleason (1983, p. 910) proclaims, the term identity only came into use in the 1950s, and is “an elusive and ubiquitous one”.

The concept of identity began to be used in the social sciences to explore increasingly pertinent questions at the time, such as ‘Who am I?’ and ‘What does it mean to be me?’ (Houkamau, 2007; Gleason, 1983; Siteine, 2013; Giorgio & Houkamau, 2021). These questions became particularly salient for immigrants experiencing alienation and loneliness (Siteine, 2013). These questions and issues about identity became more pronounced, and of particular importance and interest in the social sciences particularly in the fields of anthropology, psychology and sociology. Overtime, the concept of identity has developed as an analytical tool to study culture (in anthropology), human development (in psychology), and how humans relate to each other in social contexts (in sociology). The concept of identity has also extended to analysing how indigenous people make sense of themselves and their life experiences particularly in the context of change as a result of colonisation.

In terms of a defining identity, because there are various perspectives in the literature, pinning down an exact and precise definition is challenging. Erikson, one of the most preeminent and influential identity theorists, describes identity as something “noisily demonstrative”, as a “desperate quest”, and as something resembling a “deliberately confused search” (Erikson, 1968, p. 19). Rata (2012, p. 111) describes identity as “something we ‘are’, something we ‘do’, something we ‘develop’, or something we ‘belong to’”. Castells (1997, p. 6) writes that identity is “people’s source of meaning and experience”. For Houkamau and Sibley (2010, p. 11), identity “is an umbrella term used to describe an individual’s comprehension of him or herself as both an object and an actor in the social world”. Houkamau (2007, p. 20) defines identity “as part of the self-concept that relates to social comparison”, and explains that identity is relative, and that individuals “understand who they are by relating themselves to others in various ways”. Erikson said that ‘identity’ has become so common in scientific usage that to define it “would almost seem petty”, but he also cautioned that identity could be “made so narrow for purposes of measurement that the over-all meaning is lost” (Erikson, 1968, p. 5). Therefore,

giving a definition of identity upfront, for the purposes of this study, aims to give clarification about what exactly is being investigated.

This study reported in this thesis uses Nasir's definition of identity, which was also used by Webb (2014) in a study that explored the development of Māori students' political awareness and engagement. After a thorough review of the literature, Webb considered Nasir's definition most applicable to her study on Māori identity.

Nasir defined identity as:

A sense of self, constructed from available social categories, taken up by individuals and ascribed by cultural groups and social settings...Identity is a concept that also captures the interplay between social and cultural institutions and norms, and individual learning and developmental trajectories. Identities take shape as a part of a cultural process of becoming..." (Nasir 2011, p.17; quoted in Webb, 2014, p. 20).

This definition views identity as both an internal cognitive and individual process (drawing on the psychological approach), and acknowledges the role and influence social relationships have on identity (the sociological approach). The psychological and sociological approaches to identity are explained in Section 2.3. This definition of identity aligns with popular Māori articulations of Māori identity, as described in Section 2.6.3, and is therefore considered applicable to this study.

### **2.3 Western approaches to identity**

There are two dominant 'Western' approaches to theorising about identity - the psychological and sociological approaches (Siteine, 2013) – both of which are relevant to understanding Māori identity and, therefore, are applicable to this study. This section begins by reviewing the psychological approach, and then the sociological approach to identity. It then provides a discussion about how both approaches contribute to this study and are utilised to understand Māori identity. This section also considers which approach is best aligned to Māori conceptions of

identity. This section also considers the approach that is most congruent to the research framework of this study, which includes Kaupapa Māori combined with a social constructivist paradigm (which includes Kaupapa Māori merged with a social constructivist perspective), using the qualitative research methodology Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis.

### **2.3.1 Psychological approach to identity**

The psychological approach maintains that identity is primarily a thing of the mind, and focuses on the psychological workings of the inner-self (Erikson, 1968). Erikson was one of the first to theorise identity, and he observed; “the more one writes about this subject [identity], the more the word becomes a term for something as unfathomable as it is all-pervasive” (Erikson, 1968, p. 9). Erikson synthesised early conceptions of identity that were centred on the concept of the ego, and developed a theory of human development (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 2014). Erikson proposed that identity was about an individual’s self-understandings learned during childhood that were inevitably tested as the individual progressed through human stages of development (Erikson, 1968). According to Erikson, in the fifth stage of human development, during adolescence, individuals experience ‘identity crisis’ and ‘identity confusion’, and are required to resolve self-understandings to create a stable sense of self and personal identity (Erikson, 1968). Following identity consolidation, an individual is able to assume a productive place in society with a positive sense of purpose. Erikson considered this process of identity formation imperative to human kind’s ‘socio-genetic’ evolution because “only an adult ethics can guarantee to the next generation an equal chance to experience the full cycle of humanness” (Erikson, 1968, p. 42) Following this reasoning, identity resolution is a prerequisite to human development, and by implication, failure to consolidate adolescent self-understandings to a mature identity is degenerative to stable society and human evolution.

Erikson’s theorising on identity has been influential in the psychology literature, including Marcia’s ‘identity status model’ (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Marcia, 2014). Like Erikson, Marcia’s theory views identity as something that is constructed in the mind, and that involves a resolution of “childhood identifications in the individual’s

own terms, so that she/he establishes a reciprocal relationship with her/his society and maintains a feeling of continuity within her/himself" (Kroger & Marcia, 2011, p. 33). Marcia developed the identity status model in order to measure 'ego identity' as formulated by Erikson (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). The model consisted of four identity statuses termed; identity achievement, foreclosure, moratoriums, and identity diffusion. The first two statuses described individuals who had demonstrated commitment to identity formation, and the others low-commitment. Unlike Erikson's stages, Marcia's statuses are not necessarily linear but can change with environmental changes. Similarly to Erikson, Marcia's model focuses on identity at the individual level, where identity is seen to reside within an individual, as part of the self-concept (Rata, 2012). Other identity theorists extended Erikson and Marcia's theories (such as Mead).

Mead's theorising moved identity away from solely being an internal individual structure or process to a thing involving dynamic interaction with others. Mead proposed that understanding self was made possible through interactions with others, and identity involved a process consisting of projecting one's self (I) onto others, and others' responses back to self (me) (Mead 1934; Borell, 2005).

Other theorists, including Mead, proposed a relationship between identity and the roles that an individual assumes in a given situation and/or time of life (Borell, 2005; Castells, 1997; Houkamau, 2008). According to role theory, roles determine social learning and behaviours that enable the carrying out and fulfilment of roles. Castells (1997, p. 7) contends that roles are "defined by norms structured by institutions and organisations in society", and how much these influence an individual's identity relates to "negotiations and arrangements between individuals and these institutions and organisations". Role theory accounts for multiple identities as individuals can have more than one role at one time, and as they move between roles at different stages of life. An important aspect of role theory (when considering Māori identity) is that although it is concerned with identity at an individual level, role theory acknowledges the influence that social relations have on identity (Borell, 2005). Henri Tajfel took this concept further.

Of interest to this study, is the work of Tajfel who proposed that identity, although still an internal cognitive process, “emerges at the intersection of self and society” (Houkamau, 2008, n.p). Tajfel developed social identity theory that explains identity as “that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance of that membership” (cited in Rata, 2012, p. 6; Liu, 2005). Social identity theory has been used in research involving Māori, and is therefore explained in detail below (Rata, 2012).

Social identity theory centres around three key concepts, categorisation, identification and comparison (Borell, 2005). Categorisation involves individuals categorising people by placing them into groups, and giving social groups names that attribute meaning. Identification involves individuals assuming membership (or not) to a social group. Identity is determined by group membership, and strong group membership suggests a positive sense of identity (of the individual group member). The terms ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’ are used to describe group membership (and non-membership) as a result of this process of identification. Comparison involves individuals comparing groups. In this process individuals expound their own ‘in-group’ attributes by comparing themselves more favourably to other ‘out-groups’. Comparison can result in a positive sense of identity in individuals (as members of a group), but can also “contribute to social stereotyping, social judgement, inter-group conflict and crowd behaviour” (Borell, 2005, p.18). Social identity theory is useful when considering Māori identity because it acknowledges the role social relationships have on identity formation (Rata, 2012).

The psychological theories described above provide insight into how the participants of this study potentially go about constructing a Māori identity, particularly as an internal cognitive and mental process. How psychological theories are used in this study is explained further after considering the sociological approach to identity (see Section 2.3.2 below).

### **2.3.2 *Sociological approach to identity***

The sociological approach, increasingly informed by interpretivist and constructivist principles, views identity as socially constructed and related to the societal context in which individuals live. The sociological approach focuses on identity, not at the individual level, but at the level where an individual engages and interacts with the social world (Moeke-Pickering, 1996). Identity construction from this perspective is dynamic and involves not just how an individual interacts with the social world but also how the social world acts upon an individual (Liu et al., 2005). Therefore, in this way, identity and identity construction is complex, “fluid, situational and multiple” and “socially bestowed and sustained” (Siteine, 2013, p.102), and is about being and becoming (Hall, 1990; Webb, 2014). Identity is multiple, changeable and is also influenced by wider societal level factors (Houkamau, 2010). Identities are also historically contingent and involve power (Liu et al., 2005; Poata-Smith, 1996; McIntosh, 2005).

Recognising the critical role of power, McIntosh (2005) explains identity construction as a process of claims making involving not only how one sees ones-self but also how a person constructs ones-self in relation to others. Liu et al. (2005) add to this, explaining that identity “is a fundamental organising principle in the enactment of power...and a critical marker of inclusion and exclusion in social organisation” (Liu et al., 2005, p.15). Identity involves social relationships, and is about belonging and “what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others” (McIntosh, 2005, p. 38). Because identity is about power – it involves power dynamics where claims of the less powerful are over-powered by those in the more dominant group in society (McIntosh, 2005). From this perspective Māori identities have been heavily impacted on by Pākehā hegemony and Māori being a marginalised group in New Zealand society.

From the sociological perspective identities are also historically contingent and emerge from the historical, social, and political contexts in which they are embedded. In Aotearoa identities have been shaped and determined by historical process such as colonisation. Poata-Smith (1996, p.112-113) contends that identities are “blurred, multiple and historically contingent”, and that “what it means to identify as Maori or

as Pakeha changes radically throughout history, reflecting the dynamic relationship between changing material conditions and the way in which those societies are organised". The sociological approach to identity takes account of context and its role in influencing identity construction.

This study drew on the sociological approach and its premise that identity, and therefore Māori identity, is influenced by contextual factors. The sociological approach presupposes that these factors are both contemporary and historical, and, therefore, to understand the participants holistically it is necessary to have some knowledge of history, and understanding of how history can influence the participants and their Māori identity construction. The sociological approach also contends that social interactions and relationships influence identity. Based on this review of literature, this study presupposed that sociological factors influenced Māori identity construction. Therefore, sociological factors including significant historical events and social contextual factors and their probable influence on the participants, were taken into account during the analysis of the data, which is described further in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.3.

### ***2.3.3 Utility of both approaches to understanding Māori identity***

To better understand the participants, in terms of their Māori identity construction, both the psychological and sociological approaches were used in this study. The sociological approach encouraged awareness of, and therefore helped to identify, wider societal factors (described in the previous section) that potentially influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. The psychological approach encouraged (if not prioritised) consideration of individual constructions of Māori identity, and how each participant went about constructing Māori identity as an internal cognitive mental process.

It is pertinent to acknowledge that most research on Māori identity has favoured the sociological approach to identity (see for example, Borell, 2005; Kukutai, 2010; Rata, 2012). This is because the sociological approach aligns to Māori conceptions of identity that (traditionally at-least) view identity as situated around the concept of whakapapa (genealogy) and therefore located external to the individual. This point is

evidenced by the translation of the word identity into Māori. That word is ‘tuakiri’ and literally means ‘beyond the skin’, which indicates that ‘identity’ in a Māori sense is viewed primarily as an external and socially mediated experience (Rata, 2012).

However, although the sociological approach is important and useful to understanding the factors that influence Māori identity, it can pass over or ignore individual constructions of Māori identity (as noted by Houkamau and Sibley, 2010). Therefore the psychological approach to identity is also important because it acknowledges that Māori identity construction occurs at an individual level as an internal experience (Rata 2012). The psychological approach to understanding Māori identity also allows for diverse expressions of Māori identity by validating individual constructions of identity that may differ from more collective group articulations of identity.

A further point worth considering (in terms of the general preference amongst Māori researchers of the sociological approach to identity) is that the sociological approach concerns (often outside) forces acting on and influencing Māori identity (whether Māori like it or not). This arguments fits with binary discourse that locates Māori as oppressed people, without agency, and in direct opposition with Pākehā ‘oppressors’. From this perspective, (negative) forces act on Māori identity and Māori have little say in the matter. The psychological approach may accredit (intentionally/deliberately or not) more agency to Māori even if individually to make independent decisions about identity choices.

Finally, as identified by Houkamau (2010), individual subjective interpretations of Māori identity are under-reported in the research on Māori identity. The research has focused on collective interpretations of Māori identity (and often from an essentialist viewpoint of identity). This has proved problematic because it ignores and invalidates personal interpretations of Māori identity and has in turn contributed to authenticity debates and exclusion of Māori for not being Māori enough.

Therefore for the purposes of this study both the sociological approaches and the psychological approaches were used in order to provide a wide focus able to view

and take account of multiple factors that might be influencing the participants and in relation to their Māori identity construction.

## 2.4 Pre-European identities in New Zealand

Prior to the arrival of Europeans to Aotearoa, the indigenous inhabitants (the ancestors of Māori) did not conceive of themselves as Māori (Liu et al., 2005; O'Carroll, 2013). According to Liu et al. (2005, p, 13) there was no such thing as ‘Māori’ identity, as there “can be no sense of an ethnic self without a contrasting ‘other’” (Liu et al., 2005, p. 13). Pre-European Māori were organised into social groups that were determined by descent from common ancestors and related to distinct waka (canoe)<sup>18</sup> traditions (King, 2003; Walker 1996; Webb 2014). Iwi (tribe), hapū (sub-tribe), and whānau (extended family) were the most significant and important social groupings, and identity was an expression of this group membership (Liu, 2005; O'Carroll, 2013; Rata, 2012; Walker, 1996).

Pre-European ‘Māori’ identities developed from the indigenous peoples’ unique ontology, the unique environment, and how the Māori ancestors lived in the world. Hoskins and Jones (2017, pp. 51-52) state that pre-European Māori ontology (like all ontologies) “developed in a particular context of knowing that was itself moulded out of the problems of living, acting, and thinking in specific natural and social environments”. In Māori ontological thought, all things are relational and the “identity of things in the world is not understood as discrete or independent, but emerges through and relates to everything else” (Hoskins & Jones, 2017, p. 53). Objects in the world are connected through life force or mauri<sup>19</sup> that is present in all material objects, and fundamental in Māori ontology is the connection between things is privileged over the objects themselves (Hoskins & Jones, 2017). An example of this is the connection a Māori person has (or more accurately can have) with his or her tribal mountain. Independently both objects (a person and a mountain) are important, but assume greater importance when considered in relation to each other. This relational significance is evident when Māori people introduce themselves. In a Māori context, such as on a marae, Māori people (where they can)

---

<sup>18</sup> Waka is usually translated as canoe but is more accurately a double-hulled sailing vessel that polynesian navigators used to migrate to Aotearoa/New Zealand

<sup>19</sup> Mauri is defined as life principle, life force, vital essence.

often introduce themselves by saying their pepeha (tribal saying) and stating landmarks of relational significance such as their maunga tipuna (ancestral mountain). This practice is done to establish connections with others. This practice is regarded as preferable to a person introducing themselves by name alone and therefore independent and separate from others.

Ranginui Walker (1996) also discusses pre-European Māori identity in relation to a distinct and unique pre-European indigenous ontology. In doing so Walker explains that Māori ontology (and therefore pre-European Māori identities), extends beyond the material world to the immaterial. Walker also explains the critical role of whakapapa in reifying the connections between objects (whether material or immaterial).

Walker uses the popular aphorism to illustrate the connection between the material and non-material in Māori ontology: “E kore au e ngaro, he kākano i ruia mai i Rangiātea – And shall never disappear the seed which was sown in Rangiātea” (Walker, 1996, p. 26; Penetito, 2009). This saying emphasizes physical connections (in terms of the seed) back to Rangiātea, the physical homeland of Māori ancestors located in Hawaiki (Eastern Polynesia), but also acknowledges (indirectly) the spiritual homeland (Hawaiki). Hawaiki in Māori thinking is the physical place Māori come from and it is also the spiritual place Māori go back to, thus reinforcing the inter-relatedness of the material and spiritual worlds. This saying also relates to identity and aims to remind that a person with Māori whakapapa can never be lost because their identity is secured by their physical and spiritual connection (through whakapapa) back to the ancestral homeland.

Walker (1996) explains whakapapa<sup>20</sup> in the context of pre-European Māori identities, and that the recital and practice of whakapapa is central in Māori thinking (and to Māori identity) because it was the way in which Māori established and affirmed connections between things. It is important to note that in Māori ontology humans were connected to non-human objects through whakapapa, and it was through the recital and practice of whakapapa that reified those connections.

---

<sup>20</sup> Whakapapa is genealogy and includes knowledge and recital of genealogy.

In Māori thought (as traditionally conceived), whakapapa also connected the immaterial and spiritual worlds to the material, including the physical and social worlds. Pre-European Māori identities were inextricably linked to geography and landmarks such as, mountains and rivers, which acted as symbols or markers of identity. Whakapapa also mediated and determined social groups, which were based on common ancestry. Landmarks demarcated boundaries between different social groups, and signalled where one tribal identity began and another ended (Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Webb, 2014).

In pre-European Aotearoa, the tribe and connections to the tribe determined by whakapapa was the bedrock of traditional identity (Belich, 1997). Race or ethnicity did not become factors or determiners of (Māori) identity until contact with Europeans (Walker, 1996).

## 2.5 The word Māori

The word Māori means ‘normal’, ‘regular’ or ‘ordinary’ (O’Carroll, 2013; Liu, 2005, Kukutai, 2010). Before Europeans came to Aotearoa, the word Māori was not used to describe or identify people. The indigenous people differentiated themselves based on waka (migration vessels) and iwi (tribe) affiliation (Walker, 1996). The word Māori came in to use to differentiate the indigenous people from the Europeans coming to Aotearoa. The term Māori was used to distinguish people based on race and, at the same time, capture various and different tribal groups into a single entity (A. Durie, 1997). Correspondingly the word Pākehā, which means different, distinguished Europeans from the indigenous people, and also captured different European ethnicities such as, English, Scottish, Irish and Danes into a single group.

Belich (1997) hypothesised a way in which the terms Māori and Pākehā, and their corresponding identities, came into being by a process he calls ‘using and theming’. Using and theming, according to Belich, was the homogenisation or the ‘using’ of the indigenous people, which was “encouraged by the rise of Them” (Belich, 1997, p.16). The word Māori came into common use in the 1850s with an increasing sense of Māoriness and Māori identity, and this growing sense of ‘us’ as ‘Māori’ increased relative to the growing threat and strength of ‘them’ as Pākehā. Pākehā first became

a serious threat to indigenous independence in 1845, and as Belich (1997) claims, military, political and economic dominance shifted in their favour after the New Zealand wars (by the 1880s). Belich's argument suggests that the sense of Māoriness (as he describes it) or Māori identity (for the purposes of this study) became marked with Pākehā assuming power and dominance in Aotearoa. However, Belich remains cautious, adding that this sense of Māoriness was by no means universal (Belich, 1997).

Despite the (sometimes vague) prevalence of the terms Māori and Pākehā, the terms are problematic, as are the identities these words try to encapsulate. Te Ahukaramū Royal (2011) and A. Durie (1997) question the appropriateness of the term 'Māori' because it homogenises different tribal groups, and because when the term first emerged in the 1840s some tribes were at conflict. Similarly the term Pākehā was likely problematic for different European ethnic groups, such as the English, Irish, and Scots, who may have resisted a shared identity.

The precarious utility of the term Pākehā is also highlighted by the fact that today few New Zealanders of European descent choose to identify with the term (Giorgio & Houkamau, 2021). According to Liu (2005), 40-50% percent (depending on the sample) of Pākehā prefer the term 'European'. Liu (2005, p.77) also notes a common misconception (not amongst Māori) that the word Pākehā is a derogatory term that means "white pig". Royal (2011) also questions the utility of the term Māori when its most meaningful function (to him at-least) is to refer to a group of people (Māori people) who are only similar because they share a particular set of negative social statistics when compared to other groups (most notably Pākehā).

This review of literature sought to examine the word Māori, and its use to describe diverse indigenous people. It was carried out because the word can have a homogenising effect which belies the complex nature of Māori identity. This sets the scene for studies that researched Māori identity that are described in the next section.

## 2.6 Previous research on Māori identity

Most scholarly work on Māori identity has focused on explaining Māori culture and “a unique Māori view of the world” (Houkamau, 2008, p.1). As such, most of the literature on Māori identity is descriptive rather than explanatory and therefore, according to Houkamau (2008) under-theorised. There is scarce research that explains Māori identity in terms of how Māori identities are constructed, and or the factors that might influence Māori identity. However, there are some notable exceptions including, Borell (2005), Kukutai (2010), and Rata (2012), and therefore, these are reviewed in this section.

This section also reviews the work of Mason Durie (1995, 1997, 1999) and McIntosh (2005), who developed typologies to describe and explain diverse expressions of Māori identity. Durie’s theorising about Māori identity has also been informative to the longitudinal study ‘Te Hoe Nuku Roa’ that gathers quantitative data about Māori households and Māori identity. Therefore, Te Hoe Nuku Roa is also reviewed in this section. This section concludes by synthesising the findings of the work reviewed, and by explaining how the present study drew on and or extended those findings.

### 2.6.1 *Borell (2005) “Living in the City aint so bad: Cultural diversity in South Auckland”*

Borell’s (2005) significant and often cited study explored Māori identity beyond how Māori identity is typically constructed by Māori scholars and in ways that are not necessarily “congruent with the experiences of Māori as a diverse people” (Borell, 2005, p. 8). As has been explained elsewhere, articulations of Māori identity have been predominantly descriptive rather than explanatory. They have also been ideological, and have promoted an essentialist view of Māori identity that has excluded some Māori unable to meet certain cultural criteria (Giorgio & Houkamau, 2021). Most research on Māori identity has been framed from this perspective and focused on Māori identity in relation to access to classical markers of Māori identity. Borell’s exploration of Māori identity conducted in a South Auckland urban setting, aimed to uncover contemporary expressions of Māori identity that might complement or challenge traditional and dominant conceptions of Māori identity.

Borell's study revealed a number of significant findings that are relevant to the present study. First, Borell found the classical markers of Māori identity had varying degrees of significance for different participants. The most popular and significant classical markers of Māori identity (for the participants of her study) were; te reo Māori (the Māori language), tribe (knowing what it is and its location), and marae (awareness of and active engagement). Borell established that the classical markers of Māori identity were more important to those participants from the tribe where the research was conducted (South Auckland), and conversely the markers were less important for those participants that lived in South Auckland but came from an outside tribal area. This finding indicates Māori urbanisation<sup>21</sup> as a factor in Māori identity construction (or at-least a factor in the declining salience of the classical markers of Māori identity). This is a significant factor that could be a factor for the participants in the present study.

Another important finding from Borell's study is that Māori identity is not determined by conventional and essentialist factors alone, but also by 'experiential indicators'. These include, "negative stereotypes, statistics and representations of Maori around notions of poverty, violence and dysfunctional parenting and families" (Borell, 2005, p. 80). Borell found that through continued reinforcement in wider society these negative experiential indicators could become markers of Māori identity for some people. For example, a Māori person could think that being poor is a part of being Māori and therefore a part of Māori identity. Borell also found that some participants were able to create positive images of themselves as Māori based on other experiential indicators. The most significant was that some participants were able to construct a Māori identity based around a heightened sense of connection to their local environment (South Auckland), and this was despite a pervasive negative stigma about this area of Auckland.

Borell's findings are significant and relevant to the present study, and have similar aims, including investigating and exploring the relevance of the classical markers of Māori identity to young Māori people as they construct their Māori identity. Borell

---

<sup>21</sup> Urbanisation or Māori urbanisation describes the movement of Māori to towns and cities after the Second World War. In 1945 just over 20% of Māori lived in urban areas; by 2006 over 80% were urban dwellers.

identified various ‘experiential indicators’ influential to the participants of her study. The present study seeks to identify other factors additional to those identified by Borell. The present study aims to extend Borell’s work, firstly in terms of Kaupapa Māori and research method as in Borell’s study these were not explained in detail. Also the present study aimed to be aware if Borell’s factors are context dependent (an urban city in South Auckland) and/or if they are applicable to other contexts.

Borell’s study is particularly relevant to the study reported in this thesis (in aims and findings) as it did not have a predetermined view of Māori identity, but rather sought to find out about Māori identity by asking people. Borell considered the salience of the classical markers to Māori identity and found that this varied between participants. An important finding was that the classical markers were more important (to Māori identity) to participants from the tribe where the research was conducted. This finding indicates urbanisation as a reason for the changing salience of classical markers, and therefore suggests urbanisation as a reason why some Māori have a strong Māori identity while others do not. The present study will likely add to Borell’s by giving more information about the classical markers of Māori identity, for example, by identifying which are more prevailing and important to the participants and their Māori identity construction.

Borell’s findings also highlight experiential factors as influential to Māori identity construction and found a particular factor related in the context of her study (connection and affinity to the urban environment where the participants lived). Borell found that the participants made positive associations between place and expressions of their Māori identity. The present study will identify factors that are influential to the participants, and note if the factor found in Borell’s study is generalizable to the present research context.

### **2.6.2 *Kukutai (2010) “Thin Brown Line”***

Kukutai’s doctoral thesis (2010) explores the relationship between Māori ethnicity and inequality in New Zealand. Although her study focuses on Māori ethnicity (and thus makes a distinction between Māori ethnicity and Māori identity) this thesis is pertinent to understanding Māori identity. Drawing on international literature about

‘ethnicity’ Kukutai develops a framework to explain Māori ethnicity, and specifically seeks to explain and understand how Māori ethnicity can increase or decrease in salience (and how Māori ethnicity can correlate to disadvantage).

Drawing on three theories, new assimilation, social constructivism and racial formation, which were developed in immigrant - host contexts such as the USA, Kukutai adapts these theories to explain Māori ethnicity. Kukutai explains Māori ethnicity as contingent on macro-level processes she terms, ‘exogenous change and the institutional environment’, and micro-level processes, ‘ethnic identification and ethnic identity’.

The process of exogenous change and the institutional environment proposes that ideological and economic factors shape the broader social structure (the institutional environment) including formal rules (laws and policies) and informal structures (customs and values) (Kukutai, 2010, p.36). These forces bring about changes to the institutional environment that alter opportunities to foster, sustain or deny ties to Māori ethnicity (and therefore Māori identity). An example that fits this model is the changing value of the Māori language in New Zealand. For a significant period of New Zealand’s history (most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century), the Māori language was viewed as disadvantageous to life chances. This predominant idea influenced and determined the broader institutional environment that led to laws that banned the Māori language from New Zealand schools (and our grandparents being beaten at school for speaking Māori).

With the rise in (Māori) cultural nationalism – an ideological shift – and the idea that re-claiming Māori culture would reduce Māori disadvantage, the institutional environment changed to where the Māori language became one of the official languages of New Zealand, and where it is considered (by some) to be advantageous to life chances. Kukutai acknowledges that there can be a lag between official state policies and informal structures (the actual beliefs and values of people), so that for example, even though the Māori language has received government recognition, it can still be viewed as unimportant and disadvantageous (to life chances) by the majority of the, particularly dominant, population.

The next component of Kukutai's framework for explaining Māori ethnicity is the micro-level processes of ethnic identification and ethnic identity. Ethnic identification refers to the identification or placement of self, either by self or by another, into an ethnic category, (for example Māori). Ethnic identification can and is often ascribed by others due to physical characteristics such as skin colour, and or can result from a "subjective sense of belonging" (Kukutai, 2010, p. 37). Kukutai makes a distinction between ethnic identification and ethnic identity, which she defines as, "an ideational construct comprising two distinct dimensions" (Kukutai, 2010, p. 38). One dimension is developmental and involves a 'search' for identity. The second is an affective dimension that requires "affirmation, belonging, and commitment" (Kukutai, 2010, p. 38). The affective dimension of ethnic identity is often associated with attachment and solidarity to ethnic group. Ethnic identity is also often expressed through ethnic ties that are not stable, 'essential' individual traits but rather the symbols and "discursive" practices that define a group. Ethnic ties are therefore, changeable, and can also be strengthened and/or can decline in significance during an individual's life.

Additional to pertinent explanations of Māori ethnicity, relevant to understanding Māori identity in the present study, Kukutai's research revealed significant findings in relation to Māori identity. The study found significant ethnic and socio-economic segmentation within the Māori population, and that Māori identification based on ethnicity was a stronger predictor of disadvantage across a range of socio-economic indicators. Māori identification based solely on 'ancestry' was a less salient predictor of disadvantage. Kukutai found that specific ties to Māori identity were a stronger predictor of social disadvantage than Māori identification per se. This finding is of significance to the study reported in this thesis, as it examined factors that influence Māori identity construction. Kukutai's study suggests that some factors of Māori identity could be advantageous to an individual's life chances and other factors (such as ethnic ties) could be disadvantageous to life chances. The study reported in this thesis builds on Kukutai's study by examining factors that influence Māori identity construction and, in doing so, gain insight into which factors might be more advantageous and beneficial to an individual's life experiences.

Kukutai's study is particularly relevant in its theorising about Māori identity and how it explains that Māori identity can change over time, and that this happens as a result of various macro and micro level processes combined with an internal process of ethnic identification. Kukutai's study precipitates awareness of these macro and micro level factors and encourages a wide lens view of potential factors that might influence Māori identity construction. Kukutai's study also suggests that certain ties to Māori identity (classical markers) are more advantageous than others. There is very limited research that supports this finding, therefore, the study reported in this thesis will extend this study and serve to fill a research gap.

### ***2.6.3 Rata (2012) “Te Pitau o te Tuakiri: Affirming Maori Identities and Promoting Wellbeing in State Secondary Schools”***

Rata's (2012) study investigated Māori identity development in the context of state secondary schools to explore the relationship between Māori cultural engagement, Māori identity, and psychological wellbeing.

Rata acknowledges the difficulties defining Māori identity due to the fact that Māori people experience diverse realities and are not a homogenous group. Rata explains traditional Māori identities in the same way that they are typically described (see Section 2.7.2 and Section 2.7.3 below for examples), and that contemporary Māori identities are historically contingent and have changed in response to changing socio-political conditions. Rata cites colonisation and state policies as key factors that have weakened Māori culture and Māori identity, including various ‘legal instruments’ such as; the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 (enabled the confiscation of Māori lands), the Native Schools Act 1867 (aimed at assimilating Māori), and the Tohunga Suppression Act 1908 (which outlawed Māori healers and forms of traditional Māori healing and knowledge). These (and other state policies) resulted in loss of land, resources, power and control, and had the affect of “devastating Māori social collectives and cultural identity” (Rata, 2012, p. 4).

Rata's analysis contends that colonisation has resulted in new forms of Māori identity, and that many Māori are unable to conform to or maintain traditional Māori ‘culture’. As has been noted elsewhere in the literature Māori have been separated

from the “determining elements upon which the identity of their ancestors had rested” (Fitzgerald et al., 1996, p. 35). Rata explains that, while some Māori are ‘deeply rooted’ in traditional Māori culture, through various ‘voluntary and involuntary processes’, many Māori have “more or less assimilated to Pākehā culture. (Rata, 2012, p. 4)

Rata invokes three western theories, social identity theory (explained elsewhere), ethnic identity, and acculturation to explain ‘voluntary and involuntary processes’ that have resulted in diverse forms of Māori identity. She also attempts to reconcile these theories to ‘traditional’ conceptions of Māori identity that centre around ‘whakapapa’ (genealogy), and view identity construction as an external process involving social relations and context.

Rata found that Māori cultural engagement influenced Māori identity positively, and that Māori identity had a positive influence on wellbeing. Rata’s study also found that school environments (likely) influence Māori identity construction (of Māori adolescents), and therefore the more a school promotes Māori culture the more secure Māori student’s Māori identity is likely to be.

In Rata’s study Māori cultural engagement was measured using indicators taken from Te Hoe Nuku Roa which included: knowledge of whakapapa; marae participation; and Māori language proficiency (Rata, 2012). As such, Rata’s study has a somewhat prescribed and relatively narrow view of Māori identity. Given this, the study reported in this thesis extends Rata’s study by gathering qualitative data about Māori identity and with the aim of promoting a wider and more inclusive view of Māori identity.

Rata’s study is significant because it correlated Māori cultural engagement to Māori identity and found that Māori cultural engagement positively predicted Māori identity. Rata’s study is one of only a few studies that focuses on Māori identity construction at the stage of adolescents, a critical period of identity development as identified by Erikson (1968). However, Rata’s study has a relatively narrow view of Māori culture (using prescribed indicators from Te Hoe Nuku Roa). The present study aims to extend Rata’s work by taking a wider view of Māori culture and by

gathering qualitative data in the form of participants' words about what makes up Māori identity.

This section has reviewed studies related to Māori identity, all carried out by Māori researchers and, thus, representing an insider perspective of Māori identity. These studies are frequently cited in the literature, and the findings were relevant to the study reported in this thesis. The study reported in this thesis extends these previous studies by obtaining qualitative data from Māori boys, a group under reported in studies about Māori identity.

## **2.7 Typologies and measures of Māori identity: Hall, Durie, McIntosh, and Te Hoe Nuku Roa**

This section begins by reviewing Stuart Hall's writings on cultural identity because his work has been cited in the literature on Māori identity and has been influential to (some) Māori academic theorising about Māori identity, including M. Durie (1995, 1997) and McIntosh (2005), who developed typologies to describe diverse types of Māori identity. In the present study, the aim was not to describe Māori identity in terms of a typology or particular predetermined identity type, but rather to privilege the participants' perspectives of their Māori identity. However, the typologies reviewed here (Sections 2.7.2 and 2.7.3) are relevant to the present study because they informed how I interpreted what the participants said about their Māori identity. In this way the typologies provided language to describe and a framework to understand what the participants said about their Māori identity. M. Durie's (1995, 1997) work has also been instrumental to Te Hoe Nuku Roa, a longitudinal study of Māori households that incorporates elements of Māori identity. Therefore, Te Hoe Nuku Roa is reviewed in Section (2.7.4) and its applicability to the present study considered.

### **2.7.1 *Stuart Hall on cultural identity***

Jamaican-born British cultural theorist Stuart Hall devised two formulations of cultural identity, the 'essential' identity, and the 'positioned' identity. These have

influenced typologies that describe Māori identity, and are therefore relevant to the present study.

The ‘essential’ identity comprises a shared culture and history of a people acting along imaginary axes of similarity and continuity (Hall, 1990). This identity is made up of essential ‘cultural’ parts that are both fixed and static. The essential identity is (re)-created in a way that Hall describes as a ‘production of identity’ that goes beyond unearthing what was lost from the colonial experience to a ‘rediscovery’ through a retelling of the past. Hall contends the critical role of the essential identity when he says it must be ‘excavated’ and brought to light for its emancipatory power. Hall acknowledges the political orientation and politicising power of this position for colonised and marginalised peoples in post-colonial struggle to agitate and challenge dominant regimes.

The second cultural identity type is the ‘positioned’ identity described as containing critical points of similarity, but also points of significant difference that make up “what we really are”, and “what we have become” (Hall, 1990, p. 225). Hall states that when talking about identity we cannot talk for long about ‘one experience and one identity’ without encountering discontinuity and rupture. The positioned identity includes notions of power, and involves how colonised people are positioned within the ‘narratives of the past’. From this perspective colonised people are positioned (not by themselves) within the dominant discourses and the received histories of a country. As colonised people ‘decolonise’ (assuming this is even possible) or in Freirean terms ‘conscientise’, and regain some semblances of power (at-least the power of self-identification) colonised peoples re-position themselves within their own revised narratives and retellings of the past. Hall (1990, p.225) declares that identities “come from somewhere, have histories....undergo constant transformation...are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power”.

Elements of Hall’s theorising are present in typologies developed by Māori authors to describe Māori identity. For example, the essential identity links closely to traditional type identities described by both Durie and McIntosh. The ‘positioned’ identity is similar to Durie’s ‘marginalised’ Māori identity, and McIntosh’s ‘forced’ Māori identity type. Hall’s work stimulates awareness of factors that likely influence

Māori identity – particularly the interplay between history, culture and power. Although Hall wrote about a different context, I found his work persuasive and therefore likely informed how I interpreted and analysed what the participants said about their Māori identity.

### **2.7.2 Mason Durie' typology of Māori identity**

Durie's work on Māori identity and particularly how it correlates to wellbeing has been influential. Durie (1995) identified a number of identity frameworks aimed to capture 'characteristics' of Māori identity and what it means to be Māori. These included well-known frameworks in the health sector, such as Durie's 'Te Whare Tapa Wha', and Pere's 'Te Wheke' that both included Māori 'cultural' aspects considered necessary for optimum health and wellbeing. Durie also described studies carried out that used 'Māoriness' scales that aimed to measure and articulate what it means to be Māori.

However, M. Durie (1997) acknowledges problems with these scales that presume a homogenous Māori identity and therefore as a response formulated a typology of Māori identities that aimed to capture and describe Māori diversity (Houkamau & Sibley, 2010). Durie's first Māori sub-group included those that are 'culturally' Māori and have knowledge and understanding of whakapapa (genealogy), Māori language and tikanga (customs). The second group are bicultural – which means they identify as Māori and are able to operate effectively with Pākehā. The third group are marginalised and not able to operate effectively with Pākehā or other Māori.

### **2.7.3 Tracey McIntosh**

Recognising the critical role of power, McIntosh (2005) explains identity construction as a process of claims making involving not only how one sees ones-self but also how a person constructs ones-self in relation to others. McIntosh articulates that identity is about social relationships – about belonging and "what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others" (McIntosh, 2005, p. 38). Explaining Māori identity, McIntosh states that marginality is a factor in Māori identities because Māori (through colonisation) have been positioned at the

margins of New Zealand society. McIntosh asserts that identity construction is a political process and Māori identities are often created in conditions of scarcity, or are expressions of desperation and resistance. McIntosh identifies the influence of power on identity construction specifically for marginalised people where “identity may be less about choice and more about the dominance of outsider perceptions” (McIntosh, 2005, p. 38).

McIntosh acknowledges the plural nature of identities, and that a person’s Māori identity is linked with other elements of identity such as, that of a ‘Kiwi’ or ‘New Zealander’, or other aspects of identity including, gender, age, class and sexual orientation (McIntosh, 2005, p. 38). Recognising that categorising identities can be overly simplistic, McIntosh provides a typology of contemporary Māori identities as a means to explain some prevalent expressions of Māori identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The typology has three categories of identities and although each group is described as if it were singular each identity type can be considered in umbrella term encapsulating multiple similar type identities.

The first identity is called the ‘traditional identity’ and is closely likened to the ‘essential’ identity described by Hall (1990) and the ‘culturally Māori’ identity type described by M. Durie (1997). McIntosh affirms the traditional identity is not a pre-European identity but refers to an identity articulated by (some) Māori that is demonstrated by affiliation to certain specific ‘cultural’ markers (referred to in this study as classical markers of Māori identity). McIntosh highlights some of the classical markers including whakapapa as a key component, and other important markers including, mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), proficiency in te reo Māori and tikanga (cultural protocols) (McIntosh, 2005). The traditional identity type is described as being the right of those who can claim it through whakapapa, but also that this identity articulation comes with a set of expectations specifically that a person will “not only be Maori...but will also know what being a Maori is and will act Maori” (McIntosh, 2005, p. 44). Similar to Hall’s essential identity the traditional identity has ‘fixed’ elements sourced from the past, and is also a ‘power-positioned’ identity that aims to advance certain ‘Māori’ political aims. McIntosh claims that the ‘traditional identity’ type is the dominant Māori identity form in Aotearoa/New Zealand. She also acknowledges a pitfall with the traditional identity because it can

be exclusive and elitist, and can lead to issues of authenticity with some Māori being considered not Māori enough for not conforming to specific ethnic ties to identity.

In McIntosh's typology, the second identity is the fluid identity, which "is a response to the social/material world as well as an accommodation, manipulation and gentle rebuff of the traditional identity" (McIntosh, 2005, p. 46). The fluid identity can be described as a fusion identity that 'plays' with traditional markers of identity such as, te reo Māori and kapa haka and grounds these in a contemporary social landscape. The fluid identity is elucidated in Borell's important work on the Māori identities of urban Māori youth in South Auckland (Borell, 2005). Borell's study emphasizes a need for a "greater appreciation of the dynamics of identity formation", and more flexible definitions of what it means to be Māori (McIntosh, 2005, p. 46). The fluid identity has been (in some quarters) misconceived and dismissed as an indicator of societal and cultural dysfunction, however, Borell and McIntosh view fluid identities as an authentic attempt by (predominantly) young urban Māori to make meaning from their genuine lived experiences (McIntosh, 2005; Borell, 2005). McIntosh predicts that the fluid identity type will become the dominant Māori identity type in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The third identity articulated by McIntosh is the forced identity, which includes identities formed under conditions of deprivation and the most extreme conditions of marginality. This identity type is considered 'forced' on an individual rather than constructed by them, and the forced identity is based more on the constructions and perceptions of the outsider group (McIntosh, 2005). McIntosh links the forced identity type to various negative social statistics and implies that forced identity is a correlate to social deprivation, such as higher unemployment, lower academic attainment and poverty.

#### **2.7.4 Te Hoe Nuku Roa**

M. Durie's typology and theorising about Māori identity has also been informative to the development of Te Hoe Nuku Roa, a longitudinal study of Māori households aimed to capture the diversity that exists in Māori lived experiences, and by doing so provide a more realistic view of Māori identity. Te Hoe Nuku Roa correlates cultural,

socio-economic and personal factors of Māori households over time. Te Hoe Nuku Roa is relevant to this study not just because of its foundational theorising about Māori identity but because it also includes measures of cultural identity where the aim is to test the salience of these characteristics over time (Durie, 1995).

Te Hoe Nuku Roa is a relational framework involving four interacting axes, Paihere Tangata (human relationships), Te Ao Māori (Māori culture and identity), Ngā Āhuatanga noho-ā-tangata (socio-economic circumstances), Ngā Whakanekeneketanga (change over time). For the purposes of the present study, axis two, Te Ao Māori (Māori culture and identity), is most relevant and seeks to measure Māori identity by the following subsets: personal identity, cultural heritage, natural resources, Māori institutions (access to). Te Hoe Nuku Roa is significant to this study because it attempts to measure or capture Māori (ness) beyond measures of culture and knowledge. However, the model describes Māori identity in a predetermined way, which can deny or limit exploration of other factors that could make up Māori identity. Houkamau and Sibley (2010) also note that Te Hoe Nuku Roa does not assess factors that influence Māori identity that occur at a personal, ‘subjective’ or individual level. This study aims to explore Māori identity construction without preconceptions of what Māori identity includes (except for whakapapa and self-identification), and attempt to gain information at the level of subjective experience. Therefore, the present study extends information gathered by Te Hoe Nuku Roa by collecting data at the level of subjective experience and by potentially identifying factors beyond those identified in that model.

Te Hoe Nuku Roa, Hall’s theorising on cultural identity, and the typologies described above influenced the analysis and interpretation of the participants’ words. For example, if I interpreted that the participant was lacking agency in their identity choices, I may have described that identity as “forced”, drawing on McIntosh’s typology. If I interpreted a participant’s Māori identity as ideological and politically motivated, I might draw on Hall’s typology (see Section 2.7.2.1) and describe that identity as an “essential” identity type influenced by the dominant discourse on Māori identity propagated by Māori cultural experts. In this way, the typologies influenced my interpretation and how I described the participants Māori identity.

## 2.8 Problematising Māori Identity

There is a general reluctance within Kaupapa Māori to critique and challenge notions of ‘truth’ particularly those espoused by Māori academia or by Māori cultural ‘experts’ (Mahuika, 2008). The reasons for this are likely various, including a general weariness (among Māori) of being criticised and considered deficient in Pākehā dominated New Zealand society. Related to this Māori are unlikely to critique the theorising and work of other Māori within Pākehā dominated institutions, including universities, in case Pākehā expand this critique in a ‘I told you so’ type fashion.

Despite this reluctance to critique, there is (now a) general criticism of a homogenous view of Māori identity. Rangihau (1992) was one of the first to question the homogenous nature of Māori identity, which he claimed was at the expense of his Tūhoe (tribal) identity (an argument taken up by others including A. Durie (1997) (Pihamo et al., 2002). As noted by Walker (1996), Māoritanga was a word used synonymously (particularly from the 1970s to the 1990s) to mean Māori identity, and Rangihau was one of the first to critique this concept saying:

It seems to me there is no such thing as Māoritanga because Māoritanga is an all-inclusive term which embraces all Māori. And there are so many different aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it’s not a history that can be shared among others (Rangihau, 1992, p.190).

Using an existential lens, Hokowhitu (2010) problematises Māori identity claiming the repatriation of ‘pre-colonial’ culture as inauthentic because this culture comes from a world and time we know little about, and is therefore not representative of the ‘facticity’ or our actual everyday experiences. Perhaps the most ardent critique of Māori identity politics, Poata-Smith (1996), argues that Māori academic prescriptions of Māori identity are ideological and influenced by ‘cultural nationalism’, and similarly to Hokowhitu, do not relate to how most Māori people actually view themselves (Borell, 2005). Hokowhitu (2010) also questions constructions of Māori identity that are ‘tethered’ to out-dated forms of resistance

and ones that position Māori as ‘the other’ or ‘the colonised’ in a coloniser/colonised binary (Mercier, 2020). Moeke-Pickering (1996) describes the constructing of Māori identity in opposition terms as a ‘threat’ to Māori identity because it has led to a competition for resources.

Some Māori academics have started to use research to challenge the notion of a homogenous notion of Māori identity, and that Māori identity should be dependent on certain prescribed ethnic ties (including the classical markers of Māori identity). For example, marae is often perceived as important to Māori identity (see Section 2.6.3), and yet Durie (1999) found evidence that marae are not part of the everyday experience of most Māori (a point supported in official statistics and in a study by Meijl (2006)).

Significant research has also been conducted into Te Reo Māori (the Māori language) in order to reveal its salience in Māori peoples’ lives and to Māori identity. Research has found that claiming te reo Māori as a prerequisite to having a Māori identity is problematic not least because only about 21.3 percent of Māori can “hold a conversation about a lot of everyday things in te reo Māori” (Birnie, 2018 p. 12).

Census data indicates that some ethnic ties usually considered constituent to Māori identity are not significant to large numbers of Māori. For example in the last census 110, 928 Māori (measured by Māori descent), approximately 17 percent, did not know the name of their iwi (tribe). This was also an 8.4 percent increase since the census of 2006. This information shows a declining salience of the classical marker “tribe” to Māori identity.

Various Māori authors have acknowledged issues of authenticity that arise when Māori feel not Māori enough and unable to meet prescriptions about what constitutes Māori identity (Poata-Smith, 1996; Mahuika, 2008; Hokowhitu, 2010; Gillion et al., 2019). Issues of authenticity have been described as a process of ‘horizontal marginalisation’, where those marginalised in mainstream society (in this case Māori) can turn on one another (Cram, Ormond, & Carter, 2006). In a study (reviewed by Birnie) about adult Māori language learners, Birnie described the psychological challenge for some adult Māori language learners, and discovered that

some Māori avoid Māori situations for fear of their Māori identity being challenged (Birnie, 2018).

Poata-Smith (1996) is probably the most damning critique of ‘cultural nationalism’ with its emphasis on reclaiming a pre-ordained Māori culture and identity. He asserts this strategy has been an ‘unmitigated disaster’ for Māori because it has failed to address structural impediments that disadvantage Māori, and therefore has done little to reverse the social disadvantage impacting on Māori (Meijl, 2006).

The seemingly unproblematic nature of Māori identity is epitomized in the title of Ranginui Walker’s seminal text ‘Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle Without End’. This text has been profoundly influential to many Māori students, researchers and academics and has been critical to our conscientisation. And yet the title suggests that our identity and conceptions of our selves (constructed in contradiction) predict an existential life of struggle, a condition that other Māori authors have described as “exhausting” (Ormond et al., 2006, p. 176; Mercier, 2020).

The present study is required because common conceptions and prescriptions about Māori identity are problematic and may not be relevant for significant numbers of Māori people. Also, there is little research that reports the subjective (individual) interpretations of Māori identity, which creates a pressing need to find how individual Māori feel about, and go about forming a Māori identity (Houkamau, 2010). Also, as identity is influenced by contextual and wider societal factors, there is a need to identify factors (from context and lived experiences) that affect Māori people and influence their Māori identity construction. It is anticipated that the present study will reveal factors under-reported in previous studies on Māori identity.

This study aims to fill gaps in the current literature. For example, the present study will likely uncover information about the classical markers of Māori identity, and then, be able to discuss their salience (or not) to Māori identity. Also, most research on Māori identity has been quantitative and therefore the present study extends previous studies by gaining rich qualitative data from a particular sub-group of Māori individuals, Māori boys, who are largely absent in the research literature.

It is anticipated that the present study will be able to make some deductions about the accuracy and relevance of theorising about Māori identity to the Māori identity of actual Māori people. It is also anticipated that the present study will provide support for a wider view of Māori identity based on the views of Māori people sometimes excluded from research.

## **2.9 Chapter Summary**

In order to derive a definition of identity suitable for this study of Māori identity, this chapter reviewed literature on identity from the fields of psychology and sociology. Psychology proposes that identity is primarily a thing of the mind, and focuses on the psychological workings of the inner-self. Sociology views identity as socially constructed and related to the societal context in which individuals live.

After reviewing the literature I considered Nasir's definition of identity suitable to a study of Māori identity because it adequately incorporated both approaches and also aligned with formulations of Māori identity made by Māori scholars. Nasir's definition supports that Māori identity involves an internal cognitive process (drawing on psychology) and influenced by external factors including social relationships with others (drawing on sociology). Nasir's definition of identity can align to traditional conceptions of Māori identity, which centre on whakapapa (genealogy) and are also indicated by the concept of 'tuakiri' (beyond the skin). The definition used in this study extends traditional conceptions of Māori identity to the extent that it incorporates the psychological approach to allow for individual and diverse conceptions and expressions of Māori identity.

The literature review then reviewed literature that describes pre-European Māori identities. The review highlighted that Māori authors particularly aim to reveal a unique Māori ontology and Māori world-view, and following from this, elements that many Māori authors consider constituent to Māori identity such as, whakapapa (genealogy). The review of literature then unpacked the word Māori, including its meaning and how it became used in Aotearoa/New Zealand to describe the indigenous people after the arrival of Europeans. My review indicated that the word Māori enabled 'othering', allowed distinctions with Europeans (Pākehā), but also had

the effect of homogenising what were previously diverse Māori identities. This ‘othering’ and homogenising of diverse peoples, along with colonisation, contributed to the complex nature of Māori identity, and this section set the scene for a review of research studies on Māori identity.

I then reviewed past studies by Māori authors who have researched Māori identity. Although these studies are few, those by Borell (2005), Kukutai (2010) and Rata (2012) were informative and significant to the present study, and therefore, were reviewed in detail. This study sought to add to and extend the findings of these studies, for example Borell’s (2005), by exploring further the salience of the classical markers of Māori identity to Māori identity construction and by identifying experiential factors not identified in her study. This study reported in this thesis also build on Kukutai’s (2010) work by identifying factors that influence Māori identity construction, and gained some insight into factors that were advantageous to the participants’ feelings and life experiences. And finally, this thesis extended Rata’s (2012) study by gathering qualitative data about Māori identity and by adopting a more inclusive view of Māori identity.

I then reviewed additional literature influential to theorising Māori identity, including the cultural theorist Stuart Hall (1990) and typologies of Māori identity developed by Māori authors M. Durie (1997) and McIntosh (2005). I reviewed this work because it was informative to my understanding of Māori identity and likely influenced how I interpreted the participants’ words and what they had to say about their Māori identity.

Finally, in this chapter, I reviewed literature by Māori authors that problematise Māori identity and the way in which cultural experts have prescribed Māori identity in essentialist terms. Findings of these studies suggest that the essential Māori identity is inauthentic for many Māori. The review contextualised the present study and highlighted the need to understand Māori identity from authentic life experiences.

## **Chapter 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODS**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter describes the research design and methods used in this study. As described in Chapter 1, this study was located within a Kaupapa Māori framework, including notions of theory and practice, where I aimed to contribute to the continued development of Kaupapa Māori as a thorough and rigorous research framework. In order to formulate the research design, it was necessary to theorise Kaupapa Māori to clarify its metaphysical assumptions. Theorising of Kaupapa Māori (located in Chapter 1, Section 1.3.2) informed the research design including incorporating the qualitative research approach interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) and its methods of collecting and analysing data.

Information in this chapter is organised under the following headings:

- Research Questions (Section 3.2);
- Research Design (Section 3.3);
- Sample/Selection of Participants (Section 3.4);
- Data Collection (Section 3.5);
- Data Analysis (Section 3.6);
- Ensuring Trustworthiness (Section 3.7);
- Ethical Considerations (Section 3.8);
- Chapter Summary (Section 3.9).

#### **3.2 Research Questions**

The overarching aim of this research was to explore the feelings of Māori boys in order to learn about the factors that influence Māori boys and their Māori identity construction. This study sought to find out more about the classical markers of Māori identity in terms of their influence, if any, on the Māori boys and their Māori identity construction. This study also aimed to conduct research from a Kaupapa Māori

framework in order to contribute to Kaupapa Māori research. The specific research questions were:

- What are the feelings of Māori boys (at one New Zealand mainstream high school) as they construct their Māori identity?
- What are the factors that influence Māori boys as they construct their Māori identity?
- What influence do the classical markers of Māori identity have on Māori boys' as they construct their Māori identity?

### **3.3 Research Design: Kaupapa Māori and Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis**

This section details the research design that includes Kaupapa Māori and the qualitative research approach interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). Section 3.3.1 describes Kaupapa Māori as a theoretical lens and explains how Kaupapa Māori reflects the research bias. Section 3.3.2 discusses the role of the researcher as the main research instrument in qualitative research and uses this as a backdrop to the self-reflexive presentation provided in the prologue. Section 3.3.3 describes Kaupapa Māori's compatibility to qualitative research methods. Section 3.3.4 introduces IPA and explains its congruence to Kaupapa Māori and to this research study on Māori identity. Section (3.3.5) concludes by describing Kaupapa Māori principles and practices that guided this research.

#### ***3.3.1 Kaupapa Māori***

Kaupapa Māori is the theoretical lens of this study. Creswell (2014, p. 533) explains theoretical lens as “a guiding perspective or ideology that provides structure for advocating for groups or individuals...” Kaupapa Māori as a research framework has emerged as a response to Western research, which has, historically, been unfavourable to Māori (L. Smith, 1999, 2017). Western research has been described as “scientific colonialism” because of its role in dismantling and replacing Māori knowledge (Cram, 2006, p. 32). Lee (2009, p. 1) describes Western research as “codified with ideologies such as imperialism and colonialism”. Bishop and Glynn

(1999) describe Western research and knowledge as perpetuating colonial values and ideologies of Pākehā superiority. Kaupapa Māori as a theoretical perspective represents a counter claim or opposing ideology to the ideological claims made by and within Western research (L. Smith, 1999, 2017; G. Smith, 2015, 2017; Pihamo, 2010).

Graham Hingangaroa Smith (2012, 2017) attributes the emergence of Kaupapa Māori to the transformative ‘praxis’ of Māori struggling for educational change and the right for Māori children to be educated in schools amenable to, and not abhorrent to Māori cultural aspirations. By doing so, Smith makes an explicit link between Māori struggles for self-determination and Freire’s (1970) “Pedagogy of the Oppressed”. Kaupapa Māori research has grown from this context alongside other emancipatory projects articulated by marginalised groups such as, indigenous peoples worldwide, feminists and African Americans (Pipi et al., 2004).

Kaupapa Māori has a clear political intent and maintains an unwavering position on Māori political rights as affirmed by the Treaty of Waitangi (1840). Despite the dominant narrative in New Zealand, which promotes ambiguity about what was agreed to with the signing of the treaty, the position from a Kaupapa Māori perspective is clear. Māori did not cede sovereignty to the Crown in the 1840, a position that is supported by the Waitangi Tribunal (Wai 1040, 2014). Therefore, the Treaty of Waitangi is a definitive affirmation of Māori sovereignty. Kaupapa Māori therefore aims to operationalize Māori self-determination and agentic positioning and behaviour as described by Bishop and Glynn (1999).

Kaupapa Māori indicates the research bias and the critical lens from which this study was undertaken. The research lens is informed by my own learning about Kaupapa Māori (and learning about Māori kaupapa generally), which has facilitated understanding Māori facticity and our place (and position) in the world. This learning has included a cultural element (as is advocated in Kaupapa Māori), including learning and engaging in Māori cultural activities, particularly, te reo Māori and taiaha (Māori weaponry). My learning has also involved a structural element, including understanding Pākehā hegemony and structural arrangements that impede Māori. Learning about Kaupapa Māori has been a process of (personal)

conscientisation and has resulted in a strong desire to resist. This (new) critical approach locates the research lens in the ‘struggle’ for and to be Māori. Yet, over time, this ‘struggle’ has become exhausting, and although necessary, I have come to view this struggle as not always conducive to inclusivity and positive Māori development. Therefore, in recent years, I have become more interested in Māori development without struggle. This has caused a rethink and new theorising about Kaupapa Māori and what it means to be Māori. However, it is important to acknowledge that this re-theorising is occurring in line with Kaupapa Māori and its on-going development. Currently, my current dominant disposition is the positive development of Māori as Māori, independent of and not in opposition to Pākehā. These thoughts make up my current worldview, which I believe is an accurate reflection of what can be described as a Kaupapa Māori perspective.

### ***3.3.2 Researcher as the main research instrument in qualitative studies (including in this study) and rationale for a self-reflexive presentation***

In qualitative research, the researcher can be described as the main research instrument for collecting qualitative data (Yin, 2011). Yin (2011, p. 13) explains this is because real-world phenomena such as, culture, “cannot be measured by external instruments but only can be revealed by making inferences about observed behaviours and by talking to people”. Researcher inferences or interpretations are secondary constructions of participants’ constructions about the world. A researcher’s interpretations are informed by the researcher’s preconceived categories or priori patterns that determine the researcher’s own meaning making of events and phenomena (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). Within this, multiple interpretations of events are possible, and researcher’s interpretations are biased, and from their point of view. Therefore, to gain insight into a researcher’s interpretation, and to understand why the researcher interpreted an event (or participants’ account) the way they did, a self-reflexive presentation is recommended in qualitative studies, in a way that highlights important elements of the research lens.

The self-reflexive presentation should be in “as revealing a way as possible”, in order to allow the reader to make their own assessment about the influence of the research

bias on the research study (Yin, 2011, p. 270). An additional purpose of the self-reflexive presentation is to enhance trustworthiness, transparency, credibility and rigour in qualitative research designs, and this aspect is covered further in section (3.7). Due to the length (and style) of the self-reflexive presentation it is presented as a prologue to the thesis (see pages xiii to xxii). The purpose of the self-reflexive presentation was to present myself (as the research instrument) as thoroughly as possible, and in a way that identifies elements of my personal self and background, determinant to aspects of this study; from selecting the topic of study, to choice of research design, data analysis and interpretation, and discussion of results.

### ***3.3.3 Kaupapa Māori and qualitative research***

This section describes how qualitative research methods are a good fit for Kaupapa Māori research. A primary aim of Kaupapa Māori research is to give a platform for Māori “to articulate their own reality and experience”, and to listen to Māori voices previously excluded in research (Mahuika, 2008, p. 4). As few studies on Māori identity have focused on Māori boys, and subjective interpretations of Māori identity construction (Houkamau, 2010); this study was concerned with understanding that voice, and more accurately, multiple Māori boys’ voices, and how these boys felt, interpreted, and made meaning about their life experiences. This study consisted of Kaupapa Māori as a research framework and theoretical lens (explained above) and used qualitative research methods to capture Māori voices and lived experiences (as suggested by Pipi et al., 2004).

Qualitative research methods are a good fit to Kaupapa Māori because qualitative research is mainly concerned with meaning, and the meanings that participants make about their world (Anderson, 1998; Creswell, 2014; McMillan, 2012; Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015; Yin, 2011). The qualitative methods employed in this study aimed to uncover the “implicit meaning of a particular situation” from the participants’ perspective, and also allowed for examination of how the researcher’s perspective influenced and determined the interpretation of the participant’s reality (Anderson, 1998, p. 90). Qualitative research methods were considered useful and appropriate in order to uncover contextual conditions including the “social, institutional and environmental conditions” that influenced the

participants' lives (Yin, 2011, p.8). Qualitative research methods are compatible with Kaupapa Māori (Cram, 2006; Moewaka-Barnes, 2015); and Kaupapa Māori's constructivist aims and objectives. Considering the congruence of qualitative research to Kaupapa Māori (as described above) this study collected qualitative data by conducting semi-structured interviews with research participants in order to access and understand the meanings participants make about their life experiences.

### ***3.3.4 Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)***

This study utilised and was guided by the qualitative research approach interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) to understand the meanings the participants made about their life experiences. IPA is considered an appropriate research design for studies of culture "which focus on the emic perspectives of the participants", and where the aim is to examine "how various groups construct their ethnic (or group) identity" (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012, p. 364). IPA protocols allowed for the researcher's interpretation, from a Kaupapa Māori perspective, to construct secondary meanings from the participants' words. IPA informed and guided all aspects of the research design, including sampling, data analysis, presentation of results, and discussion of results.

Interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) draws on principles of phenomenology, and is concerned with understanding how individuals make meaning from life experiences as described in their own words, and in their particular political, historical, and socio-cultural context (Pietkiewicz, & Smith 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015; Yin, 2011). The basic premise of phenomenology is to understand "the essence" of experience as "perceived by the participants" (Kelly, 2002; McMillan, 2012, p. 282); rather than "describe phenomena from a pre-determined categorical system" (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012, p. 362). IPA and phenomenological studies aim to understand the meanings that participants make, as faithfully as possible, about phenomena "as opposed to attempt to produce an objective statement" of the phenomena itself (Smith, & Osborn, 2015, p. 54). IPA presupposes a connection between what a person says, their thinking and feelings, but also that people struggle to articulate what they are thinking and feeling (Smith, & Osborn, 2015). Kelly (2002) explains this is because 'experience' is mediated by

level of conscious awareness, which can range from full conscious awareness to complete unawareness. Luft and Ingham (1955) support this with their model, the Johari Window, which proposes four levels of self-awareness, two of which are levels ‘not known to self’ (Luft, & Ingham, 1955). Phenomenology presupposes that, because some of what is experienced is with ‘dim awareness’, this causes difficulties for individuals to make meaning, and also to re-present and articulate meanings constructed from life experiences (Kelly, 2002). Phenomenology also accepts that it can be difficult to capture “the essence” and the “the essential features” of participants’ life experiences because “experiences present the world to us; they do not... present our experience of it” (Kelly, 2002, p. 114).

Due to the inherent difficulties making meaning from life experiences and subsequently understanding and interpreting those meanings, IPA draws on the principles of hermeneutics (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). Hermeneutics means, “to interpret” or “make clear”, and aims to understand an individual’s mind-set and language, that mediate life experiences, and the meanings they reveal (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012, p.2). Hermeneutical and IPA studies aim to place the researcher in the participants’ shoes to comprehend the participants’ experience but accepts that this is never completely possible (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). IPA therefore relies on an interpretive process called a double hermeneutic that involves the researcher interpreting and making meaning of participants’ meanings and constructions that they make about their experiences (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). IPA aligns closely to constructivism’s hermeneutic or interpretive methods that emphasise the researcher’s role in interpreting and making sense of the participant’s world (Smith, & Osborn, 2015; Yin, 2011). Therefore, IPA studies presume a dynamic and interactional role of the researcher and acknowledge that the researcher’s interpretation is from a point of view that mediates and determines the interpretation. IPA studies therefore require a strong reflexive position where the research paradigm, and interpretive lens of the researcher is well articulated and made explicit (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). In this way, IPA, like the principles of constructivism validate and support the researcher’s interpretation. In the present study, the interpretive lens is from a Kaupapa Māori perspective, and this was explained and made explicit in Section (3.3.1) and indicated in the self-reflexive presentation in the prologue.

IPA also draws on principles of idiography that emphasise the analysis of single cases and understanding the meanings made by each individual (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). In this way individual accounts are treated as an individual case, where categories that emerge in one case are ‘bracketed’, and not drawn across, and influential to the interpretation of other cases. The aim is to understand each case as fully as possible without being directed by predetermined categories, and also to be as faithful as possible to the uniqueness of each case and each individual participant (Yin, 2011). Idiography has implications for this study particularly for sampling, and these are discussed in Section (3.5).

IPA includes methods of analysis that are iterative involving an immersed relationship of the researcher with the qualitative data, where the analysis aims to give evidence of the participants’ meaning making, and at the same time document the researcher’s meaning making of the data (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). In IPA studies it is recommended that interviews be audio recorded, and the whole interview, including questions and nonverbal communication such as; pauses, laughter, sighs, and so on, be transcribed verbatim and in full (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). The participants’ words are then presented for analysis, word for word, and side by side with the researcher’s interpretation, “and even transformations” of those words (Yin, 2011, p. 15). Analysis is at the semantic level and involves full immersion in the data and interpretation of the words and nonverbal communication of the participants (Smith, & Osborn, 2015). Transcripts are closely read and re-read, and audio recordings listened to several times. In the present study the analysis involved a step-by-step and thorough process of working with the original data and drawing out themes. The steps of analysis are explained in depth in the data analysis in Section 3.6.

In IPA studies information learned about the topic is usually presented as a narrative account in the “Analysis and Results” section, as in this study. This is done by writing-up the themes from the table of themes. The researcher describes each theme, supported and ‘exemplified’ with the participants’ own words from the interviews (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). These are followed by the researcher’s analytic comments that aim to construct a persuasive account of the participants’ perspective, and that explains what was discovered and learned about the topic.

Different styles of narrative presentation are possible as described by Yin (2011). The presentation style of this study is a cross-case presentation that aims to address the research objectives of the study, and to “draw attention to the topics and issues” and priority concerns of the participants but not to the participants themselves (Yin, 2011, p. 240). Although a main purpose of this study is to give voice to the participants, this study is less concerned with presenting overly personal details about the participants that may be impertinent. The final stage in IPA, and the present study, includes a ‘Discussion’ section (see Chapter 5), which includes a discussion of what was learned from the analysis in relation to existent literature.

### ***3.3.5 Kaupapa Māori principles and cultural practices that guided this study***

Kaupapa Māori approaches to research conform to a cultural “code of conduct” and incorporate principles that promote culturally safe research (Pipi et al., 2004, p.141). Kaupapa Māori is research defined from within a Māori cultural context and draws inspiration and takes guidance from taonga tuku iho (treasures handed down from our ancestors) and uses tikanga Māori (Māori cultural practices) to guide research practices. Tikanga in Māori culture informs and determines the correct way of doing things, and this applies in Kaupapa Māori research (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, Pipi et al., 2004). Tikanga is defined as correct and comes from the root word tika (right/correct). What is tika is context based, collective dependent and is therefore dynamic. What is tika can vary even in similar situations.

Cultural concepts such as, tapu (sacredness) and mana (power) are central concepts in Māori culture, and the use of tikanga in research reiterates the importance of respecting the sacredness of all of people involved in the research. Other tikanga (cultural) principles are employed in Kaupapa Māori research such as, whakawhanaungatanga (process/acts of building family like relationships), to facilitate access, engender trust and establish the researcher, participant relationship, to ensure that research is conducted with the best interests of participants and Māori aspirations generally (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, Cram, 2006). Whakapapa (genealogy links) is also used in Kaupapa Māori research to establish and make links to the community where the research takes place and also with research participants (Mahuika, 2008). Whakapapa aims to position the researcher as an insider, within the

community with the research participants (Keefe et al., 1999). The application of Kaupapa Māori principles and research practices are also designed to promote the participatory consciousness of research participants as articulated by Bishop and Glynn (1999) to promote self-agency and to operationalize tino rangatiratanga (self-determination).

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999, p.120) gives seven examples of respectful research practices that Māori researchers use to guide research. These were also drawn on to guide the present study.

1. Aroha ki te tangata (a respect for people)
2. Kanohi kitea (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face)
3. Titiro, whakarongo.....kōrero (look, listen..... speak)
4. Manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people, be generous)
5. Kia tūpato (be cautious)
6. Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of people)
7. Kaua e māhaki (don't flaunt your knowledge)

‘Aroha ki te tangata’ (a respect for people) was an overarching principle that guided this research and my approach towards the school in which the research was conducted and the participants. The principle ‘aroha ki te tangata’ aligns to a social constructivist viewpoint, which assumes an individual’s constructions of reality are valid, and therefore should be respected. By having aroha (respect/love for the people) I believe I was able to easily and authentically follow the other research practices 2 to 4. However, I felt less inclined towards practices 5 to 7 because these were framed in negative terms. I also felt that practices 1 to 4 overrode practices 5 to 7. That is, because of practices 1 to 4 there was no need for 5 to 7. For example, if I demonstrated ‘manaaki ki te tangata’ (practice 4), then there was no way I could ‘takahia te mana o te tangata’ (practice 6). I also preferred to reframe and think of practices 5 to 7 in positive terms. For example, rather than ‘kaua e māhaki’ (don’t flaunt your knowledge), I preferred ‘kia hūmārie’ (be humble).

Kaupapa Māori principles and cultural practices (described above) were used to guide every aspect of this research and were fundamental to establishing and maintaining the necessary relationships required for this research to take place. They were also used to gain access and permission at the research site; to establish relationships with gatekeepers and key staff members at the site; during recruitment, including building relationships and rapport with research participants; and, to conduct interviews in a culturally safe and comfortable manner. Cultural practices were also used to collect data, and these are explained further in Section 3.5.2.

### ***3.3.6 Conclusion to this section***

The research design of this study is Kaupapa Māori combined with interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). The research design is a qualitative research approach appropriate to answering the research questions, and to gathering, interpreting and working with qualitative data. The research design takes account of the interactive and transactional role of the researcher, including the research bias, which is best described as a Kaupapa Māori and pro-Māori perspective. IPA was utilised and made up the research design because IPA is primarily concerned with understanding the meanings that participants' make about their life experiences. IPA also allows for the researcher's interpretation of the participants' meanings as informed by the theoretical lens from Kaupapa Māori perspective in order to interpret and describe the factors that influence Māori identity construction. The principles of IPA are informed by phenomenology, hermeneutics and idiography, and determine all aspects of the research design; including, sampling, data collection, data analysis, results and discussion, and these are explained in subsequent sections.

## **3.4 Selection of Research Site, Sample and Participants**

This section describes the process of selecting the research site, and the factors that made the research site suitable for this study. It then describes the research site in detail to illustrate my experiential and in-depth understanding of the context where the research was conducted, as recommended by Yin (2011). The rich description and my immersion in the natural setting aims to enhance validity and reliability and help readers to understand interpretations I made about the factors that influence the

Māori boys and their Māori identity construction in this unique context. This section (Section 3.4.3) then describes the sample in terms of size and the considerations that determined the sample size appropriate for an IPA-type study. This section concludes by describing how the participants were identified and selected for participation.

### ***3.4.1 Selecting a suitable research site, working at the research site.***

This section describes the process of selecting the research site, and the factors that made the research site suitable for this study. This section also explains how working at the research site enabled relationships (whanaungatanga) necessary for the research to occur, and how working at the research site facilitated in-depth understanding of the research context.

An initial stage in conducting this research was finding and choosing a suitable research site. As my family and I were moving from overseas into the region, and had no previous links to the community, I decided to conduct research in the most suitable research site – a New Zealand boys’ high school (henceforth called The School) - where I could also obtain work as a relief teacher. I sent my curriculum vitae to high schools in the region, had follow up telephone conversations with some schools, and was invited to meet the person in charge of relief at two schools. At these meetings I sought to determine the following criteria:

1. The suitability of the school in terms of any unique features that might support and enhance the aims and goals of a research study about Māori identity.
2. A sufficient amount of relief work (ideally daily) – that would:
  - a. Support my family financially, and
  - b. Enable and contribute to my experiential understanding of the research environment.

I chose The School as a place to work and conduct research because it had two particularly unique features that were pertinent to a study on Māori identity. One, The School had a very high percentage of Māori students (one of the highest in the country). Second, The School had a bilingual unit (henceforth referred to as the

Māori unit), where students were immersed in Māori culture and exposed to the classical markers of Māori identity (described in the literature review see Section 2.6.3). Also, and quite serendipitously, although not necessary to this study, The School had two teachers closely related to two prominent authors who had contributed literature about Māori identity.

The Māori unit was a particular feature of The School important to this study on Māori identity. In the Māori unit, boys were exposed to the classical markers of Māori identity, and their Māori identity construction would likely be an interplay between these and other wider societal influences. Therefore, Māori unit participants would be a potential source of rich information. Māori unit participants would also likely have something important to say about Māori identity. Participation by Māori boys in the mainstream Māori would also be important to this study. Māori boys in the mainstream would likely strengthen the data by (potentially) indicating other factors influencing Māori identity construction additional to the classical markers.

Working at The School as a relief teacher facilitated access, and by using the kaupapa Māori principle ‘whakawhanaungatanga’, I was able to develop the relationships necessary for this research to occur. Cram (2006, p. 35) translates ‘whakawhanaungatanga’ as “making connections or links”, and Mahuika (2008, p.8) as “the process of establishing family relationships”. Whakawhanaungatanga involves interacting with people (with things in common) to build a sense of understanding of one another and trust in the relationship. Working at The School enabled me to make connections with the research community, and to nurture and develop relationships with potential participants (Cram, 2006). The aspect of ‘nurturing’ relationships is important in Kaupapa Māori research, and is captured in the whakataukī (proverb) that Walker suggests is fundamental to Kaupapa Māori research: “He aha te mea nui o te ao, he tangata, he tangata, he tangata: What is the most important thing in the world, it is people, it is people, it is people” (Walker quote from Pihama et al., 2002, p.32).

Working at the research site as a relief teacher would also facilitate experiential understanding of the context (Yin, 2011). By being in the natural setting where the research was being conducted, I would begin to perceive, and become aware of

factors that might have influenced my own Māori identity construction. As multiple interpretations of phenomena are presumed, I was aware that factors that might influence my own Māori identity construction might influence someone else differently, or not at all.

Once working at The School, I started learning experientially and practically about the workings of the school, and also about the culture and wider context of the school. Keeping mindful and present to the needs of my research study I identified key people, gatekeepers who could help me obtain participants, and people who might be interested and supportive of a study on Māori identity, and people who I would need permission from. In order to get attuned to the culture of the school in regard to the things that might influence Māori boys' identity construction, I spoke to people, particularly Māori students to find out what the school was like for them. This was achieved by asking general conversation questions that were within the bounds of my role as a relief teacher. These conversations, although not part of the formal research study, were informative and helped to form impressions of the school culture and what it was like for Māori students. While immersing in the school environment and learning about the culture and context, I began framing my research study in a formal research proposal.

### ***3.4.2 Describing the Research Site***

This section gives a summary description of The School where this research was conducted. It also gives an abbreviated form of the full description of The School. Due to length, the full description is presented as an appendix (see Appendix 1). The full description located in Appendix 1 aims to be thorough and 'rich' to give the reader context, and to indicate potential factors that influenced Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity. The factors described are my interpretations of what might be influential to Māori identity. Yin (2011, p.12) contends, "the straightforward task of making a description becomes an interpretive matter". This raises issues of selectivity, that is, what is selected and described is because of the researcher's "preconceived categories" about what 'might' be important (Yin, 2011, p.12). Therefore, this description cannot be considered inclusive of all factors that

might influence Māori students as they construct their Māori identity. This section begins by stating the sources for the description of the research site.

#### *3.4.2.1 Describing The School where the research was conducted - sources*

This subsection gives the sources of the description of The School. Providing sources aims to enhance the validity and reliability of the description and the study overall. The sources include:

- My formal practical and experiential involvement, and my “emic” participation in The School for one school year (2016) as a relief teacher and a fixed-term contract teacher.
- My informal observations and conversations with people at The School during informal times and in informal spaces, for example, during lunch times.
- The New Zealand Government Education Review Office’s (ERO) last two reports of The School.
- By living in the school community. For the duration of the data collection phase of this study (one year during the 2016 school year) – my family and I lived five minutes’ walk from the school. I had many conversations with people in the community, and once they learned I was teaching at The School, these conversations usually became about The School. Community members often (enthusiastically and nostalgically) described for example, their personal involvement, own or family members’ attendance, impressions and recollections of The School. From these interactions I was able to gain a fair impression of how The School was viewed in the community.
- Historical information about the tangata whenua (people of the land, local tribal people) was learned mostly by speaking to a member of staff who worked in The School as a teacher aide. This person was very knowledgeable and an active member of his iwi (tribe) and tribal affairs. I also made an effort to speak with other Māori members of the wider community to gather details about the context that might be useful to this study. I also spent significant time in the local library – for a period there

was an exhibition about the Treaty of Waitangi and the tribes' treaty settlement that was useful for reinforcing information gathered elsewhere.

### *3.4.2.2 Description of The School*

This subsection describes The School where this study was conducted. The School was a large all boys' school that had a roll of 1,896 students on July 1, 2016 (New Zealand Government website: Education counts website). The School was located in an urban setting in one of New Zealand's fastest growing regions. The region has a moderate climate and is generally considered a desirable place to live because of its vicinity to harbours and beaches. The number of Māori students at The School was high<sup>1</sup>, and in 2016 was 479, 25% of the school roll; one of the highest Māori student school enrolments in the country. According to the government's Education Review Office report (ERO), The School had a high number of Māori teachers, although I observed that only two were tangata whenua (people of the land) from local tribes.

The School was a decile six school at the time this research was conducted. New Zealand's school decile system indicates the extent schools draw their students from low socio-economic communities and is used to determine government funding (New Zealand Government Education, 2020). As a medium decile school, The School drew students from a high, medium, and low socio-economic communities. Although socio-economic disparity in medium decile New Zealand schools is typical, economic hardship affects Māori disproportionately, and this disparity was observed at The School. For example, I regularly observed some Māori students in financial hardship indicated by not having lunch and/or without the correct school uniform.

As is common in most New Zealand schools, there was a gap in academic attainment at The School. Māori students at The School achieved lower than Pākehā students and lower against other decile six schools and national averages (for all boys) in all year levels of NCEA (National Certificate in Education Achievement). The ERO (year omitted) report says The School effectively promotes educational success for Māori as Māori and lists various strategies and initiatives that The School does to encourage this, including, "the promotion of Māori language, culture and identity in

areas of the curriculum”. Despite these positive initiatives, The School acknowledged in the ERO report that improving Māori achievement in relation to Pākehā achievement was an important priority. This was recognition by The School that Māori student achievement in NCEA was not where it should be.

Table 3.1 below shows Māori student attainment in NCEA (National Certificate of Education Achievement) at The School in the year 2016. Māori student attainment in NCEA is shown against; Pākehā student attainment; other decile six New Zealand schools, and against all boys in all New Zealand schools. The table shows that Māori students at The school achieved lower than Pākehā students at The School, lower than all boys in other decile six schools, and lower against all boys in New Zealand schools.

Table 3.1 ‘The School’: 2016 Attainment in National Certificate in Education Achievement (NCEA)<sup>22</sup>

	NCEA Level 1	NCEA Level 2	NCEA Level 3
Māori	80.8%	58.6%	35.4%
Pākehā	92.4%	82.5%	57.5%
NZ Decile 6 Schools	90.4%	78.3%	43%
NZ Boys	88.3%	78%	47.7%

Note: The categories above, NZ decile 6 schools and NZ Boys, are inclusive of Māori students that likely reduces the comparison with The School’s Māori boys’ achievement in NCEA. If these categories were exclusive of Māori students, the disparity between The School’s Māori boys achievement in NCEA against other NZ decile 6 schools and NZ boys would be significantly larger.

Generally speaking, The School was a sought-after teaching post and had a sports programme that was recognised as successful. People in the community perceived The School very positively. The School was an ideal site for this study because of the high number of Māori students and because The School had a Māori unit. It was anticipated that by conducting interviews with Māori students in the mainstream and the Māori unit would reveal pertinent information about Māori identity and Māori identity construction. More information is provided in Appendix 1 to help the reader understand in more depth the context where this study was conducted.

---

<sup>22</sup> Source: New Zealand Government 2016

### 3.4.2.3 *Sociological factors*

The sociological approach to identity proposes that identity is influenced by contextual factors as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2. This section explains how sociological factors were considered in the analysis in terms of their influence on the participants and their Māori identity construction. These included historical events, social interactions and relationships, and notions of power.

Various significant historical events occurred in the area where the research site was located and these have shaped present day circumstances, participants' life experiences and their Māori identity construction (Poata-Smith, 1996). For example, the New Zealand Wars of 1864 and the resulting punitive land confiscations caused economic deprivation for the local iwi (tribes). This caused inter-generational poverty, which has had a lasting negative impact on the local Māori and how they likely experience their Māori identity.

A significant battle in the New Zealand Wars, between local hapū (sub-tribes) and invading colonial forces, occurred very near to the school where this research was conducted. In this battle the local Māori were massively outnumbered and yet defeated a far superior (in weaponry and soldier numbers) imperial force (Belich, 2015; King, 2003). This loss caused embarrassment to the colonial forces that resulted in a retaliatory attack on an unfinished pā (fortified village), which involved the killing of the local chief, women and children (Belich, 2015; King, 2003). These historical events have had and continue to have an impact on local Māori where this research was conducted and therefore likely influence the participants' Māori identity construction (Poata-Smith, 1996).

In terms of how historical events were taken into account during the analysis, I was mindful to be aware of what the participants knew of their history and the impact this might have on their Māori identity. Also, I was interested if the participants did not know the extent of their history and why this might be the case. I was cautious that, if the participants did not know their history, it could have been ignored or retold in a way to maintain the status quo of Māori marginalisation. I was also mindful that this

situation (not knowing the history) could influence Māori identity construction by perpetuating false representations of Māori identity.

The sociological approach also contends that social interactions and relationships influence identity. Therefore, I aimed to gain insight into this factor, and how it influenced Māori identity. I achieved this in two ways; first in participant interviews, I listened to how participants described their social interactions and relationships. Second, as a participant observer in the research context, I observed people and how they interacted. I also listened carefully to what they said to each other. The information gathered from what I observed influenced my interpretation of how social interactions and relationships influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction.

Another factor, potentially influencing the participants and their Māori identity, was the notion of power, the enactment of power, and how this might be acting as a negative force upon the participants (Foucault, 1982; Liu et al, 2005; McIntosh, 2005). Therefore, while I conducted this research (and lived in the community where the research was conducted), I was mindful of power imbalances that might be occurring and acting upon Māori people in this context. In order to be attuned to and aware of potential power imbalances I considered the concept of *tino rangatiratanga*<sup>23</sup> (self-determination or sovereignty), and whether Māori were able to exercise agency in a given situation. For example, in a given situation such as, the structure of the Māori unit, I considered: Who decided this? And/or, how much agency, influence or control did Māori have in this situation? While conducting this research I observed numerous instances where Māori appeared to lack agency, which suggested a power imbalance and systemic Pākehā hegemony (G. Smith, 2017). Lack of (Māori) agency and power is a factor that (likely) impacted the participants and their Māori identity construction and is addressed and discussed in Chapter 5.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Tino rangatiratanga* means sovereignty and was guaranteed to Māori with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, although Māori sovereignty effectively ended with the New Zealand Wars, subsequent land confiscations and British colonisation

### 3.4.3 *Sample*

To understand more about Māori identity, 12 senior Māori students were purposefully selected (as described by Yin, 2011; Cresswell, 2014) in order to include students who might have something important to say about their Māori identity construction. This section justifies the sample size, describes the selection and makeup of the sample.

Interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) studies are interested in the uniqueness of events as experienced by individual participants, and each individual participant is typically considered as a single case (Smith & Osborn, 2015). Therefore, IPA studies use small samples to explore in detail, interpret and understand the meanings made by participants as they interpret their world phenomena. A sample size of three has been suggested by Smith and Osborn (2015) as an “extremely useful number for the sample”, for IPA studies to allow for an in-depth analysis of the data, and to account for “similarity and difference, convergence and divergence” (Smith & Osborn, 2015, p. 57). McMillan (2012) recommends a sample size of up to ten for phenomenological studies. This study chose a large sample, by IPA standards, of 12. This number and sample size were considered appropriate for this study for the following two reasons. First, it was anticipated that the participants in this study would likely struggle to participate in prolonged interviews – one-hour interviews are considered appropriate to collect rich data in IPA studies (Smith & Osborn, 2015; Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). Even though this potential scenario was mediated in the recruitment strategy by selecting only senior students that the gatekeepers felt could effectively express their opinion, this initial assumption proved to be correct, with some participants struggling to articulate feelings and thoughts about their Māori identity at length.

The second reason for a larger sample size of 12 for this study was the desire to give a general account of the whole group. In doing so, this gave voice to each participant and acknowledged the uniqueness of each individual participant’s interpretation of his experiences. However, as a primary concern was to understand more about Māori identity, I considered it necessary to ‘transfer’ meanings across the group in a cross-case analysis in order to identify the factors that influence Māori boys’ identity

construction. This IPA study presumes that individual constructions are unique and important, and that also when held in consensus with other group members represent something about the things that influence individuals in this specific context, and in similar contexts. This study is less concerned with giving a “full” account of participants’ perspective and personal details that might be non-pertinent to understanding the topic.

The selection of the sample for this study relied on the help of gatekeepers to locate suitable participants (as described by Cresswell, 2014). I gained the support of gatekeepers by establishing relationships with them using Kaupapa Māori principles such as, whakawhanaungatanga<sup>24</sup>, kānohi kitea (face to face communication) and by demonstrating my commitment to Māori ‘kaupapa’ (initiatives), particularly an interest in the wellbeing and care of Māori students, and Māori kaupapa generally. I also explained my research topic including its intention to hear from and give a voice to Māori students in The School, and to learn more about how they constructed their Māori identity. The gatekeepers were Māori and had formal responsibilities for Māori students as part of their role at The School. Gatekeeper one was a Deputy Principal who had oversight for the Māori unit, and the second gatekeeper was the Māori Achievement Mentor, (MAM), which was a role at The School to support Māori students’ academic achievement. The gatekeepers knew most of the Māori students in The School and therefore were crucial to locating students suitable for this research.

To locate Māori students the Deputy Principal searched the school enrolments database, under the search option Māori to locate students who identified as Māori. The Deputy Principal and Māori Achievement Mentor, reviewed the list to identify senior (Year 12 and 13) Māori students who:

1. Might have something to say about their Māori identity
2. Had the skills to articulate their opinion
3. Were at different stages/places of their identity construction

---

<sup>24</sup> Whakawhanaungatanga is a way of establishing family like type relationships

To achieve the third criteria, the Deputy Principal and Māori Achievement Mentor pointed out students who they felt had a ‘secure’ Māori identity or strong sense of themselves as Māori. They also identified students who they perceived to be at different stages or places in their identity construction. The latter students were less likely to have a secure Māori identity (in a classical sense at least) and were also likely to have wider or other factors influencing their Māori identity construction. It is important to note, that gatekeeper perceptions of students’ Māori identity, secure or otherwise, was the gatekeepers’ interpretation. The list did not state whether students were in the Māori unit or in the mainstream, so the Acting Head of the Māori unit, reviewed the list and identified students in the Māori unit.

Potential participants were approached individually, informed about the research project verbally and in writing. They were invited to participate and, if they agreed, were given parent consent forms to have completed. In order to participate students were required to get parent’s consent if they were under 18. Of the 12 students:

- All were Māori (as indicated by the The School’s enrolment database)<sup>25</sup>
- All were senior students (because of perceived ability for older students to express an opinion)
- Eight students were drawn from the mainstream and four from the Māori unit
- All were senior students with:
  - Eight mainstream students in Year 13
  - Three Māori unit students enrolled in Year 12
  - One Māori unit student students enrolled in Year 11

Initially, the study aimed to get half of the participants from the Māori unit and half from mainstream, but this was difficult due to low numbers of senior Māori students enrolled in the unit. However, the significant consistency in Māori unit participants’

---

<sup>25</sup> Note – it is important to note that The School’s enrolment database indicates “Māori” but does not indicate self-identification as Māori, because this information was likely provided by the parents on an initial school enrolment form. I proceeded with the assumption that if the potential participant had been enrolled as Māori then they were Māori – so as not to challenge or question their credentials to a Māori identity.

responses and, as the study proceeded, the need to hear from participants less likely to have a secure identity was highlighted.

It is important to note that the sampling strategy changed during the course of the study. This occurred because the sixth participant interviewed disclosed a significant factor not revealed by the preceding five participants, which was the influence of his fair skin and not looking Māori on his Māori identity construction. In light of this new information the sample strategy was changed and all but one of the remaining participants were purposively selected because they had fair skin (and were not typically Māori looking). Overall this meant that half of the participants (6/12) were selected based on the original criteria, which included whakapapa and self-identification, and the other half were purposively selected based on whakapapa, self-identification and having fair skin (and not looking typically Māori). This enabled this research to learn more about the influence that having fair skin and not looking typically Māori could have on a person's Māori identity construction – a phenomenon underreported in the literature.

### **3.5 Data Collection**

This section describes the data collection methods used to explore the feelings of Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity, and to explore the factors that influence Māori identity construction. The primary method used was semi-structured interviews (described in Section 3.5.1) conducted with 12 senior Māori students at one New Zealand high school. A feelings scale was also developed and used to capture the participants' feelings as they discussed factors that influenced their Māori identity. The semi-structured interviews were guided by Kaupapa Māori principles and cultural practices and these are explained in Section 3.5.3.

#### ***3.5.1 Semi-structured interviews***

This study used semi-structured interviews as the method to gather information about Māori identity. Semi-structured interviews are a popular method in qualitative studies and considered to be the most appropriate way to collect data in IPA studies (Smith & Osborn, 2015). Semi-structured interviews allow the “gathering of

information when we are interested in exploring the participants' views and understandings of a new topic" (Cram, 2006, p. 36). Semi-structured interviews use open-ended questions that permit individual responses, and to allow the participant to "best voice their experience unconstrained by any perspectives of the researcher" (Creswell, 2014, p. 240; see also, McMillan, 2012). Open-ended questions for this study were developed and framed to draw out the participants' feelings and to capture participants' thoughts about the factors that influence Māori identity construction. The semi-structured interviews in this study were one on one, in-person, conducted at the site (The School) in a classroom, at a time agreed upon with the participant.

An interview schedule was developed in advance (see Appendix 2 for a copy of the interview schedule) and was used to guide and support the interview process (as recommended by Smith & Osborn 2015). It is noted that an interview schedule, prepared in advance, might imply a pre-determined interaction that may seem contrary to the aim of exploring and understanding the participants' meanings unimpeded by pre-conceived categories. However, the interview schedule was used to force me to think about what difficulties might arise in the interviews, and how those might be managed (Smith & Osborn, 2015). The interview schedule also helped me to think about and predict when the participants might have trouble understanding a question and or sharing their feelings – and therefore assisted in the development of alternative questions and prompts that could be used to support the participants to articulate their views. Prompts were also developed and used to probe, seek clarification, and gain greater insight into each participant's world (as recommended by Creswell, 2014, McMillan, 2012, and Yin, 2011). During the interviews, the interview schedule was used as a guide only, providing flexibility to allow for exploration of points raised and/or to get further clarification.

Interviews were conducted outside of school class hours, either after school or during lunchtimes, so as not to interfere with participants' schooling. Most of students (11 of the 12) chose to be interviewed during the lunch hour. Although this placed a one-hour time constraint on the interviews, it was anticipated that interviews would not go longer (which was the case for all participants). As it turned out participant

responses tended to be brief and interviews usually lasted no more than about 30-35 minutes. In all cases, there was an opportunity to follow up if further questions arose.

All interviews were recorded and stored on a password-protected computer to ensure confidentiality. Interviews were transcribed professionally and proofread against the audio recording to ensure accuracy of the transcript. In addition, notes were taken during and directly after the interviews. These notes aimed to record non-verbal responses not captured in the audio such as, body language, nods, and gestures. I also recorded my impression of the participant; specifically, if I thought the participant was comfortable or not while discussing a topic and/or answering the questions. This included noting indicators of whakamā (shyness) explained below (see Section 3.5.2). The information collected from interview notes was used as part of the data analysis, along with the Feelings Scale (see below) to determine and/or confirm participants' feelings.

### **3.5.2 *Feelings scale***

A feelings scale was developed as part of the data collection to capture the participants' feelings about the factors that influenced their Māori identity construction. The Feelings Scale recorded my interpretation of how each participant felt about each theme that had emerged from the data.

The scale ranged from +4 to -4, where +4 represented the highest possible positive feeling, and -4 the most negative possible feeling (as expressed by the participant and interpreted by me). A zero represented a neutral feeling or was given when I couldn't ascertain a positive or negative feeling associated with the theme.

The rating of the participant's feelings was based on what the participant said (in the transcript) and how they said it (tone of voice in the voice recording). To aid interpretation I paid particular attention to explicit responses such as, when a participant actually stated how he felt about a topic, and also emotional responses.

Table 3.2 Feelings Scale

Score	Strength of feeling
+4	Extremely positive feeling
+3	Very positive feeling
+2	Positive feeling
+1	Slight indicator of positive feeling
0	Neutral feeling
-1	Slight indicator of negative feeling
-2	Negative feeling
-3	Very negative feeling
-4	Extremely negative feeling

This data was placed in a document called “Table of Themes, and Participant’s Feelings about Themes: Participant (Number)”. My interpretation of the participants’ feelings was also verified against my interview notes, which were taken during and just after the interview. See Section (3.6.4) for information about the analysis of the data gathered from the Feelings Scale.

Whilst important information was gathered using the Feelings Scale and interview notes, the primary source of data was from the semi-structured interviews, which revealed rich information about various factors that influenced the participants’ Māori identity. The interviews were also guided by Kaupapa Māori practices, as described in the next section.

### ***3.5.3 Kaupapa Māori practices to support semi-structured interviews***

The semi-structure interviews used to gather data for this topic were informal and used Kaupapa Māori principles and practices (particularly for Māori unit participants) to create a culturally safe environment, and to help the participants feel comfortable. Interviews with Māori unit participants began and ended with karakia (prayer or traditional incantation). This practice was regarded as culturally safe and followed the tikanga (cultural practices) of the Māori unit classes in The School.

Interviews with Māori students in the mainstream also followed school ‘mainstream’ tikanga by not doing karakia unless requested because, as Borell (2005, p. 40) explains, Kaupapa Māori research grounded in te reo Māori (Māori language) and tikanga (cultural practices) can alienate and create a “sense of incompetence and disempowerment” for people not comfortable in te ao Māori (the Māori world). Similarly, Te reo Māori (the Māori language) was not spoken with all students, although some Māori language was used with Māori unit participants as a way to connect with the participants and help them to feel comfortable during the interview process. Te reo Māori was generally not used with mainstream Māori participants, unless the participant demonstrated comfort or confidence in using Māori. If I used Māori with mainstream participants it was generally limited to common words or phrases, many of which the participant used first.

Kaupapa Māori principles such as, whakawhanaungatanga (making family like connections), combined with my cultural awareness of being Māori and having experienced Māori identity construction were used in various ways during the interview process, for example, to build rapport (Cram, 2006; Mahuika, 2008). When meeting, it is a common Māori conversational style to ask “No hea koe?” (Where are you from?), before or instead of “Ko wai to ingoa?” (What is your name?). This allows Māori (traditionally at least) to explore connections that come through whakapapa (genealogy). This is a Māori way of building rapport and a way of establishing relationships, and this Māori cultural practice was sometimes used to build rapport with participants when I considered that this approach would be beneficial.

Another Kaupapa Māori cultural practice that was used to support the participants in the interview process was the eating and sharing of kai (food). This practice is of spiritual significance and relates to the concepts of tapu (sacred) and noa (neutrality) (Barlow, 2008). Tapu can be explained as a sacred spiritual essence, and people that are unfamiliar with each other generally have a heightened sense of tapu or sacredness, due to various factors, for example, the attachment and continued presence of ancestors. Food is considered noa or a neutral force that reduces the heightened sense of tapu. Therefore, the eating of food has the effect of establishing normality or neutrality in a relationship, and also encourages and facilitates a

positive, culturally safe relationship between the participant and the researcher. In the interviews I provided lunch, which was usually sandwiches and cookies from Subway.

Another cultural practice that was used to support the participants and the interview process was koha, which can be translated as gift, and also relates to the concept of utu (reciprocity) and acknowledgement as described by Howitt (2008). To ensure that relationships are balanced and reciprocal, people give koha (gifts). In keeping with this, at the end of the interview, I gave the participant a voucher, as a koha, to acknowledge their time and participation in the research project.

My emic advantage also helped to notice and interpret culturally defined nonverbal responses and behaviours such as, whakamā (shyness) (McMillan, 2012). Whakamā is a feeling similar to shy or uncomfortable and is usually expressed nonverbally. Whakamā can be expressed when someone doesn't know how to respond to a question, or doesn't want to, or doesn't know how to articulate a feeling. Whakamā can indicate a more deeply held feeling that someone doesn't know how or want to express. During the interviews I recorded indicators of whakamā and other nonverbal responses and behaviours in my interview notes where possible. During analysis these notes were read with the transcript to help me to understand and interpret how the participants were feeling as they answered questions and described their life experiences, and to build richness and depth to my interpretation.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

This section describes how the data collected from the semi-structured interviews were prepared and presented for analysis. It also explains how the data analysis was conducted in order to help the reader understand how I interpreted the data and drew out themes or factors that I interpreted as influential to the participants' Māori identity construction. The analysis followed IPA procedures and a step-by-step process developed by Smith and Osborn (2015). Section 3.3.4 explained how these (IPA) procedures were congruent for the research framework of this study, and how they were appropriate to the research design. The aim was for the data to be presented in a way that was logical, and that the analysis was conducted in a way that

was coherent and methodical in order to enhance the credibility of this study. My interpretive lens also influenced interpretation of the data, which was from a Kaupapa Māori perspective that was made explicit in Section 3.3

This section describes the analysis of the data in terms of the steps that were taken at each stage of the analysis that resulted in the creation of a specific document of analysis. Six documents were created as a result of the steps of the analysis (henceforth termed documents of analysis), and therefore this section is organised in subsections, where each subsection describes the steps taken that resulted in that document. The subsections are as follows:

- Exploratory Comments and Emerging Themes (Section 3.6.1)
- Initial List of Themes and Cluster of Themes (Section 3.6.2)
- Table of Themes (Section 3.6.3);
- Analysis of Data Collected Using The Feelings Scale (Section 3.6.4);
- Cross-Case Analysis (Section 3.6.5);
- Table of Results (Section 3.6.6).

### ***3.6.1 Exploratory Comments and Emerging Themes***

In preparation for data analysis, I copied each original transcript into a new Microsoft word table with three columns. The copied transcript was pasted into the middle column, and the new document was formatted to make space to record exploratory comments (or my base interpretations) side by side with the transcript and participant's words. Each transcript was analysed idiographically, that is treated as a complete individual case, and analysed in its entirely before moving on to the next case.

In the first step of analysis I read each transcript, and recorded notes or exploratory comments in the left-hand column. Exploratory comments included anything significant or interesting about what the participant said (as suggested by Smith, & Osborn, 2015). Exploratory comments also aimed to document my thinking and sense making about the participant's sense making of the topic (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). To do this I wrote down any thoughts or comments of potential

significance that might inform how I interpreted the participant's words. I also included critical questions, that were not necessarily answered within the text, and "comments associated with personal reflexivity", which served to document my thinking about what I wanted to know and learn more about from the what the participant was saying (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012, p. 367).

In the left-hand exploratory comments column, I also recorded my interpretation of the participant's feelings. My interpretations of participant's feelings were based on the participant's actual explicit words, how they said them (tone of voice in the voice recording), and also particularly emotional responses, as suggested by Pietkiewicz and Smith (2012). My interpretations of participant's feelings were also informed by my notes that I had recorded during the interview, or just after the interview had taken place. During the interview, I recorded any impressions that I had made of the participant, including, for example, how comfortable I thought they were while discussing a topic and/or answering the questions. I also re-visited each data set that included, re-listening to the audio, re-reading the transcripts, notes and interview schedules to check that my impressions and interpretations of participant's feelings were as accurate as possible. I re-presented participant's feelings in the table of themes document, and this is explained in more detail in Section 3.6.4.

When Māori language was used in the interviews, as was the case with the four students from the Māori unit, I translated the Māori language, and placed English translations in the left-hand column with the exploratory comments. To distinguish the translations from the exploratory comments, I highlighted the Māori to English translations in green. To save space for exploratory comments, I abbreviated some of the Māori language, for example, rather than translate a beginning or end prayer, I just wrote 'prayer' (highlighted in green).

At the second step, exploratory comments were developed into emergent themes. This stage of analysis is at a higher level of abstraction – drawing more on the researcher notes and theoretical lens to develop the emerging themes (Pietkiewicz, & Smith, 2012). The forming of categories or emergent themes is "recursive" or a process of "constant comparison" where the researcher continually searches for evidence supportive or contrary to the themes emerging from the text (McMillan,

2012, p.299). To do this I re-read the exploratory comments and the transcript to notice anything significant and important, and these were transformed into a concise phrase that aimed to be grounded in that participant's account and to "capture the essential quality of what was found in the text" (Smith, & Osborn, 2015, p. 68). The concise phrases were recorded in the right-hand column as emerging themes. I named this first data analysis document 'Exploratory Comments and Emerging Themes: Participant (Number)'. An extract of this document (for participant one) is provided as an appendix (see Appendix 3).

### ***3.6.2 Initial List of Themes and Cluster of Themes***

The next step of analysis involved exporting the emerging themes in the order that they appeared in the initial 'Exploratory Comments and Emerging Themes: Participant (Number)' document and placing them in chronological order in a separate document. This second document was named 'Initial List of Themes and Cluster of Themes: Participant (Number)' and consisted of two columns with the emerging themes pasted into the left-hand column. The aim of this step was to transform the emerging themes into explicit themes. This stage drew particularly on the Kaupapa Māori interpretive lens that gave me a background and grounding in the topic that also informed and determined how I understood and interpreted what the participants were saying. Particularly influential to my interpretation was the literature on Māori identity (especially by Māori authors) that describes various factors that can influence Māori identity, including what are described as the 'classical markers' of Māori identity (see Chapter 2 Section 2.6.3). In my analysis I was interested to learn about the influence of the classical markers of Māori identity on the participants' constructions of Māori identity.

Transforming the emerging themes into explicit themes was done in two steps. First, I looked for connections between emerging themes, and grouped or clustered (emergent) themes that had a conceptual link into a distinct group. These clusters or groups were pasted into the right-hand column. An example of this document (for participant one) is provided in Appendix 4.

### ***3.6.3 Table of Themes***

The next step involved creating a table of themes. To do this I created a new word document called ‘Table of Themes, and Participant’s Feelings about Themes: Participant (Number)’, and copied in each cluster of themes from the previous ‘Initial List of Themes and Cluster of Themes: Participant (Number)’ document. At this point I gave each cluster a new name or descriptive label. To keep the themes grounded in the participant’s account, I used the participant’s actual words as descriptive labels for themes where possible and applicable. In some instances, descriptive labels were the ‘classical markers’ of Māori identity as identified in the literature review (see Chapter 2, Section 2.6.3). The descriptive label represented the superordinate or main (explicit) theme, and the initial emergent theme labels became subthemes or supporting ideas to the superordinate theme. I also condensed the subtheme titles where applicable, for example, by omitting duplicates.

The resulting table of themes document aimed to represent and highlight the priority concerns of the participants about the topic. To highlight which themes were most important and significant to the participant I reordered the themes with priority themes at the top of the document, down to themes that I interpreted as being less important to the participant. I also used the feelings scale to apply a number to the theme to describe the level of feeling the participant had about that theme, as described in the next subsection. Each case analysis resulted in a table of themes that aimed to highlight the priority concerns of each participant, and present information (themes) that addressed the research objectives of this study. An example of this document (for participant one) is provided in Appendix 5.

### ***3.6.4 Analysis of Data Collected Using the Feelings Scale***

In the document ‘Table of Themes, and Participant’s Feelings about Themes: Participant (Number)’, I interpreted the participant’s feelings in relation to each theme. This was done to answer research question 1, which was:

Research Question 1:

“What were the feelings of Māori boys (at one large New Zealand boys’ high school) as they constructed their Māori identity?

This data was analysed by first checking my interpretation of participant’s feelings against notes that I had recorded at the time of the interview or just after the interview. In the interview notes I had typically recorded my impression of the participant and how I perceived he felt during the interview. I also aimed to record explicit responses where the participant stated how he felt about a topic discussed during the interview.

Then, the data derived from the Feelings Scale was analysed to determine each theme’s influence on the participant’s Māori identity. This was achieved by presuming a connection between level of feeling and influence on Māori identity. For example, I presumed a positive feeling indicated a positive influence on the participant’s Māori identity. Conversely a negative feeling indicated a negative influence on the participant’s Māori identity.

By analysing the data from the Feelings Scale I was able to delineate between themes and interpret each theme’s significance. This was achieved by comparing level of feeling between themes. For example, I determined that a theme with a positive score was more significant than themes with lower positive scores. Similarly, I determined themes with low negative scores, for example (-4), as more significant than themes with closer to zero negative scores, for example (-2).

I also determined that themes with extreme levels of feeling, for example (-4) and (+4), were particularly significant. For example, if I interpreted a participant as having an extremely negative level of feeling about a theme (for example -4), this indicated that the theme was very significant in an extremely negative sense and likely detrimental to the participant’s wellbeing. As a result, themes with extreme levels of negative feeling also indicated the priority concerns of the participants requiring urgent attention. Conversely, themes with extremely positive levels of feeling (for example, +4) indicated themes that were very significant in a positive sense with a very likely positive effect on the participants and their Māori identity construction. All themes with positive levels of feeling were interpreted as being

significant to the participants and their Māori identity construction to varying degrees.

### ***3.6.5 Cross-Case Analysis***

Each case was analysed in full (idiographically) to gain in-depth understanding of each participant, and the meanings each made about the factors that influenced their Māori identity construction. The analysis continued by converging the tables of each participant and conducting a cross-case analysis to investigate the factors most significant to the group as a whole (a procedure recommended by Yin, 2011). This was done by printing all of the tables, placing them on a wall, and reading across the tables to reveal the themes that were significant across the group. A new document (see below in Table 3.3) was created called “Cross-Case Analysis: Table of Themes for all Participants” that recorded the most significant themes and noted that participants for whom each theme was a factor. This document also grouped the themes in relation to the research objectives they related to, as shown in the table below.

### ***3.6.6 Table of Results***

The final document created, as part of the analysis, was the document called ‘Table of Results’. This document showed the participants’ response or non-response to themes, and in the case of a response, recorded the participants’ feelings in relation to that theme. This enabled collation of results to show the average scores for the participants’ feelings. The ‘Table of Results’ document is located in Appendix 6, and an abridged version is presented in the results chapter (Chapter 4).

Table 3.3 Cross Case Analysis: Table of Themes for all Participants

<b>Research objective</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Themes</b>	<b>Participants</b>
1. To explore the feelings of Māori boys at one NZ high school as they construct their Māori identity	Priority concerns of the participants	Negative stereotypes of Māori	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, 10,11,12
		Having fair skin/Being a white Māori	6,7,9,10,11,12
		Being excluded by other Māori	6,9,10
2. To investigate the factors that influence Māori boys as they construct their Māori identity	The most significant Factors that influence Māori identity construction (additional to those above)	Whakapapa	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,12
		Whānau	2,3,4,5,6,7,11,12
		Upbringing	1,2,3,4,5
		Influence of grandparents	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,11,12
3. To examine the classical markers of Māori identity and their influence on Maori boys as they construct their Māori identity.	Classical markers of Māori identity	Te Reo Māori	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
		Kapa Haka	1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10,11,12
		Declining significance of other (crucial) markers e.g., marae	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 Only significant for 3,4,8

### 3.7 Ensuring Trustworthiness

This section explains how the research design of this study enhances its credibility and trustworthiness. Credibility and trustworthiness were built into this research by the following:

- Locating the research within a Kaupapa Māori framework, which included; clarifying and defining Kaupapa Māori, exploring the diverse aims of Kaupapa Māori and its metaphysical assumptions, and by clarifying the metaphysical location for this study. Also, ideology inherent within Kaupapa Māori and influential to interpretation was explicitly stated, including within a self-reflexive presentation that revealed researcher bias and subjectivity.
- Through prolonged engagement in the field setting and the community where the research took place – this enabled experiential understanding, and rich, detailed description of the research context.
- By presenting the data and documents for analysis in an orderly way that could be easily followed and understood.

- By developing research procedures (systems of analysis) that were methodical to allow a third person to understand how the data was interpreted.
- Triangulation that involved review by research supervisors.
- Adherence to evidence in the form of participants' actual language, used in the write up, which enables checking and verifying of researcher interpretations.
- Consulting the school (where the research was conducted) by writing a report detailing the main findings of the research and seeking the school's feedback.
- Following procedures of and for ethics approval.

The bullet points above are explained in more detail below:

This research was conducted from a Kaupapa Māori framework that includes its own unique subjectivity and particular research bias. To build trustworthiness in this study, I located myself within this framework and aimed to make my bias (and that of Kaupapa Māori) clear (see Section 3.3.1). In order to achieve this and locate myself within a Kaupapa Māori framework, I first sought to clarify its metaphysical assumptions. To do this I identified that different metaphysical positions are possible within Kaupapa Māori, and are determined by various factors including the purpose and aim of inquiry. By clearly identifying and stating the research objectives and purpose of this study – specifically to listen to Māori boys to explore their subjective feelings as they go about Māori identity construction, and the factors that influence Māori identity - I was able to decide a metaphysical location commensurable to those aims. The metaphysical location of this Kaupapa Māori study assumed a relativist view of reality and closely aligns to the constructivist principles, where individuals make meanings and constructions about reality based on experience. By clarifying Kaupapa Māori's metaphysical position I was then able to develop the research methodology congruent to its metaphysical location and aims of the inquiry.

In this study I also proposed a new theoretical element to the metaphysical location and methodological of Kaupapa Māori and this study, and that was a movement away from dialectical thinking that positions Māori, and our constructions of reality,

in relation to Pākehā, a position that ‘others’ Māori in binary opposition to Pākehā – a position inapt to the developmental and transformational aspirations of Māori. This ‘apotheotical’ position also enhances trustworthiness in this study as it is inclusive and accepts Māori people as diverse and heterogeneous (including at a epistemological level), and in terms of the diverse meanings and constructions that we make about our life experiences. Although this study does not deny the importance of ‘culture’ based on classical concepts such as, language, the apotheotical position incorporates all Māori including those unable to construct a Māori identity based on classical precepts. This theoretical position also assumes the constructions that Māori make are valid and legitimate constructions, and responses to the experiences that Māori have in a particular context.

Trustworthiness in this study was also enhanced in this study through prolonged engagement in research community where the research was conducted (McMillan, 2012). For one year my family and I lived in the same street as the school; and, during this time, I worked in the school as a relief and fixed-term teacher. Living in the community and my experiential engagement (experiences as a teacher/ in various roles) in the school allowed me to develop an awareness of the various and multiple factors that could potentially influence the participants as they constructed their Māori identity in this particular context.

To ensure trustworthiness and credibility this study aimed to be transparent (as recommended by Yin, 2011). Transparency was enhanced in this study by presenting the data and documents for analysis and describing and documenting the research procedures in a way that they could be reviewed and scrutinised (Yin, 2011). Research procedures also aimed to be methodical and orderly so they could be easily understood, and so that interpretations could be checked and verified against the participants’ actual language.

Trustworthiness was ensured in this study through peer/supervisor review, specifically the research supervisors who reviewed and scrutinised all aspects of the research design. This was a form of triangulation as suggested by Mathison (1988). As this thesis is being presented to an Australian University, a secondary Māori supervisor was enlisted, (Dr. Craig Rofe, Victoria University of Wellington) who

added credibility by reviewing all aspects of the research design, including Kaupapa Māori research principles of data collection, and data analysis to determine that this research was conducted in a culturally safe way, and that data interpretation was accurate and plausible from a Kaupapa Māori perspective.

In important element of research that contributes to its trustworthiness and credibility is that findings adhere to the evidence (Yin, 2011). In the present study the evidence was the participants' actual language, which was presented in full in this thesis side by side with my interpretations. Pertinent to the interpretation was my theoretical lens that was fully articulated in this study. My interpretations side by side with the participant's actual language allows for a third person to determine if my interpretations are accurate by adhering to the evidence (from an explicitly stated point of view).

Another aspect of this study that contributed to its trustworthiness and credibility was dialogue with The School that including a detailed report to the school that explained the main findings of the study (based on the initial exploratory analysis). The results of this study were 'sensitive' in terms of the level of negative feeling that the participants had about the negative stereotypes of Māori that they were exposed at The School (and how the school might respond to this). However, the principal was very supportive of the research, and indicated he wanted the findings addressed. As a preliminary step, the principal forwarded the report to lead teachers responsible for professional development on culturally responsive and relational pedagogy.

A final aspect of this study that enhances its trustworthiness and credibility is its adherence to ethical procedures that are considered culturally appropriate and safe from a Kaupapa Māori perspective, and by complying with standards of ethical research as detailed in procurements of ethics approval, as explained in more detail in the next section.

### **3.8 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations of this study were mediated by following Kaupapa Māori principles and methods to ensure the research conducted was culturally safe as

described in Section 3.5.2. Ethical issues were also considered in line with Curtin University's policies and processes of ethics approval, which included an application to, and approval from Curtin University's Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number -10379, see Appendix 7). There were three main areas for ethical consideration, described below, and which included; obtaining informed consent, reducing the risk of harm to participants, and ensuring confidentiality and anonymity.

### ***3.8.1 Informed consent***

The first ethical consideration was to obtain informed consent from the school and then from the students who participated in this study. A key Kaupapa Māori principle whakawhanaungatanga<sup>26</sup> was used to establish positive (familial type) relationships with the principal, key gatekeepers such as, the Māori deputy principal, and potential participants. Whakawhanaungatanga enabled us to get to know each other, and to make my intentions clear about the reasons for carrying out this research, and that the research would be conducted with the best interests of the school and participants. These relationships based on whanaungatanga facilitated getting the school's buy in, interest and understanding for the need for this study. It also paved the way for obtaining informed consent.

Informed consent is an important concern in ethical research (Howitt, 2008; Yin 2011). Informed consent was obtained by explaining key elements of the study verbally, in the case of the principal and Māori deputy principal over three formal meetings, and by providing information and consent sheets (see Appendix 8). The information sheet included key information about the study to ensure consent was informed, and included; the aims of the study, information about what was required from participants in terms of an interview to collect their views about the topic, that participation was voluntary and participants could withdraw at any time, assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, and potential risks to the school and participants.

---

<sup>26</sup> Whakawhanaungatanga is a process of establishing familial type relationships.

### 3.8.2 *Confidentiality and anonymity*

The second ethical concern was to protect the participants' confidentiality and anonymity so as to reduce the potential of harm to the school and the participants. This study had the potential to cause harm if the results revealed negative information about the school and its staff. For example, as this study involved Māori identity and identity is often associated with race, and based on my own negative experiences with my Māori identity (see self-reflexive presentation in the prologue), I anticipated the participants might discuss racism in the school as a factor influencing their Māori identity construction. I was unsure if the principal anticipated racism as a factor that might be revealed by the participants, nonetheless, when I discussed this study with the principal, in order to get permission, I explained that the study could reveal sensitive information, and therefore there was an ethical need to protect the school, staff, and participants from potential harm. This would be achieved by ensuring confidentiality and anonymity.

In this study (I explained that) confidentiality and anonymity would be protected by not reporting the school's name, or the names of staff or participants in any communication, including the final thesis or any report that might emerge from the study. Also, any identifiable information that could reveal the school was omitted, for example, the town and location of the school.

In this study there was potential risk to the students who participated. This study aimed to give the Māori boys the opportunity to share their voice and to be heard without fear that they might be disadvantaged in any way. To ensure the participants safety I took measures to protect their confidentiality and anonymity. I explained to the participants that the school would not be aware of who was participating in the study; I would tell the school what the participants had to say, but the school would not know who said what. I also explained that all names would be omitted in the report to the school, the final thesis, and in any other report or communication that might result from the study. In the thesis pseudonyms replaced the participant's names to ensure the participants' confidentiality and anonymity.

While carrying out the study I also ensured confidentiality and anonymity of the participants by following ethical protocols of (correctly) handling data and the storage of data. This process was aided by completing Curtin University's research management plan. For example, on audio recordings and transcripts the participants were identified by 'participant and number', for example Participant 1. Audio recordings and other data, including documents of analysis, were saved on a password-protected computer. Physical transcripts and any hard-copy information and data that could link the participants to this study were filed and stored in a secure and locked office.

### ***3.8.3 Minimising harm to participants***

The third ethical consideration involved minimising harm to the participants as they shared personal and sensitive information, for example, about their family circumstances and/or upbringing, and their feelings about their experiences related to their Māori identity. This related to the ethical principle that participants should be treated respectfully and fairly (Yin, 2011). As my own experiences with my Māori identity involved racism, exclusion and resultant negative feelings, I anticipated the participants might also recount difficult experiences and uncomfortable feelings. In order to minimise harm to the participants as they described their experiences and shared their feelings, I drew on Kaupapa Māori practices of ethical research to create a safe space for the participants to share their experiences and feelings. These included whakawhanaungatanga<sup>27</sup> (explained above), and the use of tikanga (cultural practices) such as, karakia and te reo Māori (for Māori unit participants) to protect the tapu (sacredness) and mana (power) of the participants (Bishop, 1999; Cram, 2006).

I drew on my 'emic advantage' and Kaupapa Māori practices of ethical research as described by L. Smith (1999) to have aroha (love and respect), show compassion, understanding and empathy for the participants (see Section 3.3.3). Following these ethical principles and Kaupapa Māori procedures I believe the participants felt safe and able to share their experiences and feelings about what was often a difficult and sensitive topic.

---

<sup>27</sup> Whakawhanaungatanga is a process of establishing familial type relationships.

### 3.9 Chapter Summary

This study's research design included Kaupapa Māori combined with the qualitative research approach Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). This research design was considered appropriate to investigate Māori identity, including, the gathering and analysing of qualitative data to answer the research questions.

This research was conducted at one New Zealand all boys' high school. The school had particular features pertinent to an investigation of Māori identity. The school had a large number of Māori students in the mainstream school, and a Māori unit, where students in the unit, were exposed to aspects of Māori culture. Twelve senior Māori boys were purposively selected, and semi-structured interviews were conducted to hear their voice and about their life experiences related to Māori identity. Kaupapa Māori principles and practices were used throughout the investigation to ensure the research was conducted in an ethical and culturally safe way.

The research design used IPA procedures of working with data, including a step-by-step process of data analysis. These steps were explained in detail in this chapter and aimed to be logical so that the analysis was carried out in a methodical way. IPA also recognises the interactive and transactional role of the researcher and acknowledges researcher interpretations of participants' meanings. The research design, therefore, incorporated IPA methods of analysis to interpret the meanings the participants' made about their life experiences. To enhance transparency and to understand researcher interpretations, the research lens was made explicit, which was articulated and explained as Kaupapa Māori.

The research design explained in this chapter enabled the successful collection and analysis of data and uncovered significant and pertinent information about Māori identity. This data is presented as findings in the following chapter.

## **Chapter 4**

### **RESULTS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the results of this study. The overarching aim of the study was to examine factors that were likely to influence the participants' Māori identity construction. In the semi-structured interviews participants identified and discussed numerous factors in relation to Māori identity. The analysis of the data, through the cross-case analysis, revealed the most significant factors to the group overall, and the factors most pertinent to the research objectives of this study. The most significant and pertinent factors are shown in Table 4.1 below, and include an average feelings score (the calculation for which is described in Chapter 3) for each factor of the Feelings Scale. These scores ranged from +4 to -4, where +4 represented an extremely positive feeling, 0 represented a neutral feeling, and -4 represented a very negative feeling. Scores were based on my interpretation of the participants' feelings, and were used to indicate the intensity of the participants' views of each of the factors.

Table 4.1 Factors that influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction – and the average scores from the Feelings Scale

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Average score</b>
Negative stereotyping of Māori	-3.16
Having fair skin	-0.66
Being excluded by other Māori	-3.75
Whakapapa	+0.75
Whānau	+3.33
Upbringing	+3.0
Influence of grandparents	+3.44
Te Reo Māori	+1.58
Kapa Haka	+2.1
Marae	+1.0

The factors shown in the table above are reported in this chapter in three sections, each of which corresponds to one of the three research objectives.

Section 4.2 reports on the feelings of 12 Māori boys from one New Zealand boys' high school as they experienced factors that influenced their Māori identity. This section reports on and explains the factors that the participants felt most strongly about, including: negative stereotyping of Māori; having fair skin; and, being excluded by other Māori. I interpreted these as negative factors to Māori identity construction (as interpreted on the Feelings Scale).

The next section (Section 4.3) reports those factors identified as influential to Māori identity construction that were additional to the factors identified in Section 4.2. These factors include: Whakapapa<sup>28</sup>; whānau<sup>29</sup>; influence of Māori grandparents; and, upbringing. I interpreted these as positive factors to Māori identity construction (as interpreted on the Feelings Scale).

Finally, Section 4.4 reports on the classical markers of Māori identity that were influential to the Māori identity construction for the Māori boys that participated in this study. These included; Te reo Māori<sup>30</sup> and Kapa Haka<sup>31</sup>. This section also reports on marae<sup>32</sup> because most of the participants mentioned marae when discussing their Māori identity.

## **4.2 The feelings of Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity**

This section reports the findings related to the first research objective, which sought to explore the feelings of Māori boys at the school as they constructed their Māori identity. Analysis of the data (described in Chapter 3) led to the identification of themes related to the factors experienced by the boys as they constructed their Māori identity. Using the 'Feelings Scale', described in Chapter 3, it was possible to determine which themes the participants felt most strongly about. Analysis of the data indicated that the concerns that were most pressing for the participants were:

---

<sup>28</sup> Genealogy

<sup>29</sup> family

<sup>30</sup> the Māori language

<sup>31</sup> Māori dance group

<sup>32</sup> customary village centre

negative stereotyping of Māori (described in Section 4.2.1; and, having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori (described in Section 4.2.2).

#### ***4.2.1 Negative stereotyping of Māori***

Analysis of the data indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori had a major influence on the participants' subjective feelings and appeared to influence the boys' Māori identity construction (for some of the participants). Based on the results of the Feelings Scale, the negative stereotyping of Māori that were portrayed by their peers, the media and others were of major concern for all but one of the 12 participants (with an average 'feelings' score of -3.16). For the exception, there was acknowledgment that, although negative stereotyping of Māori occurred, he considered it to be a "bit of shit thrown" and that it "happens a lot". This particular participant did not appear overly concerned about the issue (see Section 4.2.1.3).

This section explains the various aspects that made up this factor, and describes each aspect to provide a better understanding of how negative stereotyping influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. The section begins by relating how the participants described the negative stereotyping (Section 4.2.1.1) and then goes on to explain who, in the participants' views, stereotyped Māori negatively (Section 4.2.1.2). Next, the section describes the participants' feelings and reactions to negative stereotyping of Māori (Section 4.2.1.3), and how often the participants experienced negative stereotyping (Section 4.2.1.4). Finally, the section describes how the negative stereotyping influenced Māori identity construction (for the majority of the participants) (Section 4.2.1.5)

##### ***4.2.1.1 How the participants described negative stereotyping of Māori***

All of the participants spoke of the stereotypes that they had experienced at the school and in the wider community. In all cases, the participants spoke of generalisations that were used to stereotype Māori in ways that were negative. For example, Tamatea said (amongst other things) that Māori were sometimes referred to

as “oh like savages” and “hori”.<sup>33</sup> Ruakere spoke about Māori being referred to as ‘bullies’, and explained that bully was “a negative stereotype, negative label from being Māori”. Ryan spoke of Māori being stereotyped as ‘scary’ when he said: “Quite often it is something said behind their back cause some people often perceive being Māori is being a bit scary”. Te Oranga explained that some people think Māori were ‘dumb’ when he said, “they think we don’t got any brains”.

Five of the 12 participants described a negative stereotype that generalised Māori as being poor. For example, Te Oranga said that Māori were sometimes called “pōhara” (poor),<sup>34</sup> and Tamatea said, “like homeless or one of those like lower decile sort of fellas”,<sup>35</sup> and “hungry all the time”. Bryce said Māori were sometimes described as, “you know like no shoes and stuff. Eats everyone’s food”.

Seven of the 12 participants gave accounts of how negative stereotyping of Māori was exemplified in the media. According to some of the participants, the way that Māori were portrayed in the media was overwhelmingly negative. For example, Te Toiroa said:

Oh, so just, you know, in the media and what’s not on the news, ya know? Some of them really, doesn’t really create a positive name for us as Māori and kinda gets me little bit, ya know, a bit down about that cause ‘Māori do this, Māori do that’. And I look, yeah, it’s just not, it doesn’t set a good trend for Māori, and doesn’t really make me feel any better.

Some of the participants spoke about how Māori were usually portrayed in the media, and how this could fashion a stereotype that Māori were ‘criminals’. For example, Te Mana said, “because if they [Pākehā students] have said any negative things about Māoris and that, they probably just hear it on the news, like robbing and all this weed [marijuana] stuff”. Jason summed up how the media could demonise

<sup>33</sup> The term ‘Hori’ is a transliteration of the English name George, which was very popular during the early years of European colonisation of New Zealand. Today, some people use the word derogatorily to describe Māori people.

<sup>34</sup> Pōhara means to be poor

<sup>35</sup> Decile refers to the NZ government’s ‘decile system’ used to describe or rate a school based on the socio-economic conditions of the school’s catchment area.

Māori in ways that people might not recognise, saying, “I think [demonizing Māori in the media], it’s done so much. It’s so, I don’t know how can I say it, it’s [done] so underhandedly that you don’t really notice that it’s happening; but you have sort of been fed these ideas”. Ruakere explained how he experienced the ‘criminal’ stereotype at the school saying; “when anything or something gets stolen, people instantly just blame Māori”.

All of the participants spoke of how negative stereotypes were communicated to them in different ways. Five participants described negative stereotyping of Māori as banter or being passed off as jokes. For example, Louis described the negative stereotyping of Māori as ‘banter’ and “a bit of shit thrown”. However, all of the other participants (the exception being Louis) acknowledged that they felt negatively when they experienced negative stereotyping of Māori, even if it was said as a joke or banter. For example, Bryce said, “it’s [negative stereotyping of Māori] just a bit of banter but yeah there’s definitely like a serious side to it too”. Some of the participants provided more information about this ‘serious side’ to negative stereotyping. For example, Scott explained that negative stereotyping of Māori could constitute teasing or bullying when he said:

I’ve been in a few classes where I have been teased for being Māori and, you know, done all that stuff. And you know, I don’t really take notice of it but that’s sort of, um, I guess, I guess, yeah, bullying.

Some of the participants explained how negative stereotyping of Māori could be present in (some) peoples’ attitudes and expectations, and could be communicated non-verbally. Te Oranga explained, in “the way they [people who stereotype Māori] look at you”. Some of the participants talked about negative stereotyping as being a negative attitude about Māori that was ubiquitous and prevalent at the school and in the wider community. For example, Scott said, “oh I see around the community, oh you’re Māori scum or whatever and they do that kind of stuff. I just think like, ‘oh that’s a bit low, don’t do that’”. Bryce explained what he felt was a general negative attitude about Māori in wider society when he said that “quite a lot of people don’t like the Māori population”.

One of the participants talked about how negative stereotyping of Māori could include other peoples' 'low expectations' of Māori. For example, when Tūkino spoke about his experiences at his previous school, he said, "I always felt like always expected to almost fail, like a sign of expectation of like 'oh you're Māori' you know, like there's always those stereotypes that come along with being Māori". He explained these expectations and stereotypes further, saying, "like the stereotypes of ... low attendance, like poor background, things like that".

Some of the participants spoke about how negative stereotyping of Māori could be communicated non-verbally. Te Oranga said the stereotypes included "what they say, like how they look, how they look at you, and like how they say it". The next factor considered who the participants felt 'they' were.

#### *4.2.1.2 Who stereotyped Māori negatively*

Analysis of the data indicated that, according to the participants, Pākehā students in the school were the predominant group that stereotyped Māori in ways that were negative. Te Oranga was the most explicit when he explained; "I don't wanna sound really racist but, like, Pākehā boys [stereotype Māori negatively]". Tamatea also stated in the context of students at the school, "Oh well ... there's a few Pākehā who do it".

Four of the participants identified Pākehā friends who would stereotype Māori negatively and tease or make fun of Māori. For example, Ruakere spoke about his Pākehā friends who would make fun of him if he spoke Māori words, he explained: "People I hang out with aren't Māori, but you know, sometimes when we're out surfing or doing activities ... sometimes I would ....say a couple of words in Māori and ... they'll laugh about it". Bryce said that most of his friends were Pākehā and "they like know I'm Māori, but like there's a bit of banter you know, there's banter about me being like white".

Some participants talked about their experiences of negative stereotyping of Māori in the wider community and Scott identified older Pākehā males as more likely to stereotype Māori negatively. Scott said, "Hmm I gotta say some of the elder people,

cause they're probably the worst". He went on to clarify 'the elder people' saying, "Like adults, Pākehā adults". He expanded on this saying:

You know I've seen around (in the wider community), yeah I've seen around school even. You know some of the adults and all that, you know, saying just bad stuff. But you know the kids are pretty bad as well. I mean some of the students, you know, it just gets back into that bullying sort of stuff.

Two participants identified Pākehā family members who would stereotype Māori in ways that were negative. For example, Ruakere and Jason talked about their Pākehā grandfathers and how they stereotyped Māori. Jason retold a story where he heard his Pākehā grandfather say "those bloody Māoris", and Ruakere described his Pākehā grandfather as a "low-key racist".

#### *4.2.1.3 Participants feelings and reactions to negative stereotyping of Māori*

Analysis of the data indicated that all but one of the participants expressed very negative feelings when they experienced negative stereotyping of Māori. Analysis of the data also indicated the participants' reactions to the negative stereotypes they experienced and highlighted their preference of trying to ignore negative stereotyping of Māori (despite feeling very negative about them).

All of the participants, with only one exception, said they had adverse feelings when they experienced negative stereotyping of Māori. The participants expressed their feelings in various ways. For example, Tamatea said negative stereotyping "pretty much drives me crazy...like out the gate" (really angry). He also felt "annoyed". Ryan said he felt "offended". Other participants expressed feeling annoyed such as Ruakere, but most participants expressed more negative type feelings. For example, Tūkino said:

No I hate it! Like, I really hate it. Like, that is something I am really passionate about is Māori students and Māori relations issues. So I hate when I hear things like that. It makes me feel,

what's the word, uh, not inadequate, but like sorry for them and stuff.

In almost all cases, the negative stereotypes made the participants feel angry. For example when asked how he felt when he heard negative stereotyping of Māori, Scott said, “um, angry”. Te Manu said, “so that’s why I just feel a little bit angry”. Some participants were more forthright, such as Te Oranga and Jason who both said it [negative stereotyping of Māori] “pisses me off”.

Some of the participants explained that negative stereotypes made them feel down. For example Te Toiroa sounded demoralised when he explained his feelings about the negative stereotyping of Māori he experienced saying:

...gets me little bit, ya know, a bit down about that. Cause Māori do this, Māori do that. And I look, yeah, it’s just not, it doesn’t set a good trend for Māori, and doesn’t really make me feel any better.

Additional to their feelings, the participants explained their external reactions to the negative stereotypes they experienced. Participants’ external reactions were mostly passive and included, ignoring, or trying to stay positive. Only one participant, Tamatea, spoke about a more assertive reaction and that was to confront the person doing the stereotyping.

The analysis revealed that the most common external response was [to try] to ignore the negative stereotyping of Māori that the participants experienced. This was expressed by Ruakere who said, “Uh, I just take it on the chin. It’s uh kind of hard things like that”. Bryce said, “I just brush it off, like I don’t really care”. Te Oranga said “I just go into my own bubble”, and “just, oh, just, uh, like block out all that negative, negative, uh, like talking that they’re saying”. Ruakere spoke about ignoring or ‘brushing aside’ the stereotypes and trying to stay positive, when he said:

I like to be a positive person so it’s not an insult. It’s just an insult in general. I seem to just brush aside and see something else, I don’t feel like I should tell them, or that people are saying it right

or wrong. Some people, like, have their own opinion and some people feel the way they do, and that's al-right. Sometimes it's just better to be different.

Tamatea was the only participant who talked about (the possibility of) confronting the person who did the negative stereotyping, when he said; "Well sucking it up will be the first option but it doesn't make it from there, then I will have to verbally tell them in the best way I can".

#### *4.2.1.4 How often the participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori*

Although the regularity with which the participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori varied, the analysis suggested that, overall, the participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori frequently. The participants' responses also gave some insight into what might cause a person to experience negative stereotyping of Māori more or less frequently.

Some participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori very frequently, as much as 'daily'. Bryce explained that he experienced negative stereotyping of Māori; "quite a lot, yeah quite a lot...oh, probably, probably daily" and "once or twice daily". Te Oranga said it happens a "couple of times a week", and Ryan said it happened "every week".

Some participants gave more general accounts that still communicated that negative stereotyping of Māori happened frequently, such as Louis who said "it happens quite a lot", and Jason, "oh, like all the time really". Te Mana said "Quite a lot now because it's on TV like all the time, on the news and all those kind of things". Manu said that he experienced negative stereotyping "not much", indicating that some participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori less frequently.

Some participants gave suggestions as to what could cause a Māori student to experience negative stereotyping of Māori more or less frequently. For example, Tamatea explained that it depended on how well a person got along with others, saying:

So ... [negative stereotyping of Māori happens] sort of like now and again. Or really it just depends on what sort of area you're in and what sort of connection you have with everyone. Cause if your connection isn't the best, then it'll become a daily basis.

Some participants explained why they thought they experienced negative stereotyping of Māori less than some other Māori, putting it down to skin colour and their fair complexion. Bryce saying “well I think because I’m quite like fair.... I don’t really get any of the negative effects of being Māori”. Scott said something similar, “well I guess those stereotypes don’t happen to me a lot because of my skin colour”.

#### *4.2.1.5 Possible influence of negative stereotyping of Māori on Māori identity construction (for some of the participants)*

The data indicated that the negative stereotyping of Māori had an adverse influence on at least five of the participants’ Māori identity construction. The analysis and interpretation of the participants’ responses inferred a likely negative influence on the participants’ Māori identity construction for the majority of the participants.

Five of the participants discussed how negative stereotyping of Māori influenced their Māori identity construction negatively. These participants talked about how negative stereotyping of Māori could influence their participation in certain contexts, particularly in mainstream classes with mostly Pākehā students. Te Oranga said that because of the negative stereotyping of Māori, “sometimes in class I hold back”. Jason said “in most cases I find it hard to express myself...to be a part of a Māori culture... because there tends to be more negatives than positives about it [being Māori]”. Scott talked about not wanting to explore or declare his Māori identity for fear of being different, saying:

I felt like I was the only Māori because I was surrounded by everyone who was English. And you know I couldn’t really bring myself out to say yeah I’m Māori because yeah I would be

different, that sort of thing. But yeah there were other Māori kids, but I feel like they felt the same way.

Two of the twelve participants explained that negative stereotyping of Māori could be detrimental to their Māori identity construction. For example, Ryan commented that negative stereotyping of Māori “would probably put me back, put me off it a little bit [from]... exploring more of it [Māori identity]”. Ending this theme, Bryce suggested that negative stereotyping of Māori could be detrimental to Māori identity when he said, it [negative stereotyping of Māori] “kind of makes you not want to be Māori sometimes...kind of almost makes you feel kind of ashamed”.

#### *4.2.1.6 Conclusion: Negative stereotyping of Māori*

This section began by relating how the participants described negative stereotyping of Māori that they experienced at the school and wider community. The participants described generalizations that stereotyped Māori in ways that were negative, and these included words such as, ‘hori, savages, scary, bullies, and dumb’. Some of the participants described how Māori were portrayed and stereotyped negatively in the media, and how these could play out in their everyday experiences, including in negative stereotypes, such as, Māori were ‘poor’ or ‘criminals’. Some of the participants expressed how negative stereotyping of Māori could be communicated as jokes or banter and also constitute teasing and bullying. According to some participants, negative stereotyping of Māori could be communicated non-verbally, such as, in the way that some people looked at you, and could also be present in peoples’ attitudes and expectations of and about Māori. This section explained that, in the participants’ views, other Pākehā students at the school were the predominant group that stereotyped Māori negatively.

This section then described the participants’ feelings and reactions to negative stereotyping of Māori. All of the participants, with one exception, expressed negative feelings about the negative stereotyping of Māori that they experienced. In almost all cases the negative stereotyping of Māori made the participants feel angry. The section went on to describe the participants’ reactions to the negative stereotyping of Māori, and the most common reaction of trying to ignore the stereotypes that they

experienced. The section then described how often the participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori, which was as much as daily, although there was some variation in how often the participants experienced negative stereotyping of Māori.

Finally, the section described how negative stereotyping of Māori could have had a negative influence on Māori identity construction for at least five of the participants. These participants said negative stereotyping of Māori limited their participation particularly in mainstream (school and wider community) contexts and that this, in turn, could prevent them from exploring and affirming their Māori identity. In the most extreme cases, two participants indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori could turn them off from wanting to be Māori.

#### ***4.2.2 Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori***

In this section the factors, ‘having fair skin’ and ‘being excluded by other Māori’ are considered together because the second factor (in all but one case) was a result of the first. Analysis of the data indicated that these factors, taken together, had a significant influence on the participants’ feelings and also an inferred negative influence on Māori identity construction.

During the course of the interviews the sample strategy was modified and this was explained in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3. This occurred because the sixth participant disclosed a significant factor not revealed by the preceding five participants (who were perceived to be Māori looking), and that was the influence of his fair skin on his Māori identity construction. To learn more about this factor, all but one of the remaining six participants were purposively selected because they had fair skin (and were perceived to be non-Māori looking). All of the participants who were purposively selected based on the modified sample criteria discussed having fair skin as a factor that influenced their Māori identity construction.

Based on results from the Feelings Scale, six of the participants expressed somewhat negative feelings about having fair skin (average score -0.66). However, four of the participants that expressed negative feelings about having fair skin, expressed very

negative feelings about being excluded by other Māori (average score -3.75). These two factors then, having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori (taken together) were considered to be a ‘priority concern’ of the participants and pertinent to research objective one.

This section begins by relating how the participants described their non-Māori physical appearance (referred to hence forth as having fair skin). The section then explains the most significant result of having fair skin (as experienced by three of the six participants), which was being excluded by other Māori (see Section 4.2.2.1). The section then describes the participants’ feelings about being excluded by other Māori. Finally, this section describes how having fair skin and (resulting in) being excluded by other Māori could influence Māori identity construction.

#### *4.2.2.1 Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori*

Analysis of the data revealed how the participants described their (non-Māori looking) physical appearance. These six participants described having fair skin in similar ways and ‘fair’ and ‘white’ were common self-descriptions. Louis went into the most detail saying, “I’m quite fair, I’m very fair, from all aesthetic and cosmetic comparisons I do not come off as Māori at all. I am very white”. Bryce described himself, saying, “I’m not, like, visibly Māori”, and “I don’t look, like, super Māori”.

Some of the participants talked about how other people described their physical appearance and perceived their ethnicity. For example, Bryce said; “Well, I think because I’m quite, like, fair... people in the community wouldn’t be, like, oh you know, ‘he is Māori’... They’ll just be, like, ‘oh he is Pākehā’”.

Manu explained people often acted surprised when they found out he was Māori. Manu said if other people “looked at me, they wouldn’t think I’m Māori, but if they saw my last name they’d be like, oh ‘I never knew that.’” Scott retold a story where his Māori identity seemed to be a matter of public debate, saying:

I asked some of the boys and they go ‘no, your pretty dark, you’re pretty Māori man’. But I’m like ‘oh’... I talk to some of the other

kids, ‘oh, nah you’re white’. And I’m like ‘nah bro, you should look at my family man, I’m not white’.”

The data indicated that some of the participants had their ‘authenticity’ and Māori identity challenged by some Pākehā students at the school. This could happen, for example, when a participant told others they were Māori, and the reactions this incurred could include, surprise (as explained by Manu above), disbelief, or even a refusal to believe the person was Māori. Ryan described how some people didn’t believe he was Māori because of his fair skin, explaining: “When I tell them [Pākehā students, I’m Māori], they don’t really believe me”. Ryan said when this happened he felt “a bit of shock”, and he seemed to take this as a challenge to his identity when he questioned, “why won’t you believe me?”

Some of the participants said that other Māori students could also challenge a participant’s Māori identity. For example, Jason said; “well there’s, like, some negative things, as you know, cause of my skin colour. Like if I’m around, like, some Māori people, like, they don’t really view me as Māori”. Bryce talked about how it was ‘cool’ when Māori accepted him as Māori, but implied it wasn’t ‘cool’ when, “quite often they [other Māori] are just like, nah you’re not Māori. Like, you know, like, I’m not gunna pull out my documents. I don’t really care if they believe me”.

Three participants spoke about how having fair skin could lead to being excluded by other Māori. These participants explained that being excluded by other Māori could involve being excluded from certain Māori cultural activities, such as kapa haka. Jason said he felt that Māori culture “isn’t really accepted as much as it should be... I also had a few Māori people saying like oh you can’t, you shouldn’t be doing that [e.g. kapa haka] cause you’re white”. Louis explained being excluded by other Māori in particular detail, and this is best illustrated in the interview extract that follows:

J<sup>36</sup>: Okay cool. So just to go again, at school, how do you feel about being Māori at school? Can you describe that?

L: Fine

---

<sup>36</sup> The initial “J” indicates myself the researcher/interviewer and “L” indicates Louis the participant/interviewee

J: Fine, cool. And at home?

L: Fine

J: In the community?

L: Mmm, community's a bit different.

J: Okay cool, how is that?

L: Um going back to where this discussion started. Aesthetics, I am not aesthetically Māori at all.

J: Yip

L: Speak white, I look white, my name is very white.

J: Mmm

L: Most common, my first name is most common, uh, Caucasian name in America.

J: Yip. So how do you feel about being Māori in the community?

L: Uh, not accepted.

J: Not accepted by who?

L: Māori

J: How does that come around? What is that like?

L: They don't do it too much anymore. But when I was younger, when I tried to engage in anything Māori, like activities such as kapa haka and stuff in school. I was sort of laughed at, but not

laughed at, but literally laughed at, like, “come on dude, what is this white dude doing here?” and that.

J: Mmm, and how did that feel?

L: Pretty bad. And that probably has a lot of why I polarize towards my European background.

The interview extract above showed how Louis felt “not accepted” by other Māori, and the extract implies that this was because Louis was “white”. Louis explained that being excluded by other Māori first happened at primary school when he tried to do kapa haka. The interview extract indicated the extent that being excluded by other Māori could affect a person’s Māori identity construction. In Louis’ case being excluded by other Māori resulted in Louis preferring to identify with his “European” identity.

The data indicated that four of the twelve participants experienced feeling excluded by other Māori, and that three of these participants had fair skin. One participant, Tūkino, looked Māori and experienced being excluded by other Māori. Tūkino spoke about (some) Māori environments being intimidating, and feeling excluded from the school marae and Māori unit, saying: “I used to go to that [an event at the school marae] for a little bit, and it is really intimidating to go there [to the school marae] because I am not in (the Māori unit), but I’m still a Māori student”. Tūkino described in more detail what it was like to feel excluded by other Māori and from Māori environments, saying:

I don’t wanna speak to other people but I feel that’s the same with a lot of them [other Māori], because you’re not in there and down there like everyone else is, you kind of almost singled out and that’s not how it should be because you’re in a Māori environment and it should be, you know, it should be welcoming, and it’s really not.

Bryce also spoke about feeling excluded from Māori environments saying that at the marae, “everyone is looking at you to do the right thing”. Like Tūkino, Bryce said that going to the marae could be ‘intimidating’ and that “if you step out of line, you kinda be like, sort of like, out-casted”. Tūkino explained how feeling excluded by other Māori and from Māori environments could affect his Māori identity, saying: “And that’s what doesn’t help me to be Māori, cause you know that should be the place [marae] where you should be able to identify to be Māori”.

Analysis of the data revealed the participants’ feelings when they experienced being excluded by other Māori. Based on what four participants said, and as recorded in the Feelings Scale (average score -3.75), the participants felt extreme negative feelings when they experienced being excluded by other Māori. For example, Jason said: “Yeah, that [being excluded by other Māori] probably pisses me off even more than anything a white person would say, a Pākehā would say” (referring to Pākehā person who stereotyped Māori negatively). The following interview extract, again with Louis, was particularly revealing about Louis’ attempts to try to explore his Māori identity, and how other Māori could exclude him. This extract also portrays, explicitly, Louis’ negative feelings about this situation.

J: And you tried, you made attempts to explore your Māori identity  
then

L: Yip

J: And you were, you were sort of

L: Excluded from the Māori community

J: You what sorry?

L: Excluded from the Māori community

J: Excluded from the Maori community

L: Yip

J: Oh mmm. And that made you feel? You got a feeling for that?

L: Shitty

#### *4.2.2.2 Conclusion: Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori*

This section reported on two factors, having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori. In both cases, analysis of the data indicated that these factors had a negative effect on the participants' feelings and appeared to influence negatively the participants' Māori identity construction. It is possible that, being excluded by other Māori could be detrimental to Māori identity construction because it likely prevented these four participants from exploring and affirming their Māori identity in contexts around other Māori. In one case, exclusion by other Māori was such a significant factor it was a reason why a participant preferred to identify with his 'European' identity.

### **4.3 Investigating the factors that influence Māori boys as they construct their Māori identity**

This section reports the results of the data analysis used to address research objective two, which was to investigate the factors that influence Māori boys as they construct their Māori identity. The factors reported in this section follow and are additional to the priority concerns in the previous section (Section 4.2) that were interpreted as the most significant factors that influenced the Māori boys and their Māori identity construction. The factors reported in this section can be described as determining factors of Māori identity, and were often described by the participants when answering questions, such as 'What makes you Māori?' The factors in this section were interpreted as positive influences on the participants (to whom the theme applied) and their Māori identity construction.

In this section, each factor is explained in relation to how the participants described it. This is done to provide a better understanding of how the factor influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. The participants' words are considered evidence in support of the factor's relevance to research objective two of

this study on Māori identity. The factors reported on in this section include: whakapapa (Section 4.3.1); whānau (Section 4.3.2); influence of Māori grandparents (Section 4.3.3); and, upbringing (Section 4.3.4).

#### **4.3.1 Whakapapa**

Analysis of the data indicated that eight of the 12 participants described whakapapa as a factor that influenced their Māori identity, although some of the participants used different words to describe it (other than or additional to the word whakapapa). For example, Scott referred to whakapapa as his “bloodline” and “heritage”. Tamatea called whakapapa his “family tree”, and Te Mana his “blood-heritage”. Louis used the word “genealogy”.

Some of the participants described whakapapa in ways different and additional to its usual meaning of ‘genealogy’. For example, Manu said whakapapa was about “knowing your past”, and “the people that came before you”. Te Mana and Tamatea both linked whakapapa to place, Te Mana saying whakapapa “helped you to know where you live”, and Tamatea, that whakapapa was about “knowing your roots”, and “knowing where you came from”.

Some of the participants either implied or stated explicitly that whakapapa was an essential element of their Māori identity, or the main thing that made them Māori. For example, Te Mana said, “what truly makes you Māori is your blood heritage”. Some of the participants said that whakapapa was one of the things in addition to other factors, such as upbringing and whānau<sup>37</sup> (discussed below) that made them Māori. One participant, Louis, said whakapapa or genealogy was the sole thing that made him Māori. When asked about the things that made him Māori, Louis said there was nothing “besides genealogy”.

Some of the participants described whakapapa as a factor that helped them to be Māori. For example, Te Toira said that his father had brought him up strong “through kapa haka” and by “teaching us our whakapapa”. Some of the participants described how whakapapa helped them to feel connected to other Māori. For example, Te

---

<sup>37</sup> Whānau is family

Oranga said that Māori people connected “through our whakapapa”. Te Oranga also said it was through this ‘connection’ that helped him to “stand tall”. Scott talked about how whakapapa connected him to his tribe. Bryce said his whakapapa helped him to feel comfortable around Māori things because it gave him the knowledge that ‘Māori culture’ was his culture too.

#### **4.3.2 Whānau**

Analysis of the data indicated that whānau was a significant factor for nine of the 12 participants and had a positive influence on Māori identity construction for these participants.

The data indicated the participants used the words whānau and family interchangeably, although the participants made a (subtle) distinction between the Māori concept of family (whānau) and the (Pākehā) concept of nuclear family. When the participants used the words whānau or family in a Māori sense it was used to describe extended (Māori) family and included, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. When the participants used the word family in a Pākehā sense they used it to describe (their) nuclear family. Participants who did not have a Pākehā parent tended to talk more about belonging to a whānau than a nuclear family. All of the participants, including those that had a Pākehā parent and a nuclear family, also had a Māori whānau that they belonged to, but that whānau/family was generally considered as something separate to the Pākehā nuclear family (if they had one). It is important to recognise the participants often use the word ‘family’ to describe their extended Māori whānau.

All of the participants spoke about whānau with very positive feelings as recorded on the Feelings Scale (average score of +3.3). Tūkino talked about his whānau with love and affection, and described his whānau as “having a big family”, and the “support that comes along with it”. He described the love in his whanau, saying that, “at tangis (funerals), even though they are a sad occasion, you get three or four days with all your family around”. Tūkino said he “loved that”. For some of the participants, whānau was a source of pride and strength. For example, Te Toira and Te Oranga talked about representing and drawing strength from whānau. Te Toira was captain

of the school's first rugby team, and said, "I walk around the school kind of representing them [my whānau]". Te Oranga did kapa haka (haka or Māori group dance), and said; "when I'm performing on stage, I'm performing for my family".

Some of the participants described whānau by contrasting it with their Pākehā family. At least three participants, (Tūkino, Jason and Ryan) described their Māori whānau more favourably than their Pākehā family. For example, Tūkino said when he visited his Pākehā family "I just don't ever really enjoy being there", and that he found his Pākehā family "quite belittling". Comparing his Pākehā family to his Māori side Tūkino said his whānau "is just a much more relaxed culture". Ryan described his whānau and how the bonding was "really unique". Comparing whānau to his Pākehā family Ryan said, "it's, like, happy", and "a lot of socialising together". Three of the participants described racism within their Pākehā family and indicated this was a reason they felt greater affinity to their whānau. For example, Bryce said his father was a "classic white male" who did little to support his Māori identity. Tūkino described his Pākehā grandfather as a "low key racist", and Jason recounted a story where his Pākehā grandfather referred to Māori performing haka on TV as, "bloody Māoris".

Analysis of the data indicated that whānau was significant to Māori identity construction for some of the participants. For example, Manu said that family was important to being Māori, and when asked what made him Māori, Ryan responded, "my family I suppose". Scott was more emphatic when asked what the main thing was that made him Māori; he said "family". Te Toira said that whānau helped him to be Māori because it helped him to know "how we are as Māori". And Tamatea said that it helped him just "knowing that my family's around, because without my family, where would I be?"

#### ***4.3.3 Influence of Māori grandparents***

Analysis of the data indicated that the influence of Māori grandparents was a significant factor for nine of the 12 participants. All of the participants described how often Māori grandparents were in their lives, and the data indicated this varied between participants. Some of the participants including, Tamatea, Te Toiroa, Te

Oranga, Tūkino, and Te Mana were brought up around their Māori grandparents and saw them frequently. Some of the participants saw Māori grandparents less frequently. In all cases the participants expressed very positive feelings about Māori grandparents, as recorded on the Feelings Scale (average score +3.44). Analysis of the data also indicated that the Māori grandparents had a positive influence on Māori identity construction for some of the participants.

Nine of the 12 participants described the role Māori grandparents had in their lives, and some of these participants indicated that this role influenced their Māori identity construction. Some of the participants described Māori grandparents as a link to Māori things, such as Māori language and culture. For example, Tūkino said “we were always with Nana and Poppa. They would always drag us along to Māori things”. Some of the participants talked about their Māori grandparents as native Māori language speakers and how this influenced their life experiences. For example, Tamatea said, “I lived around my grandmother. She was fluent in te reo [Māori language], and Māori was my first language”. Manu visited his grandparents regularly, and said they “both speak fluent Māori”, and that “influenced my family... and the way we were brought up”.

For some participants Māori grandparents helped them to learn or know something ‘Māori’. For example, Ryan spoke affectionately about his Māori grandmother and described helping her to make ‘boil up and fried bread’. Ryan said it was a “highlight” to “give her a hand”. Te Mana described how his Nan helped him feel good about being Māori by telling him pūrākau [myths or ancient legends] or stories that were interesting and amazing. He explained: “The things that make me feel this way [good about being Māori] is because of my Nan. She used to tell all those stories of ...Māui, how he grabbed the sun and pulled it down to try and stop time. That got me like ‘oh interesting’”. Te Mana talked about how his Nan’s stories helped him to connect to the past and his ancestors.

All of the participants’ descriptions of influence of Māori grandparents inferred that this theme was a positive factor in the participants’ Māori identity construction, including the following examples. Te Oranga expressed that being brought up with his Māori grandparents “helps me to understand who I am”, and also helps to

“connect...and have a bond”. Bryce said his Māori grandfather, his “koro”, gave him the motivation to want to learn Māori language and explore his Māori identity. Bryce explained his parents didn’t help much with his being Māori, but his koro “definitely” helped; “so I kinda wanna learn to kōrero [speak], like, almost for him”. Tamatea’s quote illustrates the esteem that many of the participants had for their Māori grandparents, saying, “I swear like our Kuias [grandmothers] and Koros [grandfathers], they have the key to our future as Māori.”

#### **4.3.4 Upbringing**

Analysis of the data indicated that upbringing was a significant factor for five of the 12 participants in this study. How the participants described upbringing related to each participant’s unique (idiographic) family circumstances. Therefore, the data showed differences in how the participants described upbringing, and this reflected the varied life experiences and circumstances of each participant. The data also indicated that upbringing was closely related to other themes previously described, such as whānau, and influence of Māori grandparents.

All of the five participants either stated explicitly or implied that upbringing was a factor that made them Māori. For example, Te Toiroa said, “what makes me Maori is probably...my upbringing”. Tamatea said his upbringing was a thing that made him Māori, and it was his upbringing that “brought him into the Māori world”. Ruakere talked about his upbringing and when asked what made him Māori he replied, “I was just born into it”. When asked what made him Māori, Te Oranga said, “how I’ve been brought up”.

Some of the participants talked about upbringing in relation to being brought up ‘Māori’ and within a Māori whānau. For example, Te Toiroa said upbringing was “the whole family side of things ... just getting to know everyone” and “just teaching me ... how Maoris act”. When asked about how he identified as Māori, Tūkino talked about his upbringing with his Māori side, saying, “I was brought up, like, more with my Dad’s side, who are all Māori, like, they all, like, my nana and poppa, like, heavily involved in the marae and so I was brought up in the marae”. Te Oranga

described being brought up with his grandparents, tikanga [cultural practices] and te reo [Māori language], and also “how different to how Pākehā we’re brought up”.

Some of the participants described upbringing and being brought up in ‘culture’ or with rules or ‘tikanga’. For example, Ruakere said upbringing was about “being brought up in a cultural way”. For Ruakere this involved his mother teaching him how to fish. He said: “She taught me how to fish. She would say she used to fish when she was a kid, and she’d say that her Dad had taught her”. For Te Oranga upbringing was about being brought up with rules or ‘tikanga’, such as, “respect your elders, and respect other people’s places where you go”. Te Oranga explained other rules including, “take your shoes off” and “not to sit on tables and stuff”.

Analysis of the data indicated that the participants had positive feelings when they spoke about upbringing, as recorded on the Feeling Scale (average score +3). And because five participants said upbringing was a thing that made them Māori, it was inferred that upbringing had a positive influence on the participants’ Māori identity construction.

#### ***4.3.5 Conclusion: Factors that influence Māori identity construction***

This section reported on research objective two, which was to investigate the factors that influenced Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity. This section reported on factors (additional to the ‘priority concerns’ described in Section 4.2) that influenced the participants, and where the data indicated a positive influence on the participants’ Māori identity construction. In summary this section explained how the participants described whakapapa, whānau, the influence of Māori grandparents, and upbringing, as factors that either determined Māori identity or helped the participants to be Māori. Based on the analysis of the data, whakapapa can be interpreted as an essential element of Māori identity. The other factors reported on in this section can be described as determining factors of Māori identity, and can be described as positive influences on the participants (to whom the theme applied) and their Māori identity construction.

#### **4.4 Examining the classical markers of Māori identity and their influence on Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity.**

This section reports on research objective three, which sought to examine the classical markers of Māori identity and their influence on Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity. The literature review identified classical markers of Māori identity with some authors claiming that conformity to certain classical markers strengthened a person's Māori identity (A. Durie, 1997; Kukutai, 2011, Borell, 2005; Newman, 2012; O'Carroll, 2013; see Chapter 2 Section 2.6.3). This study aimed to explore what influence, if any, the classical markers of Māori identity had on the participants as they constructed their Māori identity.

Analysis of the data indicated that all of the participants referred to at least one classical marker of Māori identity (additional to whakapapa). In all cases the participants referred to te reo Māori (the Māori language), and the analysis of the data indicated that te reo Māori could have an influence on the participants' Māori identity construction (for some of the participants). Ten of the participants mentioned kapa haka (Māori dance), and the results suggested kapa haka had an influence on some of the participants' Māori identity construction. Eleven of the 12 participants mentioned marae as a factor in their Māori identity construction. However, the data indicated that marae was only significant for three participants. The other eight participants (that mentioned marae), had little knowledge, and had minimal access and exposure to their marae. For these participants, marae appeared to be only a conceptual part of their Māori identity construction.

Aside from the classical markers of Māori identity reported in this section, the analysis of data revealed that there was little consistency among participants about other classical markers considered important to Māori identity. This finding supports Borell (2005) who found that the classical markers of Māori identity had varying degrees of significance for different participants.

Three classical markers of Māori identity are reported in this section because they were identified by most of the participants and were, therefore, considered to be significant to their Māori identity construction. The classical markers of Māori

identity are explained in relation to how the participants described them, and this aimed to provide a better understanding of how these particular classical markers influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. The participants' words are considered evidence in support of the classical markers' relevance to research objective three. This section reports on the three following classical markers of Māori identity: te reo Māori (reported in Section 4.4.1); kapa haka (reported in Section 4.4.2); and, marae (reported Section 4.4.3)

#### **4.4.1 Te Reo Māori (*the Māori language*)**

Analysis of the data revealed that all of the participants identified te reo Māori as a factor in their Māori identity construction and, therefore, I interpreted that te reo Māori was the most significant classical marker of Māori identity to the participants and their Māori identity construction.

The participants discussed their level of Māori language proficiency and the data indicated that all of the participants had some level of Māori language proficiency. Each of the four participants in the Māori unit could at least understand when I spoke Māori or asked questions in Māori, which I did occasionally throughout the interviews with Māori unit participants. When I recited karakia (prayer or incantation), at the beginning and end of interviews with Māori unit participants, the Māori unit participants responded appropriately with “tāiki e<sup>38</sup>”. Some of the Māori unit participants gave some short answers in Māori such as “kei te pai” (good), or “ae” (yes). Tamatea gave some longer answers in te reo Māori, such as “maranga mai, ko tēnei te wā, ko te wā kai” (get up, it is time to eat). All of the (eight) mainstream participants had lower language proficiency than the Māori unit participants but all could at least say and pronounce Māori words correctly. For example, Bryce grew up calling his grandfather “koro” (grandfather), and Jason said his mother used Māori phrases, such as, “katia te kūaha” (shut the door) and “pass the tote” (pass the salt). Only one participant, Louis, said he had zero Māori language proficiency saying, “I only speak white”. Despite this, te reo Māori was still a factor in his Māori identity construction because, as he said, his dad “spoke a bit of te reo”.

---

<sup>38</sup> ‘Tāiki e’ is often said at the end of a karakia and indicates that the group is unified in purpose.

The data indicated that at least three of the participants' grandparents spoke Māori, and that this was a factor for these participants and their Māori identity construction. For example, Tamatea talked about how his grandparents helped him learn te reo, and how this helped him to be Māori. He explained; "Even the kōhangā reo [Māori pre-school] , even the homework they [grandparents] would help me out with Māori homework and like kōrero, and being on the marae when I was a little kid...listening in to the whaikōrero [formal speeches]". Te Oranga talked about how he was brought up with te reo and that he was taught by his "kuias and koros" (grandparents), and how that helped him to be Māori because "it helps me like to understand who I am".

Analysis of the data indicated the participants expressed a mixture of feelings about te reo Māori. All of the participants who were in the Māori unit (and had a higher level of language proficiency than mainstream participants) expressed very positive feelings about the language and its influence on their Māori identity. For example, Tamatea said, "I feel fantastic about being Māori because of the reo". Some participants who were not in the Māori unit expressed regret that they didn't know the language, and/or wished that they could learn it in the future. For example, Jason said, "I wish I could learn more really", and Bryce said that if he could kōrero (speak Māori) "I would feel more in touch with my culture".

The data indicated te reo Māori was an important element of Māori identity construction for some (at least 4) participants. Tamatea described te reo Māori as a "natural gift that our tupuna [ancestors] had". He implied the fundamental nature of te reo Māori to his Māori identity when he said, "the amount of Māori you know, could determine the amount of mana [power/authority] you carry". Bryce stated that if he could speak more Māori, that would help him to "feel more Māori". Te reo Māori was fundamental to Jason's identity when he said, "the fact that I can speak it a little bit", was a factor that made him Māori. Te Oranga offered advice for how to be Māori saying, "learn our language and learn our ways".

All of the participants in this study mentioned te reo Māori as a factor in their Māori identity construction. In most cases the participants made references to te reo Māori as if they considered it important to being Māori, and this idea was expressed by

Tamatea when he said, “when you speak Māori it’s a whole different kaupapa [purpose] ...It’s like opening the door to a whole new path”.

#### **4.4.2 *Kapa Haka (Māori dance or Māori dance group)***

Ten of the 12 participants identified kapa haka as a factor in their Māori identity construction. Analysis of the data indicated that kapa haka could be a significant factor for some of the participants and their Māori identity construction, particularly those in the Māori unit.

Analysis of the data indicated that all of the 10 participants (that mentioned kapa haka) had participated in kapa haka, although participation levels varied between participants. The Māori unit participants did kapa haka as part of the Māori unit course, and therefore did kapa haka regularly. Māori unit students also assumed an active role in school pōwhiri (welcoming ceremonies) where they were required to do kapa haka type items such as, haka pōwhiri (welcoming haka/dance) and waiata tautoko (songs to support speeches). The data indicated that none of the mainstream participants did kapa haka at the time of this study, except for the school’s compulsory haka competition. However, all of the participants indicated they had some previous experience(s) with kapa haka such as, at primary school.

All of the ten participants (that identified kapa haka) expressed positive feelings when they spoke about kapa haka, as recorded on the Feelings Scale (average score +2.1). Te Oranga talked about not having the confidence to participate fully in his mainstream classes in contrast to his confidence when he participated in kapa haka where he liked “ripping it up”, and where kapa haka was his “moment to shine”. Some of participants spoke positively about the school’s haka competition. Ryan, saying he liked the team aspect of haka, said that he felt pride in “doing it right”. Louis said he enjoyed watching kapa haka now, but would have enjoyed it more, “back when I was interested in my Māori identity”.

The data indicated that kapa haka could be an important part of Māori identity construction for some participants. For example, Te Mana described kapa haka as one of the things that made him Māori, saying, “Things that make me Māori are kapa

haka and classes I take...on the cultural side". Jason said he liked kapa haka because it was something he could identify with as part of his culture. He explained, "I do like it [kapa haka].... it's part of my culture". Tamatea spoke about the positive acknowledgement he received from his involvement in kapa haka (as a leader from a young age), and the data suggested this had a positive influence on his Māori identity. Tamatea explained:

In year 9 when I first started boy's college, we had a haka competition right, and...it was mainly the seniors that were asked to lead the haka competition but we had no seniors standing up to the position so I offered at year 9 and got given the position and led our whole house at the haka, and ever since that moment, I've been acknowledged for it.

#### ***4.4.3 Marae and negligible significance of marae to Māori identity construction as a result of minimal access and exposure***

Eleven of the 12 participants in this study mentioned marae as a possible factor in their Māori identity construction. However, analysis of the data indicated that marae was a significant factor for only three participants. The data revealed marae had very little significance for eight of the 12 participants and that these participants had very little knowledge of and little or no contact with their marae. For example, at least two participants, Ryan and Louis, said they didn't know the name of their marae, even though Ryan lived within his tribal area. Two of the participants, Scott and Bryce, said they went to their marae for the first time only recently. Bryce said, "the first time I've ever been" was "just a few weeks ago". Jason talked about living away from his tribal area and because of this he said, "I haven't really spent a lot of time, you know...in maraes or anything like that".

Some of the participants hadn't been to their marae for a long time, including Te Oranga who said, "I haven't actually seen my marae. I haven't been there since I was a pēpi [baby]". Tamatea said he doesn't go back to his marae "on a regular basis...only when a tangi [funeral] is on". Manu had only been to his marae "a couple times". Manu mentioned going to his marae for a tangi [funeral] saying; "My

koro's [grandfather's] buried up there". A number of the participants mentioned 'tangi' as the reason for going to their marae, including Bryce who said, "I was actually there [at the marae] just a few weeks ago for a tangi". Given that eight of the 12 participants had very little knowledge of their marae, and also because none of these participants had regular contact, for these participants at least, marae had a negligible influence on Māori identity construction.

Conversely, the data indicated that marae was 'becoming' a significant factor for Bryce who had only been to his marae for the first time recently, but when asked what helped to explore his Māori identity, Bryce said:

Well definitely my marae, as I associate mostly with that. But I think its real cool. Um like I don't think that I've had the opportunities but I've never really cause its just sort of like this year and part way through last year that I've actually just kind of been proud of my Māori heritage.

Analysis of the data indicated that marae was a significant factor for three participants, Te Toira, Tūkino, and Te Mana. These participants spoke about their marae in a way that was 'taken for granted', and a normal part of their lived experience. Te Toiroa spoke about going to the marae "quite often, probably once a month", and in a way where it was a normal part of his experience. He said he goes to the marae "just to roam around with Dad, cause Dad usually goes to the marae. So go for a trip with Dad...go for a trip with the grandparents, you know just functions at the marae". These three participants had been brought up around the marae, and Tūkino explained his upbringing around the marae in the following way:

We were just brought up there [at the marae]. We were always there most weekends, like went to working bees, and were always with Nana and Poppa, who would always drag us along to Māori things...My Nana is on the board of ...our rūnanga [tribal council] and things like that, so I've just been heavily involved in that stuff all my life.

The data indicated that marae (and being brought up around the marae) had a positive influence on Māori identity construction for these three participants. Based on what the participants said and how they described marae, it is inferred that marae had a positive influence on their Māori identity construction because marae was as a normal part of their everyday experience, and therefore, likely normalised their ‘being’ Māori. Marae connected these participants to Māori culture, to their extended whānau and marae community. This in turn likely helped these participants to know they were Māori and therefore assert their Māori identity.

The data showed that marae was important for only one of the four participants in the Māori unit. Students in the Māori unit were perceived by The School to be secure in their Māori identity (more so than most if not all Māori students in the mainstream). But because marae was not significant for three of the four Māori unit participants, other factors appeared to be more significant to their Māori identity construction, particularly, te reo Māori (the Māori language) and kapa haka (Māori dance). This highlights the importance of Māori units like the one at The School because they (generally) expose Māori students to aspects of Māori culture that can support Māori students’ identity construction. The findings indicated that this appeared to be particularly important to those participants in the Māori unit who have little exposure to their marae.

Overall the findings presented above indicated that marae had little salience to Māori identity construction for those participants who had minimal access and exposure to their marae. However, for participants who had access and exposure, marae was important to their Māori identity construction. Therefore, access and exposure to marae appeared to be a determining factor in marae’s salience to Māori identity. Urbanisation and living out of one’s tribal area appeared to be a reason for some participants having little exposure to their marae, which is a factor acknowledged in the literature (see Awatere, 1984). Another factor appeared to be a disinclination on the part of some parents. However, the reasons for this disinclination and other causes for declining exposure to marae need further investigation. The declining salience of marae to Māori identity construction as a result of little access and exposure is a concern and is therefore discussed further in the next chapter.

#### 4.5 Chapter Conclusion

This thesis began with the premise that Māori identity is a site of struggle for many Māori. The results of this study and presented in this chapter give some weight to this contention. Part 1 of this chapter presented the priority concerns of the participants and these included themes that had the most negative influence on the feelings of the participants. These themes also had a likely negative influence on the participants' Māori identity construction. The main finding based on the analysis of the results was that negative stereotyping of Māori was the most significant factor. All but one participant expressed extremely adverse feelings about this issue, and the data suggested this factor had a negative influence on the participants' Māori identity construction. In the most extreme cases, negative stereotyping of Māori seemed to deter some of the participants from exploring, affirming and constructing a Māori identity.

Part 1 covered other 'priority concerns' of six participants in this study who were non-Māori looking, including the factors 'Having Fair skin' and 'Being Excluded by other Māori'. The data indicated these factors had a very negative influence on the participants' feelings and their Māori identity construction. Having fair skin could influence how other people, both Pākehā and Māori, perceived and acted towards the participant, which could challenge the participant's Māori identity construction. In some situations, another person could challenge the participant's Māori identity by denying or refusing to believe the participant was Māori. For some of the participants, having fair skin could result in another very negative situation, being excluded by other Māori. Some of the participants experienced 'being excluded by other Māori' when they overheard other Māori say they shouldn't be doing Māori things because they were white. Some participants also experienced feelings of exclusion when in Māori environments including around the Māori unit at school, or at a marae. Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori had a very negative influence on the participants' feelings and appeared to have a negative affect on their Māori identity construction. Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori seemed to prevent participants from exploring Māori culture, and exploring and affirming their Māori identity. In the most extreme case, having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori caused one participant to prefer to identify as a non-Māori.

Part 2 of this chapter described factors that had a positive influence on the participants' feelings and their Māori identity construction. These factors included, whakapapa, whānau, the influence of Māori grandparents, and upbringing. Based on the participants' views whakapapa was considered an essential and determining aspect of Māori identity, and this finding supports the literature on Māori identity. The participants described whānau, the influence of Māori grandparents, and upbringing in ways that expressed very positive feelings about these factors. These factors therefore appeared to have positive influences on the boys' Māori identity construction.

Part 3 presented the results related to the classical markers of Māori identity and their influence on Māori identity construction (or not). This study found that te reo Māori and kapa haka were significant factors that influenced the participants' feelings and appeared to influence Māori identity construction. Te reo Māori was the most significant factor. This study found that marae was significant for only (three) participants, and that lack of exposure was the likely reason for declining significance of marae for the other participants. This study found that although other classical markers could be significant to individual participants, there was no consistency between participants about the salience of other classical markers of Māori identity to Māori identity construction. This suggests that a number of classical markers of Māori identity, considered important to Māori identity in the literature, such as, iwi, hapu, and marae, could be declining in significance for many Māori. This raises significant issues that will be discussed further in the following chapter.

## **Chapter 5**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

The overarching aim of the study was to examine factors that influence Māori boys and their Māori identity construction; the findings for which were presented in the previous chapter. This chapter summarises and discusses the findings in relation to the research objectives and the existing literature on Māori identity. In this chapter the implications of the results for education in New Zealand schools are identified and outlined along with the limitations and significance of the study. A number of recommendations drawn from the findings are placed in this discussion. This chapter is organised under the following headings:

- Summary and discussion of major findings (Section 5.2)
- Educational implications (Section 5.3)
- Limitations of the research (Section 5.4)
- Summary of recommendations (Section 5.5)
- Significance (Section 5.6)
- Concluding remarks (Section 5.7)

#### **5.2 Summary and discussion of major findings**

This section discusses the major findings of this study in view of the literature on Māori identity. Each major finding has its own subsection, and recommendations, drawn from the findings, which are placed within the discussion. By conducting a thorough and in-depth analysis of each case I was able to interpret the meanings the participants made about their life experiences in relation to their Māori identity. I then deduced themes that influenced the participants' Māori identity. By developing a feelings scale I was able to interpret the level of feeling and significance of each theme to each participant. Through cross-case analysis I determined factors that were significant to the group overall, these being: Negative stereotyping of Māori (discussed in Section 5.2.1); having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori

(discussed together in Section 5.2.2); whakapapa (discussed in Section 5.2.3); whānau, upbringing and influence of grandparents (discussed together in Section 5.2.4); te reo Māori (discussed in Section 5.2.4); and marae (discussed in Section 5.2.5). For each of the sub-sections, I first summarise my findings with respect to each factor, then go on to provide a discussion of the finding.

### **5.2.1    *Finding 1: Negative stereotyping of Māori***

The results of this study indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori registered the most negative feelings of all the factors identified (as reported on the Feelings Scale). Further, given that all of the participants discussed negative stereotyping of Māori, and based on the level of feeling that the participants expressed about this issue, I interpreted this as the most significant factor that influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction. Discussion of this finding is provided in relation to research objectives 1, which was to investigate the feelings of Māori boys as they constructed their Māori identity, and research objective 2, which was to explore factors that influenced the participants and their Māori identity construction.

There are numerous anecdotes, reported in media with recurring frequency, about the prevalence of negative stereotyping of Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. Yet, there is a paucity of research on the effects that this negative stereotyping has on Māori identity construction. This discussion, therefore, draws on general literature related to Māori identity and the limited research about stereotypes related to Māori. Negative stereotyping of Māori is discussed here, first, in terms of what it means when someone stereotypes Māori negatively; second, the effect of negative stereotyping of Māori in terms of marginalising Māori students at The School; third, from a Kaupapa Māori critical perspective to discuss how the prevalence of negative stereotyping of Māori indicates Pākehā hegemony and ‘powerlessness’ of Māori in New Zealand; fourth, from the lens of structuralism to illustrate that negative stereotyping of Māori is part of the dominant discourse and the structure of The School and wider society; fifth, the negative influence that negative stereotyping of Māori had on the participants in a way that appeared to be detrimental to their Māori identity construction; sixth, and finally, strategies and attitudes that some participants adopted to help them deal with negative stereotyping of Māori.

First, in terms of the underlying meaning, the stereotyping of Māori described by the participants were overwhelmingly negative and included stereotypes of Māori as savages, bullies, scary, hori, dumb, uneducated, poor and criminal. Whilst these stereotypes corroborate those of past studies (see for example, Belich, 1997, Wall, 1997, Forster, 2003, and Warne, 2017), they also go beyond those described in the literature. Much of research has involved historical analysis of colonial stereotypes and attempted to understand the meaning and origin of stereotypes of Māori. Belich (1997), Wall (1997) and Forster (2003) traced contemporary stereotypes of Māori to their colonial antecedents including stereotypes of Māori as ‘noble savage’, ‘black savage’, ‘dying Māori’ and ‘white Māori’. Belich (1997) claimed colonial stereotypes had an entrenched belief in Māori inferiority, and it is likely that contemporary stereotypes of Māori, including those expressed by the participants, carry similar beliefs. For example, the Māori boys in this study discussed being described as hori, dumb, poor and uneducated, and these stereotypes insinuate Māori inferiority. Also the stereotypes, scary, bullies and criminal, appear to communicate a general dislike and fear of Māori. The results of this study indicated that these negative stereotypes had a detrimental effect on the participants.

Second, the results indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori had the effect of marginalising Māori students at The School, which appeared to impact negatively on their ability to construct a Māori identity. Tracy McIntosh (2005) highlights marginalisation as a factor in Māori identity construction, one that is also recognised by M. Durie (1997). McIntosh’s (2005) typology of Māori identity (see literature review Section 2.7.2.3) articulates three Māori identity types; the traditional, fluid and forced Māori identities. McIntosh explains that Māori identity is influenced by the constructions and perceptions (such as stereotypes) of others of the dominant group and that marginality is present in all Māori identity types. The results of this study concurred with McIntosh’s claim, that the prevalence of negative stereotyping at The School indicated that marginality was a factor in the participants’ Māori identity construction. For example, negative stereotyping caused very negative feelings in the participants and this could cause Māori students to withdraw and not participate fully for fear of being stereotyped.

Third, from a Kaupapa Māori, critical power analysis, the results suggested that the participants could do little about the negative stereotyping of Māori that they experienced. The participants' most common response was to ignore the stereotypes, by for example, 'brushing them aside' or 'taking them on the chin'. None of the participants (except one) mentioned any other way of dealing with negative stereotyping of Māori such as, by asking the person to stop, or by seeking help from a teacher. This finding suggested that the participants lacked the power and the ability to deal with negative stereotyping of Māori even though it was an issue of serious concern to them. The results of the study reported in this thesis, generally support the contention of various authors, including McIntosh (2005) and Liu et al. (2005), that identity involves power, and, what Hall (1990) called, 'positioning'. The participants felt helpless and powerless to confront or do anything about the negative stereotyping of Māori that they experienced, implying a 'positioned' identity where the boys experienced being "positioned and subject-ed in the dominant regimes of representation...[in an]...exercise of cultural power and normalisation" (Hall, 1990, p. 225). The results suggested, what Penetito (2009, p.14) describes as, "asymmetrical power relations that exist between Māori and Pākehā", and from a Kaupapa Māori perspective, Pākehā hegemony, where Māori "take on dominant ideas as common sense, even though these ideas may, in fact, contribute to their own oppression and exploitation" (G. Smith, 2017, p. 81). The results of my study give rise to a concern that the power imbalances, as they relate to Māori, may not be sufficiently addressed within The School. It is recommended, therefore, that schools learn to be critically aware of power imbalances and how this can limit identity choices and, in turn, ensure opportunities for Māori to exercise self-determining rights (as guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi; Recommendation # 1).

Fourth, from a structural lens, the results indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori could be widespread and ubiquitous at The School. The results indicated that negative stereotyping of Māori was part of the common language and regular way that people spoke about Māori people and, therefore, made up the dominant discourse at The School. Negative stereotyping of Māori included the words people used to describe Māori negatively, and appeared to comprise and be present in people's negative attitudes and lower expectations of Māori students. Analysis of the data indicated that these negative attitudes and expectations were also communicated

non-verbally including, in the way that others looked at Māori. Negative stereotyping of Māori was ‘taken for granted’ and appeared entrenched at an institutionalised and structural level. Therefore, I recommend that schools acknowledge the structural nature of negative stereotyping of Māori and learn to identify negative stereotyping of Māori, when and as they occur, as an initial step to eliminating them from their school (Recommendation # 2).

Fifth, in regards to the effect that this negative stereotyping had on Māori identity construction, the results of this study contribute new insights about Māori identity. This study found that negative stereotyping of Māori was detrimental to Māori identity construction, and this was evident in the following ways. First, negative stereotyping of Māori triggered adverse feelings that could cause reluctance in the participants to explore, affirm and/or assert their Māori identity for fear of being stereotyped and ridiculed. This relates to, what Webber (2011) calls, ‘stereotype threat’ where stereotypes threaten a Māori student’s performance and motivation. Second, given that negative stereotyping of Māori was found to be prevalent and taken for granted, it is possible that some participants might mistake these for actual markers of Māori identity (a point noted by Borell, 2005). This contention is also supported by Liu et al (2005, p.14) who noted, “identities are constructed through discourse or commonly shared ways of talking about things”. Three, results indicated that some participants turned away from their Māori identity because they did not want to be associated with negative representations of Māori. Where this occurred it appeared to limit Māori identity construction because it reduced opportunities for participants to be around positive aspects of Māori culture and to construct a Māori identity based on positive identity markers. I recommend, therefore, that schools acknowledge that negative stereotyping of Māori has a likely detrimental influence on Māori students’ Māori identity construction (Recommendation # 3).

Sixth, and finally, although the results of the study reported in this thesis indicated that Māori boys could do little about the negative stereotyping, it is worth noting that some of the participants, to some extent, were able to manage it by having a positive perspective and attitude. This appeared to be an internal, cognitive process (a way of thinking about negative stereotyping of Māori), which was expressed in ways such as, staying positive, brushing them aside, and not letting them [negative stereotypes

of Māori] get you down. It must be acknowledged that only a few participants were able to do this and, although having a positive attitude was a coping mechanism and seemed to reduce the severity of negative emotions (for the few that were able to do this), it did not prevent negative stereotyping of Māori from occurring. However, this at least indicated that there are strategies and attitudes that Māori boys can adopt to help them to deal with negative stereotyping of Māori.

### ***5.2.2 Finding 2: Having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori***

The results indicated that having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori had a negative influence on Māori identity construction (for the participants for whom this situation applied). Like the previous section, this section addresses research objectives 1 (feelings) and 2 (factors) of this study. The findings with respect to this factor are discussed with reference to the concept of ‘marginality’ as described by McIntosh (2005), and how being excluded is a form of ‘horizontal marginalisation’ (Ormond et al., 2006). Being excluded by other Māori is also discussed in terms of how it indicated that some Māori consider racial characteristics a constituent element of Māori identity.

The results indicated that the participants who had fair skin and experienced being excluded by other Māori, expressed very negative feelings about this issue. The results indicated that some of the participants considered this problem to be more serious than negative stereotyping of Māori. The level of negative feelings (as recorded on the Feelings Scale) was expressed by the participants using words such as ‘shitty’, and it ‘pisses me off’, indicating the severity of participants’ feelings, and suggesting that this factor was detrimental to the participants’ wellbeing.

The results suggested that being excluded by other Māori had a negative influence on the participants’ Māori identity construction. The participants reported negative feelings when other Māori excluded them, and this appeared to cause the participants to be reluctant and disinclined to be around other Māori in ‘Māori’ contexts for fear of being ridiculed and excluded. This appeared to limit opportunities for the participants to be comfortable in Māori contexts, learn about Māori culture and explore their Māori identity. This reluctance is of concern, as it could cause the

participants to be underexposed to Māori culture and overly exposed to and influenced by negative representations of Māori, for example, negative stereotyping of Māori. As various authors have stated, exposure to Māori culture can strengthen Māori identity construction (A. Durie, 1997; Kukutai, 2011; Webber, 2011; Rata 2012). The results of this study indicated that being excluded by other Māori could cause participants to disassociate with things Māori and or turn away from their Māori identity, which would be detrimental to their Māori identity construction.

My findings corroborated those of McIntosh (2005, p. 43), who identified marginalisation as a major factor that influences Māori identity. In her work, she noted that Māori not only experience marginalisation in Pākehā dominated society, but “can also experience it in Māori social arenas”. Ormond et al. (2006) called this ‘horizontal marginalisation’ explaining how some Māori experience being marginalised by other Māori. McIntosh (2005) acknowledges that this phenomenon is underreported in the literature and that there is a need to find out more about this situation. The results of this study contributed qualitative information about this problem, and how the participants experienced being marginalised by other Māori; for example, by being told they were too white to join kapa haka (Māori dance) practice. The results indicated that this ‘exclusion’ was based more on racial characteristics than the ability to perform Māori culture.

My finding, that participants were marginalised by other Māori based on racial characteristics, is contrary to some past research. Past findings have suggested that being excluded by other Māori centred around ‘authenticity’ and/or perceptions of other Māori not being ‘culturally’ Māori enough (Poata-Smith, 1996; Mahuika, 2008; Hokowhitu, 2010). The authenticity debate tends to focus on the perceived inability of some Māori to conform to specific ethnic ties to Māori identity such as, Māori language. There is scarce acknowledgement in the literature that Māori can experience being excluded by other Māori based on racial characteristics and not ‘looking’ Māori enough. The results of this study indicate that this issue was a concern for the participants (for whom this factor applied). However, due to lack of research related to this issue, including the effects being excluded has on Māori identity, further investigation is recommended as a matter of urgency (Recommendation # 4).

This finding (being excluded by other Māori) indicated that some Māori consider racial characteristics (that is looking Māori) to be a determining factor of Māori identity. In the literature, identity based on race is considered to be problematic, not least because, as this study indicated, it can lead to some Māori excluding other Māori for not looking Māori enough (Robson & Reid, 2001; Kukutai, 2011). Māori identity based on race is also contradictory to the idea, supported in the literature and by this study (see finding 3, Section 5.2.3 below), that whakapapa (genealogy and having a Māori ancestor) is the determining factor of Māori identity. Therefore, I recommend public policy and education that emphasises a definition of Māori identity based on whakapapa (as the primary element of Māori identity) (Recommendation # 5). Further, to address problems related to being excluded by other Māori, I recommend that schools (under the guidance of the Ministry of Education) acknowledge the negative effects that being excluded by other Māori can have on Māori student's feelings, wellbeing, and Māori identity construction, and therefore develop strategies to mitigate this problem (Recommendation # 6).

Given that being excluded by other Māori and that negative stereotyping of Māori were prevalent in the school where this study was conducted, these factors could occur in other New Zealand schools. Therefore, the findings of this study could have significant implications for education and schools in New Zealand. With respect to addressing negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori, and given the ramifications these factors have on a range of student outcomes, schools, guided by the Ministry of Education, could examine ways to educate teachers and students about these factors, with a view to eliminating them. To enhance the likelihood of a cultural change within schools, I recommend that a whole school approach to tackling negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori, involve challenging mindsets (beliefs, values, attitudes), shifting the culture of schools, and bringing in new norms (as recommended by Read, Aldridge, Ala'i, Fraser & Fozdar, 2015) (Recommendation # 7). The whole school approach should not only provide new knowledge, but challenge people, teach bicultural skills and force people to examine their way of thinking. More information about what a whole school could include can be found in Appendix 9.

### 5.2.3 *Finding 3: Whakapapa*

The results of the study reported in this thesis indicated that the participants (overall) considered whakapapa to be an important aspect of Māori identity. The results also indicated that the participants considered whakapapa to mean ancestry and knowledge of a Māori ancestor. This finding is consistent with the literature on Māori identity, as explained below, and adds new information about how whakapapa appears to be strengthened by a living Māori grandparent or grandparents. In the literature whakapapa or genealogy is considered to be a determining factor of Māori identity (see for example, Bishop, 1998; Karetu, 1990; Mahuika, 2008; O'Carroll, 2013; Newman, 2012; Webber, 2011). Although, the present study did not set out to test this assumption, the results corroborated it.

Whakapapa is a broad term and can mean different things. In the study reported in this thesis, how the participants described, experienced and made meaning about whakapapa (or not) in relation to their Māori identity was of particular interest. The results of this study indicated that the participants viewed whakapapa as an important element of their Māori identity. This finding was consistent with past research (see for example, Bishop, 1998; Karetu, 1990; Mahuika, 2008; O'Carroll, 2013; Newman, 2012; Webber, 2011). In terms of meaning, the participants used the word whakapapa to mean ancestry and knowledge that they had at least one Māori ancestor. It is important to note that the participants did not mean or use whakapapa in any other way, such as, the ability to recite genealogy and or demonstrate in-depth knowledge of Māori ancestry beyond a living grandparent.

An important and related aspect was that whakapapa appeared to be strengthened by a living and present Māori grandparent or Māori grandparents. A Māori grandparent (or Māori grandparents) was a tangible whakapapa link, and therefore, appeared to provide authentic (and physical) validation of being Māori – in contrast to an abstract concept of Māori identity such as, having Māori ancestors but never knowing them. Therefore, having a Māori grandparent and a living whakapapa link appeared to support Māori identity construction by helping the participants to know they were Māori and affirm their Māori identity. This new information about whakapapa, and

how it could support Māori identity construction, is described further in the next section.

#### **5.2.4 *Finding 4: Whānau; upbringing; and influence of grandparents***

The results of the study reported in this thesis found that whānau, upbringing, and the influence of Māori grandparents, were factors that had positive influences on the Māori identity construction of the participants. Discussion of this finding relates to research objective 2, which sought to explore the factors that influenced Māori identity construction.

In the literature, membership of the ‘traditional’ social groupings whānau (family), hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe) are considered to be key markers of Māori identity (Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Rata, 2012). In contrast, the findings reported in this study indicated that hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe) were not considered to be significant to the participants’ and their Māori identity construction, even for those boys with a (perceived) strong sense of Māori identity (based on perceived traditional constructs). Rather, the findings indicated that whānau, upbringing, and influence of Māori grandparents were more important to their Māori identity construction (additional to whakapapa described above and the classical markers described below). This finding supports research and commentary that describes socialisation (see for example, Rangihau, 1992), suggesting that the main site of socialisation for these Māori boys occurs more from within individual (perhaps even isolated) whānau groupings as opposed to community centred groupings such as the hapū (sub-tribe) and marae (ancestral meeting place).

The results of the study reported in this thesis indicated that whānau (family) was a central factor that helped Māori boys to identity as Māori. Being a part of a whānau appeared to help the participants: firstly, to know that they were Māori; and secondly to explore their Māori identity within the safety of the whānau; and thirdly to then affirm their Māori identity outside of the whānau context. However, even though whānau helped some of the participants to know that they were Māori, not all participants were confident to affirm their Māori identity outside of their whānau.

The results of this study indicated that upbringing, as described by the participants, was closely related to how they described the concept of whānau. Whereas the participants described whānau as a site of socialisation, for example, within the bounds of extended family members, upbringing was described as a process of socialisation and as a way that the participants learned something Māori and or how to be Māori. These findings support those of Rangihau (1992) who described how upbringing determines Māori identity. However, Rangihau's own 'upbringing' occurred within larger community units including tribe (Tuhoe), and (sub-tribe) and centred around marae (community meeting grounds). In contrast, the participants of this study described upbringing as a process occurring within each participant's individual (smaller) whānau unit. Compared to Rangihau (1992), this result suggested that there could have been a decline in the significance, over time, of wider community groupings such as tribe, sub-tribe (and centred around the marae) for the participants of this study and their Māori identity construction. It is recognised, however, that the sample was limited and, as such, it is recommended that future studies examine whether this is the case across a larger cross section of Māori boys. This recommendation is discussed further below (see Recommendation 12 in Section 5.3.1).

The influence of Māori grandparents on Māori boys and their Māori identity construction, found in the present study, has not been reported previously in the literature on Māori identity. The results of this study indicated that Māori grandparents were a positive influence on the participants' feelings and also a significant factor on the boys' Māori identity construction. However, due to the small sample size of this study further research is needed to confirm whether this is the case. It is also recommended that future studies involve a larger sample size – this recommendation is discussed in more detail below (see Recommendation 12 in Section 5.3.1). Māori grandparents were a physical whakapapa link that helped the participants to know that they were Māori and this appeared to help the boys to affirm their Māori identity (see above Section 5.2.4). The results also suggest that Māori grandparents could help participants to know something about 'Māori culture', thereby helping the participants to affirm their Māori identity. Particularly important in this regard was Māori grandparents exposing the participants to Māori language.

The findings of this study suggest that Māori grandparents contextualised what it was to be Māori and helped the participants to know that Māori culture was a living culture (in contrast to an abstract idea) that came from people's actual life experiences. In this way, the findings suggest that Māori grandparents helped the participants to know the relevance of Māori culture, and most importantly, that this culture also related to them (through a physical tangible whakapapa link) that they could see and was present in their lives. For these reasons Māori grandparents appear to be an important factor in Māori identity construction, along with whānau and upbringing.

### ***5.2.5 Finding 5: Classical markers of Māori identity: Te reo Māori***

This third research objective was to investigate the classical markers of Māori identity and their significance to Māori boys and Māori identity construction. The results of this study found that te reo Māori (the Māori language) was the most significant classical marker of Māori identity (additional to whakapapa and whānau) to the participants and was a positive influence in their Māori identity construction. These results support claims in the literature that te reo Māori is important to Māori identity (Durie, 2003; Karetu, 1990; Penetito, 2009; Kukutai, 2010, Rata, 2012, Bright & Wylie, 2017).

The results of this study indicated that most of the participants discussed te reo Māori (the Māori language) when talking about their Māori identity, with many making strong associations between Māori language and Māori identity. Some of the participants considered te reo Māori important to Māori identity even if they did not speak Māori themselves. Others acknowledged that learning Māori language would assist their Māori identity construction by helping them connect to their culture, and to help them be and feel Māori.

Although the results of this study indicated that level of Māori language proficiency had an influence on Māori identity construction, which corroborate the findings of previous studies, such as; Rata, 2012; Durie, 2003; Karetu, 1990; Penetito, 2009; and Kukutai, 2010, this finding is underreported in the literature on Māori identity. In the study reported in this thesis, the participants with greater proficiency appeared to

have increased access and more opportunities to participate in Māori cultural activities. Language proficiency also appeared to give participants greater confidence in Māori environments and when participating in Māori cultural activities. These findings suggest that a proficiency in te reo Māori enabled participants to connect more to Māori culture, with other Māori people, and in Māori contexts outside of whānau, which, in turn, appeared to have a positive accumulative impact on Māori identity construction. Based on these findings, it is recommended that New Zealand schools increase opportunities for Māori students to learn te reo Māori (Recommendation # 8).

#### ***5.2.6 Finding 6: Classical markers of Māori identity: Marae***

For the participants who had access and exposure to their marae (three out of 12), the marae appeared to be an important aspect of strengthening their Māori identity. This finding supports the general view that marae is important to Māori identity (Cram, 2006; Durie, 1999; Penetito, 2009).

Despite the importance of the marae to these three participants, the remaining students did not have access to their marae. This finding, that more participants did not have access when compared to those that did, is consistent with past research, which found that many Māori have limited access and exposure to marae. As early as 1999, Durie reported that only one in three Māori visited a marae regularly (Durie, 1999). In the present study, the results indicated that marae was a negligible part of everyday life experience for the majority of participants (nine out of 12). These participants knew very little about their marae, some did not know the name of their marae, and/or had never been to their marae. One participant did not mention marae as a factor related to his Māori identity. Given that marae is generally considered vital to Māori identity construction, and the lack of more recent research into this area, it is recommended that further research examine both the reasons for the lack of connection to marae as well as the affects that this limited access has on Māori identity construction (Recommendation # 9).

Interestingly, even though the majority of students had only limited access or exposure to marae, some (specifically those in The School's Māori unit) still had a

strong sense of Māori identity. Whilst this is only a small sample, it suggests that, perhaps other factors, outside of the marae, have a strong influence on Māori identity construction. It would appear that, some students who are not exposed to marae have made links to the Māori culture from other sources. This is consistent with claims in the literature that links to a range of aspects of Māori culture can support Māori identity construction (A. Durie, 1997; Rata, 2012; Bright & Wylie, 2017).

### 5.3 Limitations of the Research

The limitations of this research are considered in this section in two parts. Section 5.3.1 considers limitations of this research in terms of Western academic standards of generalisability (particularly in terms of generalisability). Section 5.3.2 considers the limitations of the research in terms of Kaupapa Māori research.

#### 5.3.1 *Limits to generalisability*

This study used a Kaupapa Māori framework and drew on the qualitative research approach interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) to interpret the meanings Māori boys made about their life experiences and their Māori identity. Generalising is not usually an orientation of qualitative research or IPA research designs (McMillan, 2012; Yin, 2011; Pietkiewicz, & Smith 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). However, as Yin (2011, p. 98) notes, research has greater value when its findings “have implications going beyond the data collected”, and because of this, most “researchers strive for some degree of generalizability for their results” (Shulman, 1997, p. 13). Although there are limitations, generalising in qualitative research may be better described as ‘transferability’, which McMillan (2012, p. 305) describes as “the appropriateness of applying the results to other contexts and settings”.

In this study, a cross-case method of analysis was used, where the meanings made by participants in each case were carried across to determine which meanings were common between cases. Punch (1998) calls this ‘case-to-case transfer’ that in essence is a form of generalising within a study to deduce themes that apply to the participants overall. Therefore, because individual meanings were transferred or generalised to the whole group, it can reasonably assumed the results can be

transferred or generalised to (other groups of) Māori overall. Yet there are limitations to this assumption, and these are described below.

Firstly, as this study has shown, assumptions about a homogenous Māori people are problematic (as has been explained elsewhere, see Sections 2.5 and 2.8) and generalising findings to all Māori or to a sub-group of Māori can be erroneous because of the potential to exclude those Māori for whom the finding or characteristic does not apply. From a social constructivist perspective, we can assume that people share experiences in common within a bounded system, but the meanings people make about those (shared) experiences are subjective. Therefore, findings of the present study generalised to the wider population are stated as possibilities rather than objective statements of truth (of what is true for Māori people).

Generalising is also limited by the makeup of the sample, specifically the age and gender of the participants. The sample in the present study involved 12 senior Māori boys, aged 15 to 18, from one New Zealand all boys' high school. Regarding the appropriateness of generalising the findings of this study to girls, we can reasonably assume that Māori girls in a similar bounded context (for example a nearby sister school), would share similar experiences and factors that influence their Māori identity construction. Yet it would be erroneous to assume that (all) Māori girls interpret and make meaning from those experiences in the same way. This is also contrary to the aims of *Kaupapa Māori* because it potentially excludes Māori girls' voices and perspectives about their Māori identity. This highlights the need to conduct a similar study to ask Māori girls about the factors that influence their Māori identity construction. I therefore recommend that a similar study be conducted at a nearby all girls' (sister) school (Recommendation # 10).

Caution should also be exercised with respect to generalising the findings of this study to Māori of other age groups. This study interviewed senior Māori boys, most of whom were 17 or 18 years old, although for practical reasons (there were few senior Māori unit students) I conducted an interview with one (mature) 15 year old. Erikson (1968) contends that identity development, expressed in the terms 'crisis' and 'diffusion' is a feature of human development that occurs during adolescents.

Identity resolution is required for the transition into successful and productive adulthood and yet identity resolution is not guaranteed. Following Erikson's theory, the identity crises that Māori boys experience is a normal part of their human developmental stage (adolescence) but by implication perhaps not so normal at other stages in human development, for example at adulthood. Therefore it might be erroneous to generalise findings from a group of adolescence to adults who have matured and developed other ways to interpret, perceive and make meanings about their Māori identity. This highlights the need to ask adults about the factors that influence their Māori identity. It is recommended, therefore, that future studies examine whether the factors identified in the present study apply to other age groups of Māori people (Recommendation # 11).

Generalising the results of this study could be limited by the specific and bounded research context in which this study took place. This research was conducted in a decile-six, all-boys' high school with a significant Māori student population (about one in three), located in a fairly large New Zealand urban area. It is important to acknowledge that results could differ according to context including differences in socio-economic, geographic and demographic conditions such as, if the study was carried out in a school that had a majority of Māori students, or in a school with only a few Māori students. It is also likely that factors that influence Māori boys and Māori identity construction are influenced by societal factors such as, poverty and socio-economic conditions (represented by decile rating) of a community where a school is located. As Māori identity construction is multifaceted and context dependant it can be reasonably assumed that although generalising is possible, it is limited by the context.

The findings of this study, and the ability to generalise, are also limited by the sample size. Although, a sample size of 12 is considered large for an IPA study, this is not considered large enough in quantitative research to generalise to larger populations (McMillan, 2012, Pietkiewicz, & Smith 2012; Smith, & Osborn, 2015). It is recommended, therefore, that further studies involve a larger sample (Recommendation # 12).

### **5.3.2 Limitations in terms of Kaupapa Māori research**

This section involves a critical reflection of the research in terms of Kaupapa Māori. There were some limitations to the study, when considered against Kaupapa Maori research standards and these are acknowledged below.

An established and fundamental principle of Kaupapa Māori is that research about Māori, should be (carried out) by Māori, for Māori and with Māori (Forster, 2003; Pihama et al., 2002; L. Smith, 2015; Mercier, 2020). This principle conveys a number of important research concerns for Māori, including, who controls and who benefits from the research.

From a Kaupapa Māori perspective Māori should control research about Māori. However, it is acknowledged that, although the main researcher was Māori (of tribe Ngāti Kahungunu), the research was made possible by an Australian government research grant, supervised by a non-Māori and carried out through Curtin University located in Perth, Australia. However, to mediate this situation and to increase this study's validity from a Kaupapa Māori perspective, a Māori secondary supervisor (Dr Craig Rofe - Ngāti Rangi, Te Atihaunui-ā-Pāpārangi) was enlisted to provide input and to verify the results from a Māori perspective (at the supervisory/review level) and to judge my findings against what is considered valid and reasonable from a Kaupapa Māori perspective.

A second limitation, in terms of Kaupapa Māori, is that research concerning Māori should be for Māori and done with Māori (Forster, 2003; Pihama et al., 2002; L. Smith, 2015). Although Kaupapa Māori research principles (described in Section 3.4.3) were incorporated wherever possible during the research process, (for example, tikanga (cultural practices) including karakia<sup>39</sup> and mihihi<sup>40</sup> were used with Māori unit participants to start interviews in a culturally appropriate way), it is important to note that, although Māori, I was an outsider and a relief teacher in the research context. It is acknowledged that, although connections were established with the Māori teachers in the Māori unit, significant links were not established with

---

<sup>39</sup> Karakia is prayer or incantation.

<sup>40</sup> Mihimihi are greetings generally done before and after official proceedings.

the wider Māori community where the research took place. This was largely due to practical reasons, as I was not a permanent staff member at the school and would, therefore, require significant input from the Māori unit teachers to get whānau<sup>41</sup> interest, support and participation in this study. Based on my observations I believed the Māori teachers were overworked and under significant stress because of their roles as Māori teachers at The School, and felt that asking them to engage whānau for the purposes of my study would have placed an unwelcome burden on them.

These limitations raise the issue of who benefits from the research conducted. To increase the likelihood the participants (and the school in which they were studying) benefited, at the completion of the research stage, I wrote and gave a report with preliminary findings to the school Principal, (Māori) Vice-Principal, and Māori unit staff. The Principal passed the report on to the school leadership team responsible for developing professional learning strategies around cultural responsiveness and relational pedagogy.

#### **5.4 Summary of Recommendations**

This section gives a summary of recommendations (that are placed in full in relevant sections above) drawn from the results and findings of this study.

*Recommendation # 1* Schools become critically aware of power imbalances and the effect this has on identity choices, and therefore ensure opportunities for Māori to exercise self-determining rights as guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi.

*Recommendation # 2* Schools acknowledge the structural nature of negative stereotyping of Māori and learn to identify them as a first step to eliminating negative stereotyping of Māori from schools.

---

<sup>41</sup> Whānau means family, but in this context is used more broadly to include members of the wider Māori community at the school.

- Recommendation # 3* Schools acknowledge that negative stereotyping of Māori has a likely negative affect on Māori students' Māori identity construction.
- Recommendation # 4* Further investigation and research into being excluded by other Māori and its affect on Māori identity.
- Recommendation # 5* An inclusive definition of Māori identity based on whakapapa as the determining component of Māori identity.
- Recommendation # 6* Schools acknowledge the very negative effects that being excluded by other Māori can have on Māori student's feelings and wellbeing and Māori identity construction, and develop strategies to mitigate.
- Recommendation # 7* Ministry of Education lead whole school approach to negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori.
- Recommendation # 8* Schools provide more opportunities to learn te reo Māori.
- Recommendation # 9* Further research to examine the reasons for lack of access and connection to marae as well as the affects that this has on Māori identity construction.
- Recommendation # 10* Similar study be conducted in a nearby sister school to include Māori girls' voices and to learn about the factors that influence Māori girls' Māori identity construction.
- Recommendation # 11* Future studies examine whether the factors identified in the present study apply to other age groups of Māori

people.

*Recommendation # 12*      Further studies involve a larger sample.

## 5.5 Significance

This study is significant in various ways and to various stakeholders, including; researchers, government officials and policy makers, school leaders, teachers, Māori leaders and people interested in Māori development. This is discussed further below.

This study is significant to researchers (both Kaupapa Māori and Pākehā researchers) because it fills various gaps in the literature on Māori identity. Much of the literature on Māori identity has been informed by the anecdotal perspectives of Māori cultural ‘experts’, for example, see Rangihau (1992), Karetu (1990), and Houkamau and Sibley (2011). Much of the research on Māori identity has also been quantitative. This study uncovered rich qualitative data from a sub-group of Māori (Māori boys) largely absent in the literature. As Houkamau (2010) noted, individual subjective interpretations and the meanings made by individuals about Māori identity have been largely under-reported. There is also scarce research about how Māori feel as they experience factors that influence their Māori identity construction. This research is significant to researchers because it gave a voice to Māori boys and captured their feelings as they described factors that influenced their Māori identity construction.

This research is significant to all stakeholders concerned with Māori identity, Māori wellbeing, education, and Māori development because it identified factors that appear to influence Māori identity construction. In the literature, Borell (2005) concluded that essentialist and also ‘experiential’ factors determined Māori identity. This study found both positive and negative experiential factors. Negative factors included: Negative stereotyping of Māori, having fair skin and being excluded by other Māori. Positive factors included: Whānau, upbringing and the influence of Māori grandparents. In this study positive factors appeared to support, and negative factors appeared to be detrimental to Māori identity construction. Due to the fact that past research has acknowledged a strong correlation between identity and academic

attainment (Bennett, 2001; Hawaikirangi-Pere, 2013), the findings of this study will be of significance to New Zealand schools at both a government policy level and school level (including, school leaders and teachers). This study provides information about factors that support Māori identity construction, which stakeholders should use to guide teacher practice and support Māori students.

This study also identified and highlighted factors that should be considered critical and urgent because of their extreme and negative affect on Māori boys and their Māori identity construction. These findings will be of significance to stakeholders in education. In particular, negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori require immediate attention, including further investigation, and should be addressed in order to provide fair, descent and satisfactory education for Māori in New Zealand schools.

This study is significant to iwi (tribal) leaders and to school leaders because it identified another factor of critical importance. Marae are generally considered vital to Māori culture and identity, and yet, this study found that marae could be declining in significance as a result of limited exposure. This study is significant because it provides information that can inform iwi and education leaders to help address this situation.

This research is significant to researchers and policy makers because it highlighted the need for inclusive definitions of ‘Māori’. Māori should not be defined in binary opposition to Pākehā or in exclusively essentialist terms. Inclusive definitions of Māori identity could be based on social constructivist principles and meanings that Māori people make (as explained by them) from their real life experiences.

Although there are limitations to this study, the findings are likely to be significant to the field of Kaupapa Māori research because I have sincerely endeavoured to conduct this study from a Kaupapa Māori perspective. Graham Smith (2012, p.19) states that the Kaupapa Māori requires “constant critical renewal and reflection”. He also insists that Kaupapa Māori research be engaged with at a theoretical level, and contain two key elements, a cultural element and a political element (Smith, 2012). This study re-centred Māori and did so by privileging Māori knowledge and by using

Māori cultural practices in research. This study also engaged at a political level by, for example, analysing and critiquing structures that perpetuate negative stereotypes of Māori identity. Therefore (it is hoped) this study is significant by contributing to the ongoing renewal of Kaupapa Māori.

## **5.6      Concluding Remarks**

This study was conducted from a Kaupapa Māori research framework and has contributed to the continued development of Kaupapa Māori with its various aims to re-centre Māori in New Zealand. Graham Hingangaroa Smith argues for the importance of celebrating incremental victories on the way to achieving our ‘utopian vision’ of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination). Although this study has not been radical in its transformative or political intent, the incremental victory of this study is that it gave a voice to Māori boys and considered their views about their life experiences as valid, legitimate and necessary. The views of the Māori boys who participated in this study contributed new information and knowledge about Māori identity.

This study found factors that can have a positive affect on Māori identity, including the influence of Māori grandparents, whānau (extended family) and upbringing. This study also found qualitative evidence about the positive affect that some classical markers of Māori identity can have on Māori identity, particularly, te reo Māori (the Māori language) and kapa haka (Māori dance). This study also identified factors that can have a negative affect on Māori identity, including negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori. These negative factors had a very detrimental affect on the participant’s feelings and a likely negative influence on their Māori identity. Due to the extreme level of negative feelings expressed by the participants, these negative factors are of serious concern.

The findings of this study have various implications for education in New Zealand schools and policy developers. This study has identified ways that schools can support Māori boys (and potentially other sub-groups of Māori such as girls) as they attempt to construct a Māori identity. This study also highlighted the need to mitigate

and eliminate negative factors that influence Māori students and their Māori identity from New Zealand schools and wider New Zealand society generally.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Bristol, PA: Flamer Press.
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Maori sovereignty*. Auckland, New Zealand: Broadsheet.
- Bargh, M. (2013). Sustainable self-determination: Oil or soil? In S. Katene, & M. Mulholland (Eds.), *Future challenges for Māori: He kōrero anamata* (pp. 49-60). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Barlow, C. (2008). *Tikanga whakaaro: Key concepts in Māori culture*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of the New Zealanders: From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland; London: Allen Lane.
- Belich, J. (1997). Myth, race and identity in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 31(1), 9–22.
- Belich, J. (2015). *The New Zealand wars and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Bennett, S. (2001). Cultural identity and academic achievement of Maori undergraduate university students (Thesis, Master of Science in Psychology). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Birnie, J. D. (2018). *Exploring learner-centredness for adults learning te reo Māori: Easing the path to language acquisition* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy). University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Maori approach to creating knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199–219.

Bishop, R. (2012). Pretty difficult: Implementing Kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 38–50.

Bishop, R. Glynn, T. (1999). Researching in Maori contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 20(2), 167–182.

Bishop, R. (1999). Kaupapa Maori research: An indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Maori and psychology: Research and practice - The proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Maori and Psychology Research Unit* (pp. 1-6). Hamilton: Maori & Psychology Research Unit.

Borell, B. (2005). *Living in the city aint so bad: Cultural diversity in South Auckland* (Thesis, Masters of Philosophy in Psychology). Massey University, New Zealand.

Bright, N., & Wylie, C. (2017). *Ākonga Māori in English-medium primary and intermediate schools: Findings from the NZCER national survey of primary and intermediate schools 2016*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity: The information age: Economy, society and culture Volume II*. Oxford. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Cliffe-Tautari, T. (2019). Transitory Māori identities: Māori students shape-shifting like Māui. *MAI Review*, 8(2), 205-218.

Cooper, G. (2012). Kaupapa Maori research: Epistemic wilderness as freedom? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 64–73.

Cram, F. (2006). Talking ourselves up. *Alternative*, 2(1), 28–45.

- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Essex, Pearson Education Limited.
- Durie, A. (1997). Te aka matua: Keeping a Maori identity. In P. Te Whaiti, M. McCarthy, & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiatea: Maori well-being and development* (pp. 142–162). Auckland, Auckland University Press.
- Durie, M.H. (1995). Te hoe nuku roa framework: A Maori identity measure. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 104(4), 461–470.
- Durie, M.H. (1997). Maori cultural identity and its implications for mental health services. *International Journal of Mental Health*, 26(3), 23–35.
- Durie, M.H. (1999). Marae and implications for a modern Maori psychology. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 108(4), 351–366.
- Durie, M.H. (2003). *Launching Māori futures: Ngā kāhui pou*. Wellington, New Zealand. Huia.
- Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori directed practice. *MAI Review*, 1(1), 1–11.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth in crisis*. Norton: New York.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Black skin white masks* (C. Markmann, Trans.). London: Pluto Press.
- Fanon, F. (1961). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York: Penguin Books.
- Fitzgerald, E.D., Durie, M.H., Black, T.E., Durie, A.E., Christensen, I.S., & Taiapa, J.T. (1996). Whaihua tatau: A representative sampling method for Maori populations. *He Pukenga Korero, Koanga (Spring)*, 2(1), 34–42.

- Forster, M. (2003). Te hoe nuku roa: A journey towards Maori centred research. *Ethnobotany Research and Applications*, 1, 47–53.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). UK: Penguin Books.
- Fulcher, E. (2015). How colonisation has shaped, and still shapes, the Maori identity through processes of racialization. *CERS Working Paper*. Retrieved from <https://cers.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/97/2016/04/Colonisation-and-Maori-Identity-in-New-Zealand-Emily-Fulcher.pdf>
- Gillion, A., Cormack, D., Borell, B. (2019). Oh you don't look Maori: Socially assigned ethnicity. *MAI Review*, 8(2), 126-141.
- Giorgio, A., Houkamau, C. (2021). Hybrid identities: Māori Italians challenging racism and the Māori/Pākehā binary. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 27(1), 20 – 43.
- Gleason, P. (1983). Identifying identity: A semantic history. *The Journal of American History*, 69(4), 910–931.
- Grootveld, C.M. (2013). *Critical perspectives on the transformative potential of higher education in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: community, culture, difference*. London. Lawrence & Wishart.

Hawaikirangi-Pere, C. (2013). *Māori cultural identity and education* (Thesis, Master of Education). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Hohepa, M. (2015). Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori development and learning. In L. Pihamo, S. J. Tiakiwai & K. Southey (Eds.), *Kaupapa rangahau: A reader: A collection of readings from the kaupapa rangahau workshop series* (pp. 115–123). Hamilton, The University of Waikato.

Hokowhitu, B. (2010). A genealogy of indigenous resistance. In B. Hokowhitu, N. J. Keremoal & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous identity and resistance: Researching the diversity of knowledge* (pp. 207–225). Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.

Hoskins, T.K., & Jones, A. (2017). Non-human others and Kaupapa Māori research. In T.K. Hoskins & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 49–64). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Houkamau, C. A. (2006). *Identity and socio-historical context: Transformations and change among Maori women* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Houkamau, C. A. (2008). The life story model of identity: A bridge between two spaces. *Claiming spaces: Proceedings of the 2007 national Maori and Pacific psychologies Symposium*, 19–27.

Houkamau, C. A. (2010). Identity construction and reconstruction: The role of socio-historical contexts in shaping Maori women's identity. *Social Identities*, 16(2), 179–196.

Houkamau, C. A., & Sibley, C. G. (2010). The multi-dimensional model of Māori identity and cultural engagement. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 39(1), 8–28.

- Houkamau, C. A., & Sibley, C. G. (2011). Māori cultural efficacy and subjective wellbeing: A psychological model and research agenda. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(3), 379–398.
- Howitt, C. (2008). *A guide to preparing your application for ethics approval at SMEC (Rev. ed)*. Perth, Western Australia: Curtin University of Technology.
- Karetu, T. S. (1990). The clue to identity. *New Zealand Geographic*, 5, 112–117.
- Keefe, V., Ormsby, C., Robson, B., Reid, P., Cram, F., & Purdie, G. (1999). Kaupapa Māori meets retrospective cohort. *He Pukenga Kōrero, Koanga (Spring)*, 5(1), 12–17.
- Kelly, S. D. (2002). Edmund Husserl and phenomenology. In R. Solomon, & D. Blackwell (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to continental philosophy* (pp. 112–142). London: Blackwell Publishing.
- King, M. (2003). *The penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Kroger, J., & Marcia, J.E. (2011). The identity statuses: Origins, meanings, and interpretations. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 31–53). New York: Springer.
- Kukutai, T. (2010). *Thin brown line: Re-indigenizing inequality in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy). Stanford University. USA.
- Kukutai, T. (2011). Māori demography in Aotearoa New Zealand: Fifty years on. *New Zealand Population Review*, 37, 45–64.
- Lee, J. (2009). Decolonising Māori narratives: Pūrākau as a method. *MAI Review*, 2(3), 1–12.

- Liu, J. H., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T., & Teaiwa, T. (Eds.). (2005). *New Zealand identities: departures and destinations*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Liu, J. H. (2005). History of identity: A system of checks and balances for Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: departures and destinations* (pp. 69–85). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Luft, J., & Ingham, H. (1955). The Johari window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness. *Proceedings of the Western Training Laboratory in Group Development*. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- McIntosh, T. (2005). Māori identities: Fixed, fluid, forced. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 38–51). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- McMillan, J.H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA, Pearson Education.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Marcia, J. E. (2014). *Development and validation of ego-identity status 1* (June 1966). Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281>
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17.
- Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, self and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, L. (1996). *Nga aho o te kakahu matauranga: Multiple layers of struggle by Maori in education* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy in Education). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

- Meijl, T. van. (2006). Multiple identifications and the dialogical self: Urban Maori youngsters and the cultural renaissance. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 12(4), 917–933.
- Mercier, O. R. (2020). What is decolonisation? In A. Hodge (Ed), *Imagining decolonization* (pp.40-82). Wellington, Bridget Williams Books.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Moeke-Pickering, T. (1996). *Maori identity within whanau: A review of literature*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Moewaka-Barnes, H. (2015). Kaupapa Māori: Explaining the ordinary. In L. Pihama, S. J. Tiakiwai & K. Southey (Eds.), *Kaupapa Rangahau: A Reader: A collection of readings from the kaupapa rangahau workshop series* (pp. 29–33). Hamilton, The University of Waikato.
- Nasir, Na'ilah S. 2011. *Racialized identities: Race and achievement among African American youth*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Newman, E. (2012). Challenges of identity for Maori adoptees. *Australian Journal of Adoption*, 3(2), 1–30.
- New Zealand Government, Ministry of Education. (2020). *School deciles*. Retrieved from <https://www.education.govt.nz/school/funding-and-financials/resourcing/operational-funding/school-decile-ratings/>
- New Zealand Government. (2020). *Māori education review*. (Statistics related to Māori). Retrieved from <https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Publications/Briefings-to-Incoming-Ministers/4-1093092-Maori-Education-BIM-Annex-ABC.PDF>

O'Carroll, A.D. (2013). Maori identity construction in SNS. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 6(2), 2–16.

Ormond, A., Cram, F., & Carter, L. (2006). Researching our relations: Reflections on ethics and marginalisation. *Alter-Native: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 2(1), 174–192.

Penetito, W. (2009). Placed-based education: Catering for curriculum, culture and community. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 18, 5–29.

Pietkiewicz, I., & Smith, J. (2012). A practical guide to using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in qualitative research psychology. *Czasopismo Psychologiczne*, 18(2), 361–369.

Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Maori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26, 30–43.

Pihama. L. (2010). Kaupapa Maori theory: Transforming theory in Aotearoa. *He Pukenga Korero, Raumati (Summer)*, 9(2), 5–14.

Pipi, K., Cram, F., Hawke, R., Hawke, S., Huriwai, T.M., Mataki, T., Milne, M., Morgan, K., Tuhaka, H., & Tuuta, C. (2004). A research ethic for studying Maori and iwi provider success. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23, 141–153.

Poata-Smith, E. S. T. A. (1996). He pōkeke uenuku i tu ai: The evolution of contemporary Māori protest. In P. Spoonley, D.G. Pearson, C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Ngā Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 97–116). Palmerston North, N.Z: Dunmore Press.

Pool, I. (1963). When is a Maori a “Maori”? *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 73(3), 206–210.

- Punch, K. (1998). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rangihau, J. (1992). Being Maori. In M. King (Ed), *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga* (pp. 183–190). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Rata, A. (2012). *Te pitau o te tuakiri: Affirming Maori identities and promoting wellbeing in state secondary schools* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Read, K., Aldridge, J., Ala'i, K., Fraser, B., & Fozdar, F. (2015). Creating a climate in which students can flourish: A whole school intercultural approach. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 11(2), 29–44.
- Robson, B., Reid, P. (2001). Ethnicity matters: Maori perspectives paper for the review of the measurement of ethnicity in official statistics. *Statistics New Zealand: Te Tari Tatau*, 1-30. Retrieved from <https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/34835/Ethnicity-Maori-main.pdf?sequence=8&isAllowed=y>
- Ross, M. (2020). The throat of Parata. In A. Hodge (Ed), *Imagining decolonization* (pp.21-39). Wellington, Bridget Williams Books.
- Royal, T. A. C. (2011). Preface. In T. McIntosh, & M. Mulholland (Eds.), *Māori and Social Issues (Vol.1)* (pp. vii–viii). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Shulman, L. S. (1997). Disciplines of inquiry in education: A new overview. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complimentary methods for research in education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 3–29). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Siteine, A. (2013). ‘Positive in their own identities’: Social studies and identity affirmation. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(2), 99–111.
- Smith, J., Osborn, M. (2015). Interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods*, 54–80.

Smith, G. (2012). Interview Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 10–20.

Smith, G. (1991). Reform and Maori educational crisis: A grand illusion. *Monograph No.: 3*. The University of Auckland.

Smith, G. (2015). The dialectic relation of theory and practice in the development of Kaupapa Māori praxis. In L. Pihama, S. J. Tiakiwai & K. Southey (Eds.), *Kaupapa rangahau: A reader: A collection of readings from the kaupapa rangahau workshop series* (pp. 17–27). Hamilton, The University of Waikato.

Smith, G. (2017). Kaupapa Māori theory: Indigenous transforming of education. In T.K. Hoskins & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 11–27). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies*. Dunedin, New Zealand, University of Otago Press.

Smith, L.T. (2015). Kaupapa Māori research: Some Kaupapa Māori principles. In L. Pihama, S. J. Tiakiwai & K. Southey (Eds.), *Kaupapa rangahau: A reader: A collection of readings from the kaupapa rangahau workshop series* (pp. 47–53). Hamilton, The University of Waikato.

Smith, L.T. (2017). Towards developing indigenous methodologies: Kaupapa Māori research. In T.K. Hoskins & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical Conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 11–27). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Sommer, M. (2011). Colonies: Colonisation: Colonialism: A typological reappraisal, *Awe*, 10, 183–193.

Statistics New Zealand. (2013). Information on the New Zealand 2013 census. Retrieved 2 March, 2016, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz>.

Taonui, R. (2017). *Declaration just the beginning for indigenous communities*. Retrieved from <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/opinion/96704437/rawiri-taonui-declaration-just-the-beginning-for-indigenous-communities>

Waitangi Tribunal. (2014). *He Whakaputanga me te Tiriti / The Declaration and the Treaty* (Report no. Wai 1040). Retrieved from <https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/WT/reports.html?selArea=Northland>

Walker, R. (1996). *Ngā pepa a Ranginui: The Walker papers*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

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

Wall, M. (1997). Stereotypical constructions of the Maori ‘race’ in the media. *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 40–44.

Wandel, T. (2001). The power of discourse: Michel Foucault and critical theory, *Cultural Values*, 5:3, 368–382, DOI: [10.1080/14797580109367237](https://doi.org/10.1080/14797580109367237)

Warne, K. (2017). No laughing matter. *Mana Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.mana.co.nz/news/viewpoint-no-laughing-matter.html>

Webb, T.L. (2014). *Becoming and being aware and engaged: An exploration of the development of political awareness and participation among Maori and Pakeha secondary school students in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (Thesis, Doctor of Philosophy). Columbia University, USA.

Webber, M. (2011). Look to the past, stand tall in the present: The integral nature of positive racial-ethnic identity for the academic success of Māori students. *Giftedness from an indigenous perspective*. University of Auckland. New Zealand.

Yin, R.K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, The Guilford Press.

*Every reasonable effort has been made to acknowledge the owners of copyright material. I would be pleased to hear from any copyright owner who has been omitted or incorrectly acknowledged.*

## **Appendix 1**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH SITE**

*The School was a large all boys' school that had a roll of 1,896 students on July 1, 2016 (New Zealand Government website: Education counts website). The number of Māori students at The School was high, and in 2016 was 479, 25% of the school roll; one of the highest Māori student school enrolments in the country. According to the government's Education Review Office report (ERO), The School had a high number of Māori teachers, and I observed this in practice. However, I consider it pertinent to note that of the relatively high number of Māori teachers in the school, only 2 were tangata whenua (from local tribes). There was another staff member (teacher aide) who was tangata whenua, and (about) 2 of the Māori teachers (from other tribes) had married in to the local tribes.*

*The School was located in a city with approximately 125,000 people in one of New Zealand's fastest growing regions. The region had a moderate climate by New Zealand's standards and had close proximity to harbours, beaches, and related recreational activities. The region was a popular tourist destination and was regarded as having an appealing lifestyle. Like many places in New Zealand, the region had had recent sharp increases in costs of housing and costs of living. Average incomes in the region were approximately \$50,000 and the average cost of a house was approximately \$530,000 when this research was conducted (citation left out to protect confidentiality of the school).*

*The School was a decile 6 school at the time this research was conducted, and drew its students from high, medium, and low socio-economic backgrounds. Although socio-economic disparity in medium decile New Zealand schools is typical, economic hardship affects Māori disproportionately, and this disparity was observed at The School. The School had accelerate classes that utilized technology where students were required to own their own laptop. I observed few if any Māori students in accelerate classes, and there are two obvious explanations for this. Either Māori students were performing much lower academically, and not reaching the accelerate classes, or they couldn't afford it.*

*At The School I often observed and encountered Māori students without lunch. It was common for Māori students, who had come to know me, to ask for my lunch. I often saw Māori students eating uncooked 2-minute noodles. I observed that 'Food Tech' was a popular subject as students cooked often, and the teachers sometimes turned a blind eye to double helpings (and were therefore popular). In some physical education classes I noticed some students without correct uniform. These students were disproportionately Pacific Island and Māori students; some Māori students commented that they couldn't afford it. Upon hearing that two Māori students (who were brothers) had pulled out of a rugby team halfway through the rugby season, I asked the students to find out why. The students said*

*that it was too expensive, and so their father had told them they couldn't play. Although The School was a medium decile school, poverty for some students in The School was an issue, some students going hungry and not affording the various opportunities The School had to offer. Poverty for some students was a barrier to learning and achievement in The School. It is important to note that the economic hardship described is not unique to The School and confined only to Māori students, and is increasingly common in many New Zealand schools.*

*Teaching positions in this region were desirable and highly sought after, (as they are in The School). High costs of living in Auckland had seen many Auckland teachers move into the region. The School had an unofficial employment strategy of hiring teachers from their relief teacher list. Many of the teachers on The School's relief list were from Auckland, having recently moved into the region. At the time this research was conducted I worked in The School as a relief teacher. It was explained that relief teaching in The School was like "an interview everyday". The best relief teachers were assured lots of relief work, were offered fixed-term contracts first, and assured the possibility of future long-term employment.*

*The School placed a particular emphasis on sport and had a reputation of being a very good sports school. The School offered a full range of sporting opportunities and had a high performance sports programme. Many students come from out of the school zone and travelled considerable distances from neighbouring towns to attend The School because of the emphasis on sport, and to play in The School's better teams. Teachers were expected to coach sports teams and it was assumed that teacher participation in sport would facilitate positive student teacher relationships in the classroom. It was also assumed that student participation in sport had positive impacts on student's holistic and overall development, and therefore positively influenced students' academic achievement. The emphasis and expectations on teachers to be involved in sport influenced employment of teachers to The School. New teachers were usually selected from the relief list and progressed onto a fixed-term contract. Moving to a permanent contract often and unofficially involved taking on sports coaching positions.*

*The School was located near significant historical sights and was on a street named after a colonial military general who in the New Zealand wars led an attack on a local iwi at a pā (fortified village) located less than a few kilometers from The School. The assault on the pā included the heaviest artillery bombardment on New Zealand soil in New Zealand's history, and despite a large numerical advantage, the colonial forces suffered an improbable and embarrassing defeat, including the loss of most of their officers (Belich, 2015). In retaliation, the colonial general led and attacked another local pā that was unfinished and*

*not ready for battle, inflicted large losses, killing women, children and rangatira (chief) of the local iwi (Belich, 2015; King 2003). After the wars (in the 1860s) the New Zealand government exacted further loses to the local iwi (tribes) by confiscating most of the land in the area, thus stripping the tribes of their economic base. Many of the Māori students at The School whakapapa (have ancestral links), to the local iwi, to the people killed in the New Zealand wars, and to the land confiscated by the New Zealand government.*

*The School's last government Education Review Office (ERO) report states that most Māori in the school whakapapa (have ancestral links) to several iwi (tribes) in the local area. Based on my conversations with local people there are two 'main' tribes in the area where The School is located, and significantly (for this study), the tangata whenua (people of the land) descend from two different waka or polynesian migration vessels that form the basis of tribal identity. Although some of the tangata whenua could claim ancestry to both tribes, many claim ancestry to one or the other, and relations between tribes could be described as fluctuating between co-operation and belligerent. At the time of writing another tribe (that descend from a different waka), was contentiously asserting mana whenua (indigenous land rights) in the area, a claim (likely) considered illegitimate by members of the two most prominent tribes.*

*The School's last Education Review Office (ERO)<sup>42</sup> report was very positive. The report states that The School provides "high quality education... within a well-ordered, caring, inclusive and welcoming environment"; and "students can experience success through a rich curriculum, multiple learning pathways, and an extensive programme of co-curricular activities appropriate for boys" (ERO, date omitted). From living in, and speaking with people in the community, The School is highly regarded and considered a very good school.*

*Curiously, in the last ERO report, the Māori composition of The School specifically the high percentage of Māori students (26% for that reporting period) was placed at the beginning of the report and was the first point under the heading "What are the important features of this school that have an impact on student learning?" (ERO, date omitted). This pronouncement that the high numbers of Māori students in The School is an important feature that impacts student learning can be read as an exonerating factor, vindicating The School if overall student achievement is not where it should be. In spite of or because of this statement the ERO report says The School effectively promotes educational success for Māori as Māori and lists various strategies and initiatives that The School does to encourage this including*

---

<sup>42</sup> The date of The School's two ERO reports have been omitted to protect the confidentiality of the school. Citations of the reports are as follows (ERO, date omitted).

*“the promotion of Māori language, culture and identity in areas of the curriculum”. Despite these positive initiatives The School acknowledges improving Māori achievement in relation to Pākehā achievement remains an important priority. This is an acknowledgement that Māori students’ achievement in NCEA is not where it should be.*

*Māori students at The School achieve lower than Pākehā students and lower against other decile 6 schools and national averages (for all boys) in all year levels of NCEA (National Certificate in Education Achievement). This is shown in the following table.*

#### **“The School” Attainment in National Certificate in Education Achievement (NCEA): 2016**

	NCEA Level 1	NCEA Level 2	NCEA Level 3
Māori	80.8%	58.6%	35.4%
Pākehā	92.4%	82.5%	57.5%
NZ Decile 6 schools	90.4%	78.3%	43%
NZ Boys	88.3%	78%	47.7%

\*Source: New Zealand Government 2016

Note: The categories above, NZ decile 6 schools and NZ Boys, are inclusive of Māori students that likely reduces the comparison with The School’s Māori boys achievement in NCEA. If these categories were exclusive of Māori students the disparity between The School’s Māori boys achievement in NCEA against other NZ decile 6 schools and NZ boys would be significantly larger.

#### **Indicators of how Māori identity is viewed at The School, and communication with the Māori community**

*The School in recent years had re-introduced a house system. The purpose of the house system was to “enhance a sense of belonging and support for student wellbeing” (ERO, date omitted), and to “build school spirit by providing additional opportunities for competition and student leadership” (ERO, date omitted). The house system, specifically the names adopted for the houses, suggests certain things about how The School perceives and conceptualizes Māori identity, and also suggests that The School did not adequately involve its Māori community in choosing Māori figures that might adequately represent and inspire the tangata whenua (people of the local tribes) students of The School.*

*There were five houses in The School’s house system, each taking its name from a famous New Zealand figure or role model who achieved and/or excelled in their respective field. Two of the role models were Māori but not from iwi (tribes) in The School’s region. I spoke with one of the Māori staff members (one of the very few, (perhaps 1 of 2) who is tangata*

*whenua), and he said there was no consultation with the Māori community over who the houses would be named after. He also listed two or three local iwi (tribal) persons that he considered a more suitable choice, because they linked directly to the Māori students in the school and community.*

*This issue suggests two things about how The School relates to its Māori community. Firstly, it indicates that The School views Māori identity as being universal and homogenised. A one size fits all conceptualization of Māori identity. This view, despite being a common conception of Māori identity), marginalizes iwi (tribal) claims and expressions of identity and culture.*

*The house naming issue also suggests something about The School's communication and consultation processes, contrary to ERO's assertion that The School actively encourages and involves The School's Māori community. While at the school, I did observe The School's attempts to communicate with the Māori community, however these were modelled similarly to communication methods in the rest of The School, such as, through parent teacher interviews, where parents are informed of and told about student progress, as opposed to communication aimed at increasing the participatory consciousness of the community, as described by Bishop and Glynn (1999) and considered appropriate to engage Māori communities.*

*While at The School I attended three Māori focused events where the Māori community and families of Māori students liaised with The School – one bilingual unit parent teacher hui (meeting), one pōwhiri (welcoming ceremony of new staff members), and a kapa haka competition (Māori performance competition). The impression I gained was that there was distance between The School's staff (including bilingual unit teachers and senior management staff) and the Māori community and families. For example, at the bilingual unit's parents' hui (meeting), staff members (teachers and senior management team), wore suits, and sat opposite not amongst and with the Māori families. The communication seemed one way and involved The School informing the Māori families what The School was doing, as opposed to finding out what the families wanted for the education of their children, and how they could participate in that (either at a curriculum design level or more practical implementation level). Even though I felt The School was well-intentioned, I thought they were a miss at connecting with the community in a way to break down the distrust that many Māori (parents) likely felt from their own experiences within mainstream New Zealand education, explained for example by Penetito (2009) who described mainstream New Zealand education as failing most Māori that passed through it.*

## **Describing The School's Māori Unit**

*The School's Māori unit was considered a unique feature of The School and pertinent to this investigation on Māori identity. Therefore a description of the Māori unit will be given based on my observations, experiential and practical involvement in The School and with the Māori unit. It is important to note that as a relief teacher I was considered a preferred option to relieve Māori unit classes because of my ability to speak Māori, and willingness to support Māori kaupapa (initiatives).*

## **The School's Marae**

*The Māori unit at The School was centred around The School's marae (ceremonial space) complex. The School's marae incorporated the physical elements of 'traditional' marae, although non-physical 'spiritual' elements best expressed in the terms tapu (sacred) and noa (normal – not sacred) were modified and adapted to suit the purposes of a school. Physical elements of the marae included;*

- *A taiapa (fence) demarcating the marae from the outside areas*
- *The marae atea (courtyard) that is typically tapu (sacred), and used primarily for formal oratory during pōwhiri (welcoming ceremonies) and therefore not a common area. The marae atea at The School's marae was not tapu (sacred), but considered noa (normal – not sacred) and therefore students were permitted to play and eat on the marae atea (not usually permitted on typical marae)*
- *Wharenui – (carved meeting house). Wharenui are often referred to as 'the meeting house' and also in some cases 'the marae', which signifies the central place of the wharenui to the marae overall. Traditional wharenui are typically named after, and represent the body of a paramount or significant ancestor. The wharenui at The School was not named after an ancestor but named as a place of learning. Carvings, and photographs in a typical wharenui are of descendants of the paramount ancestor. Carvings in The School's wharenui related to waka (Polynesian migration ships) and iwi who reside in the area, as well as representations of pūrākau (ancient stories) particularly stories related to whare ānanga (houses of learning). The wharenui is where the tangata whenua gather and have hui (meetings) including wānanga (learning events) and tangi (funerals). Wharenui are also used to host and house guests. Wharenui usually*

*have a mattress room attached to store mattresses used for communal sleeping, as did The School's. Wharenui are typically considered tapu (sacred) and some activities are not normally permitted such as, eating, having food, and weapons training. In most areas of the country, shoes are also not permitted in the wharenui. Activities not usually allowed in a typical wharenui were sometimes permitted in the wharenui – such as carrying kai, and weapons training. Even though The School's wharenui was used as a classroom for Māori unit classes such as, kapa haka and te reo Māori (Māori language), and was not considered tapu (sacred), the wharenui did have mana (prestige) that distinguished it and made it unique to other learning areas. The wharenui at The School was also hired out and used for various events such as, community group meetings, noho marae (marae stays), and school sports exchanges.*

- *Wharekai – (Food house) – a food hall used for feeding guests, considered as noa (not sacred) and thus a more informal marae area*
- *Kauta – (Cooking area) – separate area for cooking food*
- *Ablutions (toilet and shower) – the school marae had a separate toilet and shower exclusively for the marae additional to school toilets and showers that could be used for big groups.*

### ***The School's Māori Unit***

*The School's Māori unit had approximately 80 students in 2016. The Māori unit had large junior (Year 9 and Year 10) classes, similar to mainstream class sizes of about 25-30 students. Student numbers in senior (from Year 11) classes however, reduced significantly. By the end of 2016, the Māori unit had only one student in Year 13. Junior classes stayed together for core classes, including Maths, English, Social Studies, Science, and PE and Health, and were taught by Māori teachers where possible.*

*In the Māori unit studying Te Reo Māori (the Māori language) was compulsory for all students, and a significant emphasis was placed on kapa haka (Māori dance). Māori unit students participated in various cultural activities and events both in The School and in the wider community. The Māori unit ran pōwhiri (welcome ceremony) in The School, and Māori unit students and teachers represented The School at pōwhiri and tangi (funeral) in the community. Māori unit students learned iwi (tribal) specific knowledge such as, haka (dance), taiaha (weaponry), reo-a-iwi (local language/dialect), pūrākau (stories), and karakia (prayer, incantation). Māori unit students did karakia (prayer, incantation) in Māori unit classes particularly at the start and end of the school day. In 2016, there were no*

*teachers in the Māori unit who were tangata whenua (from the local tribes) and therefore relied on a teacher aide from the local tribe to deliver and teach iwi-specific (tribe specific) knowledge. The Māori unit met weekly together in a meeting called ‘whakamana’ that means ‘to honour’. Whakamana was held in the wharenuia (main ‘meeting’ house) and began with karakia. Whakamana had two main purposes, to acknowledge positive achievements of Māori unit students and to communicate important information.*

*I attended whakamana on a few occasions, and was surprised that whakamana was conducted in English as I presumed it was an appropriate time to communicate in Māori. I was also surprised that whakamana followed the structures and systems of the mainstream school such as, lining up and sitting in rows. Therefore, whakamana seemed primarily a way to convey/pass on information from the teachers and school (and to remind the students of ‘expectations’) to the students. Unfortunately, I did not witness whakamana being used as a space to hear Māori student voice, or get Māori student input into school and or about issues that were of concern to them. Therefore whakamana seemed to entrench/reinforce distance between the teachers and students, and between the students and any agentic engagement with their education. This may have been a contributing reason/factor why there were few senior Māori unit students, as the Māori unit did not encourage/sustain (agentic) long lasting engagement with the Māori unit and the wider school overall. Despite these perceived limitations I did observe kotahitanga (unity) and whanaungatanga (familial type relationships) between the Māori unit boys and therefore the Māori unit appeared to help the boys feel connected to each other, to the Māori unit and Māori culture. This in turn appeared to help the Māori unit participants to be connected and positive in their Māori identity.*

## **Appendix 2**

### **INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

Interview Notes:

Date:

Participant Code

<b>Notes to questions</b>	<b>Body language/ appearance / impression</b>
1. In your mind, what makes you Maori? (How are you Maori?)	1.
2. How do you feel about being Maori?	2.
2a. How do you feel about being Maori at school?	2a.
2b. How do you feel about being Maori out of school, at home, in the community?	2b.
3. What makes you feel that way about being Maori?	3.
4. What helps you to be Maori?	4.
5. What doesn't help you to be Maori?	5.
6. Who helps you to be Maori?	6.
7. Who doesn't help you to be Maori?	7.
8. How do you feel around Maori things?	8.
9. How do you feel if you have to do Maori things?	9.
10. How do you feel when you hear positive things about Maori?	10.
11. How do you feel when you hear negative things about Maori?	11.
12. Are there good things about being Maori? If so, what are they?	12.
13. Are there bad things about being Maori? If so, what are they?	13.
14. How do you feel around different groups of people, eg. Maori students, non-Maori students?	14.
15. How do you feel around different groups of people, eg Maori teachers, non-Maori teachers?	15.

Interview Schedule/ Questions	Probes
<p>Building rapport: Where are you from? What is your iwi? Tell them really interested in what they feel and have to say. And what they have to say will help teachers to know about this topic.</p> <p>1. In your mind, what makes you Maori? (alternative wording: how are you Maori?)</p> <p>2. How do you feel about being Maori?</p> <p>2a. How do you feel about being Maori at school?</p> <p>2b. How do you feel about being Maori out of school, at home, in the community?</p> <p>3. What makes you feel that way about being Maori?</p> <p>4. What helps you to be Maori?</p> <p>5. What doesn't help you to be Maori?</p> <p>6. Who helps you to be Maori?</p> <p>7. Who doesn't help you to be Maori?</p> <p>8. How do you feel around Maori things?</p> <p>9. How do you feel if you have to do Maori things?</p> <p>10. How do you feel when you hear positive things about Maori?</p> <p>11. How do you feel when you hear negative things about Maori?</p> <p>12. Are there good things about being Maori? If so, what are they?</p> <p>13. Are there bad things about being Maori? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>1. P might make distinction between what they think makes them Maori as opposed to what other people think make them Maori, if so ask them. 1 a. In your mind..... 1 b. In other peoples' view what makes you Maori?</p> <p>2. Can you tell me more about that? Can you give me an example? You feel like that because.....</p> <p>3. For example, you mentioned that you feel _____ about being Maori. What makes you feel that way?</p> <p>4. What makes it easy for you to be Maori?</p> <p>5. What makes it harder for you to be Maori?</p> <p>6. Who makes it easy for you to be Maori?</p> <p>7. Who makes it harder?</p> <p>8. Clarification: For example, if you are around te reo, kapa haka, going to the marae.</p> <p>9. For example, if you had to read Maori in class, start karakia</p> <p>10. It could be at school, anywhere</p> <p>More general probes What do you think? Can you tell me more about that? Can you give me more details about that?</p>

## Appendix 3

### EXTRACT: PAGES 1-6 OF 12

#### EXPLORATORY COMMENTS AND EMERGING THEMES: PARTICIPANT 1

Exploratory Comments	Interview Participant 1	Emerging themes
Karakia = Prayer  How is prayer received?	J: Kapai, um this is interview with participant one. The date is the 22 of June. Uh tena koe tama, me timata. Maku e timata ki te karakia, ne? Ka pai. E io nui, io wananga, Anei ra maua he uri nau ra noa E ahu atu ana I tenei taku taku ki to ara tapu Kia arahina matou e koe ki nga hua o ioio, o io nuku, o ioio, o iorangi o nehera Kia u atu matou kit e matapuna o to ora He ara matua He ara tipua He ara tawhito He ara tapu kia koe E io e Tuturu whakamaua kia tina  P: Tina  J: Haumi e, Hui e  Both: 'Taiki e'	Te Reo Proficiency (actual use)
P knows how to participate in this prayer – demonstrates confidence and knowledge in things Māori (by saying Taiki e)	J: Kia ora, kia ora tena koe tama. Nau mai  P: Kia ora  J: Nau mai ki tenei kaupapa. Ah, whakatau I a koe ki te kaupapa. A, he kaupapa ngawari. He mea ngawari, engari he mea nui. Ah, na te mea, tera pea ko nga hua ka puta he huarahi mo tatou te iwi Maori. A, nga mihi kia koe mo to, mo to whakaae, mo to ae ki te uiui, ki te korero I tenei kaupapa. Tena koe, e tama. So, thanks for uh letting us have a korero to you today.	Te Reo (actual use of language in interview)
P confidently greets in Māori  Mihi = greeting in Māori  To Establish rapport – P is responsive  Responds in Māori = good	P: Kei te pai.  J: Um yeah, we are really interested in what you have to say and uh hopefully our korero will enable us to tautoko, uh while we continue school so uh thank you very much. Uh I just wanna catch up with a couple of things first. Um so no hea koe? Where are you from?	Pepeha Te Reo use
P: I'm from Waikato  J: Really?  P: Yes, from Huntly	P: No Waikato ahau  J: O ne?  P: Ae, no Huntly  J: Oh yeah	Pepeha – mentions classical markers including, awa, marae, maunga, waka, hapu

<p>Place name omitted – confidentiality</p>	<p>P: But um, I've lived in ..... now since the age of 5</p>	
<p>States “Pepeha” = Way of introducing oneself with identity markers, in this case:</p>	<p>J: Oh, awesome. So, um what are your? Do you know your marae? What are your marae?</p>	
<p>P: the marae. Taupare is the mountain. Waikato is the river. Tainui is the waka. Kawhanui is the sub-tribe</p>	<p>P: Ko (not audible) te marae. Ko taupare te maunga. Ko Waikato te awa. Ko tainui te waka. Ko Ngati Whawhakia kei te hapu. Sweet.</p>	
<p>What influence do these have on his identity?</p>	<p>J: Tena koe, tena koe tama. Me nga mihi ko maunga, no awa, me marae, um ka paia ra.</p>	
<p>Greetings to you tama (boy)</p>	<p>Do you go back there much?</p>	
<p>Greetings to your mountain, your river and your marae, good</p>	<p>P: Uh now and again. I miss going back there though.</p>	
<p>So he spent lots of time at the marae when he was a kid?</p>	<p>J: Mmm.</p>	<p>Tangi = Funerals</p>
<p>What does that suggest? – hasn't been to marae for 2 years?</p>	<p>P: That was the go-to thing when I was a kid but yeah not really anymore but</p>	
<p>What affect does being away from tribal area (urbanization) have on identity? Does he go to marae in area he resides and in what capacity?</p>	<p>J: Mmm. So, when was the last time you went back there?</p>	
<p>Do tangi (funeral) influence identity?</p>	<p>P: Um, two years ago.</p>	
<p>How does he feel about that? And the role of marae in his life? Does marae matter to his identity?</p>	<p>J: Yip.</p>	
<p>Clarifying – trying to make space for P to talk about affect his marae has on his identity.</p>	<p>P: But I went back to Huntly that was for a funeral and that was when I ended up saying goodbye to family members that passed away then that when I got to visit most of my whakapapa and my</p>	<p>Marae – not significant factor</p>
<p></p>	<p>J: Two years ago?</p>	<p>Marae – doesn't go back regularly</p>
<p></p>	<p>P: Yeah.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>J: Mmm, awesome. So, you haven't been back for two years?</p>	
<p></p>	<p>P: Yeah, nah I haven't been back.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>J: Yip, And uh both your parents from there?</p>	
<p></p>	<p>P: Uh, mother's from Auckland, Dad's from Waikato.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>J: Ka pai ra. And you uh, you grew up here? Since you were 5?</p>	
<p></p>	<p>P: Mmm.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>J: Mmm. So, you don't go back very regularly to the marae just</p>	
<p></p>	<p>P: Nope, not on a regular basis. It's more of a, when a tangi is on. When a family member has passed away. But besides that, the only I'm still here.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>J: Ae. And how is this place?</p>	
<p></p>	<p>P: Mmm, it was fun at first. It's pretty boring now.</p>	<p>Confidently Māori</p>
<p></p>	<p>J: Is it?</p>	

<p>Kura = School</p> <p>Associates doing well at school with NCEA achievement</p> <p>Confident in his Māori identity. Is this confidence an indicator of a secure Māori identity?</p> <p>What makes him Māori? - Family. Family brought him into the Māori world. (what is Māori world?) Natural gift of tupuna (<a href="#">ancestors</a>). Positive association – gift (happy feelings) Family pushing him to learn Māori – is a strong indicator that Te reo makes him Māori</p> <p>Influence of grandmother who was fluent in te reo. Another link to te reo</p> <p>Again uses word gift to describe ability to use te reo (Māori language)</p> <p>Clarifying</p> <p>Māori world is being brought up with the language</p> <p>Very positive feelings about being Māori – emphatic! – and again associates his feelings, and being Māori with the language</p>	<p>P: Mmm.</p> <p>J: And how about kura? How is kura going for you?</p> <p>P: Kura's going pretty well. Need about 15 more credits and that's level two gone and out of the way. And then, yeah. So, school's pretty alright at the moment.</p> <p>J: Ka pai, cool. So, um? Are you Maori?</p> <p>P: Course! Fully! No hesitation about that one.</p> <p>J: Awesome. So, here's my question for you about that. So, uh, what makes you Maori?</p> <p>P: Knowing that my family's around, because without my family where would I be? And like, my family pretty much bought me into the Maori world. So, if it wasn't for my family, I wouldn't know the natural gift that our tupuna had. And like if it wasn't for them pushing me, to encourage me to actually learn to reo, I wouldn't be sitting here in front of you today.</p> <p>J: Mmm, true. So, you said that uh your parents pushed you into the Maori world, or brought you into the Maori world. Can you talk about that Maori world? What is that Maori world?</p> <p>P: Well, when I was, when I was really, oh like say as a toddler. Um pretty much, I was living around my grandmother. She was fluent in te reo. And Maori was like my first language. And then when I went to primary school I got into speaking English. And then my father noticed that I'd rather speak English than Maori. So, he urged me to be in the bilingual unit or Maori unit or anything, in schools. So, it'll keep my gift of being able to speak te reo strong as I grow up. And then it'll bring my understanding, up, I guess, like my experience level with maori.</p> <p>J: Ka pai. So, so the Maori world for you is a part that has been brought up with te reo Maori.</p> <p>P: Yip.</p> <p>J: Ka pai, so your kuia was a native speaker?</p> <p>P: Yeah</p> <p>J: Mmm. Awesome e taonga tera bro. he taonga, he taonga. Awesome. Ka pai. So, uh your whanau, your whanau actually Maori. Sweet. So, uh, how do you feel about being Maori?</p> <p>P: Great, I feel absolutely fantastic, because we're unique in the world. We're the only indigenous culture that can speak Maori. It's not like anyone else in the world can imitate our language.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: You either born Maori, or you're not born a Maori. And I was born in Maori so I have to learn Maori.</p>	<p>What makes me Māori Whanau (family) Tupuna (ancestors) Family support</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – a natural gift our tupuna had (he taonga tuku iho)</p> <p>Family – grandparent – influence of</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – te reo is the Māori world My gift of being able to speak Māori</p> <p>I feel absolutely fantastic – we are unique – te reo</p> <p>Te Reo – identity factor I feel fantastic – we are the only culture that can speak Māori</p> <p>Te reo – prescribed – has to learn Māori</p> <p>Mean as at school (note this is a positive expression)</p>
---	--	---

How was he born a Māori?	J: Right.	
Has to learn Māori because he is Māori	P: That's how I see it in my eyes.	
Positive feelings at school about being Māori – emphatic	J: Mmm. So, you felt really positive about that? Um, how about at school? How do you feel about being Maori at school?	
	P: Mean as.	
Doesn't feel need to adapt – to be Pākehā – emphatic – which is a positive expression of his Māoritanga	J: Yip.	
	P: Still feel the same like if it was, like if anyone else at the school was Maori. But they're not, which I have to adapt to because I'm Maori, and well feeling Maori.	
	J: You say you have to adapt, you have to adapt? What does that mean?	
	P: Like, cause our Maori language is a dying language. And a lot of Maori students at schools, at now, rarely actually know how to speak Maori. They know how to understand it more than as well as speak. So, what I mean by adapt, is like, trying to pretty much fit in with everyone else, even though you're like, like still learning Maori I guess.	
	J: Sweet, so you're not, so you're not adapting in terms of um trying to act more Pakeha.	
	P: Nah no way.	
	J: Yeah, okay.	
	P: Just trying to fit in as being Maori with everyone else.	
	J: Okay then, so your saying, are you saying that uh because some other Maori kids, their reo is not as good as yours.	
	P: Mmm, not really, not as good as, just that they haven't pursued theirs as I had, as I have.	
	J: Mmm.	
	P: That's what I think of it.	
	J: Mmm, awesome.	
	So just to recap, that you, there's no difference to how you feel about being Maori. At home, and at school, and in the community. When you go out in the community you still feel great about being Maori?	
	P: Course! Cause we're unique, that's the only thing.	
	J: Mmm, awesome, ka pai.	
	Okay so you feel, you feel great about being Maori, because Maori, Maori is unique.	
	P: Mmm.	
	J: Mmm. Anything else around that? What helps you feel great about being Maori? So, unique, anything else that can help you feel that way?	
Does knowing te reo contribute to his confidence – a secure Māori ID?	P: Mmm, um, feeling great about being Maori, well	More Māori language you know more Māori you feel. More mana you carry
		Things that help me to be Māori Knowing your roots

	<p>actually knowing the reo, our reo, is a good thing about Maori.</p> <p>J: So, cause you know it, that helps you to feel good about being Maori.</p> <p>P: Being more Maori. Because the less Maori you know, the less Maori you feel. Not trynna like put down other Maori's because they don't know as much but just saying, like, the amount of Maori you know, could determine the amount of mana you carry.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: So, you, you um carry your tupuna's mana. So, it's like going through descendants into me. That's how I see it. From my kuia, through my Dad, to me.</p> <p>J: Mmm, wow, interesting. Cool, mean, that's mean, that's mean. So, in a way you are saying so that um by knowing your reo that helps you to be Maori. And strengthens you to be Maori.</p> <p>P: Fully! Definitely!</p> <p>J: Mmm, awesome. Are there any other things that help you to be Maori?</p> <p>P: Um, realizing where you come from?</p> <p>J: So, we're knowing</p> <p>P: Knowing your roots. Um knowing your whakapapa, your family tree. Pretty much just, yeah, just knowing your whakapapa, just knowing where you come from, where your tupuna's come from, and how they descended and ended up into you.</p> <p>J: Mmm, awesome. So how much of your whakapapa do you know?</p> <p>P: Oh, I know my fathers side. But I don't even know my mothers side because I was brought up with my father.</p> <p>J: He Maori, raua tahi?</p> <p>P: Yip.</p> <p>J: So, we've talked about what helps you to be Maori and you've mentioned knowing uh where you're from and whakapapa and you've also mentioned te reo, um is anything doesn't help you to be maori?</p> <p>P: What do you mean by that?</p> <p>J: Um, for me personally, the fact that I'm white as, that doesn't necessarily help me to be Maori.</p> <p>P: Mmm.</p> <p>J: Because what that means is, is when I got into the world a lot of people perceive me as being pakeha.</p> <p>P: Mmm.</p>	<p>Whakapapa – family tree helps you to be Maori</p> <p>Māori proficiency (in te reo)</p> <p>Our culture is dying slowly – and that amps me (motivates)</p>
--	--	---

<p>Why does he think that Māori culture is dying? And what affect does that have?</p> <p>Motivated – fairly inspired in things Māori</p> <p>Perceives other Māori as not into Māori. To get the mahi (<b>work</b>) done</p> <p>What do I think about that – the association between being Māori and needing to get mahi done? Is being Māori something we have to work at?</p> <p>Interesting – what is that kaupapa? In this case the best definition for this word is = <b>way of being</b></p> <p><b>Yes, learning Māori language opens doors to a new world, what are some of the things that open up?</b></p> <p>Does knowing history have an affect on his feelings and Māori identity?</p>	<p>J: But I was brought up with my Maori grandparents. You know what I mean. So that, so being white doesn't help me to be Maori.</p> <p>P: Mmm.</p> <p>J: Is there anything in the world that doesn't help you to be Maori?</p> <p>P: No, I still know where I come from. I know how I stand strong, and I know deep down that our language is dying so there's not really a lot to be pulling me down besides that.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: Because that's a big disappointment with our Maori culture. Cause it is dying slowly.</p> <p>J: So how does that make you feel? Does that make you feel motivated to, to keep it going?</p> <p>P: Yeah. Keeps, yeah it like, it amps me to, to wanna learn more. Like oh I may have learnt in my extent in one day but the next day I would be like 'oh yip, keen as what's the new thing to learn? I've already learnt that thing, what's something else to learn?'.</p> <p>J: Can I ask you a question around that? Um how many are your peers are like that do you think? How many of your peers in your kura here, have that sort of attitude?</p> <p>P: Um, not many. Not many are into maori now. Not Maoris, know that it is a boring subject or kick back period or chill out period. But there is, there is a few of us, a hand full that they do it to get the mahi done.</p> <p>J: So, it's not, you're not like saying that you're not staying motivated by the subject of te reo maori but you more motivated by your own personal desire and your own belief around the importance of te reo and</p> <p>P: It's like, it's like English. If, if no one learnt how, if no one knew how to speak English, how would we communicate? Because everyone would have their own, own individual language. And we wouldn't know how to, you know speak to each other. But, but English is like a universal language.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: And then when you speak maori it's a whole different kaupapa.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: It's like opening the door to a whole new path.</p> <p>J: Can you, can we talk a bit more about that. So um ae ra, ko te reo Maori ka huakina he kuaha ano ne. He aha nga hua ka puta? When you open that door, what are some of the things that ka puta mai I te, ka huakina te kuaha? What are some of the things that come out when you open that door?</p>	<p>When you speak Māori – it's a whole different kaupapa!</p> <p>History – how we ended up here</p> <p>History – Māori are at the bottom side of things</p> <p>History/Māori – “the not really thought of people”</p>
---	---	---

	<p>P: Well history is one.</p> <p>Makes a negative association to what pākehā did? Does that go further? What does that mean? Does it carry across to today? How does he feel about that?</p>	
Affect of history – Māori are “the bottom side of things”	<p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: Like how our tupuna came from Hawaiiki, for Aotearoa ko whaka Aotearoa.</p> <p>J: Mmhmm.</p> <p>P: And how we ended up like, ended up living here. Cultivating food and you know making a living here. And then we ended up learning about how the pakeha came and destroyed a lot of our land, confiscated you know, all those sorts of things and like yeah. Not good.</p> <p>J: So, uh how does that feel when you learn, so your saying when you learn te reo maori opens up a door and one of them, one of those doors is, what was that?</p> <p>P: History.</p> <p>J: And how does that make you feel and how does that motivate you?</p> <p>P: Oh, it makes me eager to uh, to learn more about how those things happen. Like understanding the England in those times was all about concrete land and all that.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: But our Maori people, that, we had wars, like land wars and all that but we never dominated in, like another ethnicity I should say.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: And like it sort of put us on the downside, because ever since the pakeha came to New Zealand we were pretty much the kings and royals of this land, until the pakeha brought the Crown, and its pretty much put us on the lower, the bottom side of things.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: Like the not really thought of sort of people.</p> <p>J: Yeah. Uh ka pai. Let me just grab that. Can you uh order that thing.</p> <p>[Muffling]</p> <p>J: Aroha mai mo tera. No puta ko haere mai te tahi nanakia. Um oh ka pai. History aye.</p> <p>P: Mmm.</p> <p>J: Okay um, so those things however, about learning that history, that's a motivating thing for you to be stronger in your things a maori. Ne?</p> <p>P: Mmm.</p> <p>J: Mmm. Okay so just to recap there was, there was, so there was nothing really that uh, um that doesn't help you to be Maori.</p> <p>P: Doesn't help?</p>	Conscientisation
Negative sentiments about place of Māori in NZ		Social media as a negative factor – a distractor to learning te reo
Has the mood in the interview changed here?  (outside interruption)		
Sorry about that mischief fella.		
Has an awareness of history – and the things that have caused Māori experience –		
Conscientisation – beginning to perceive the reality How much is conscientisation a factor on his strength of ID/character?		Social media prevents me from learning things that I should be learning.

	<p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: Can you explain more?</p> <p>J: Sweet, yeah, cool.</p> <p>P: What you mean by doesn't help?</p> <p>J: So im interested in knowing about the things that help you to be Maori, uh and you've talked about that and the other question part of it, are there any things that don't help you? What are the things that don't help you to be Maori?</p> <p>P: Well. One big one would be social media.</p> <p>J: Mmm.</p> <p>P: Cause, that prevents like all these, like all our Maori kids and students and all that, um from actually focusing on our reo, which causes them to think about friends, likes, popularity, fame, things like that. And it totally wipes their minds</p> <p>J: Wow</p> <p>P: Of actually how bad the situation is with our Maori culture.</p> <p>J: Mmm, wow. Interesting.</p> <p>P: So, social media doesn't help to be Maori?</p> <p>J: Oh, in some ways it can, but the major problem it just distracts people.</p> <p>J: It's a distraction?</p> <p>P: Mmhmm.</p> <p>J: Mmm, yeah wow. Interesting. Mmm, do you find that for you personally?</p> <p>P: Yes, I do because it does distract me even when I'm in class and it sort of sucks because it deprives me of my own learning. Like prevents me from learning things that I should be learning.</p> <p>J: Yip, okay. Interesting, so how could we sort of help with that situation?</p> <p>P: Just not have Facebook, not have Instagram, or have Snapchat. Just things like that.</p>	
--	--	--

## **Appendix 4**

### **INITIAL LIST OF THEMES AND CLUSTER OF THEMES: PARTICIPANT**

**1**

Initial Themes	Cluster of Themes
<p>Te Reo Proficiency (actual use)</p> <p>Te Reo (actual use of language in interview)</p> <p>Pepeha</p> <p>Te Reo use</p> <p>Pepeha – mentions classical markers including, awa, marae, maunga, waka, hapu</p> <p>Tangi - Funerals</p> <p>Marae – not significant factor</p> <p>Marae – doesn't go back regularly</p> <p>Confidently Māori</p> <p>What makes me Māori -Whanau (family), Tupuna (ancestors)</p> <p>Family support</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – a natural gift our tupuna had (he taonga tuku iho)</p> <p>Family – grandparent – influence of</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – te reo is the Māori world</p> <p>My gift of being able to speak Māori</p> <p>I feel absolutely fantastic – we are unique – te reo</p> <p>Te Reo – identity factor</p> <p>I feel fantastic – we are the only culture that can speak Māori</p> <p>Te reo – prescribed – has to learn Māori</p> <p>Mean as at school (note this is a positive expression)</p> <p>More Māori language you know more Māori you feel.</p> <p>More mana you carry</p> <p>Things that help me to be Māori</p> <p>Knowing your roots</p> <p>Whakapapa – family tree helps you to be Māori</p> <p>Māori proficiency (in te reo)</p> <p>Our culture is dying slowly – and that amps me (motivates)</p> <p>When you speak Māori – it's a whole different kaupapa!</p> <p>History – how we ended up here</p> <p>History – Māori are at the bottom side of things</p> <p>History/Māori – “the not really thought of people”</p> <p>Conscientisation</p> <p>Social media as a negative factor – a distractor to learning te reo</p> <p>Social media prevents me from learning things that I should be learning.</p> <p>Influence of one parent (and father's side) Dad helps me to be Māori</p> <p>Māori was banned in school</p> <p>Kaumatua (<b>our grandparents/ old people</b>) have the key to our future – and te reo</p> <p>Te Reo – the old ways of speaking</p> <p>Grandparents – role models – te reo – help to be Māori</p> <p>A parent who doesn't help to be Māori</p> <p>A parent who doesn't value things Māori</p> <p>“I'm positive about speaking Māori”</p> <p>“I feel tapu” around Māori things</p> <p>Māori things – connection to the past</p> <p>Hearing positive things about Māori – a mood lifter</p> <p>Definitely hears negative things about Maori</p> <p>Negative Stereotypes</p> <p>Māori are savages</p> <p>Māori are pohara (poor)</p> <p>Māori are homeless</p> <p>Māori are lower decile</p> <p>Māori are hori</p> <p>Maori are hungry all the time</p> <p>Feelings associated with these stereotypes</p> <p>Drives me Crazy</p>	<p>Te Reo Proficiency (actual use)</p> <p>Te Reo (actual use of language in interview)</p> <p>Te Reo use</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – a natural gift our tupuna had (he taonga tuku iho)</p> <p>Te Reo – strong factor – te reo is the Māori world</p> <p>My gift of being able to speak Māori</p> <p>I feel absolutely fantastic – we are unique – te reo</p> <p>Te Reo – identity factor</p> <p>I feel fantastic – we are the only culture that can speak Māori</p> <p>Te reo – prescribed – has to learn Māori</p> <p>More Māori language you know more Māori you feel.</p> <p>More mana you carry</p> <p>Māori proficiency (in te reo)</p> <p>When you speak Māori – it's a whole different kaupapa!</p> <p>Māori was banned in school</p> <p>Kaumatua (<b>our grandparents/ old people</b>) have the key to our future – and te reo</p> <p>Te Reo – the old ways of speaking</p> <p>Grandparents – role models – te reo – help to be Māori</p> <p>“I'm positive about speaking Māori”</p> <p>Hates people mocking Māori language</p> <p>I love being Māori – we're unique – we have our own language</p> <p>Social media as a negative factor – a distractor to learning te reo</p> <p>Pepeha</p> <p>Pepeha – mentions classical markers including, awa, marae,</p> <p>Tangi-Funerals</p> <p>Marae – not significant factor</p> <p>Marae – doesn't go back regularly</p> <p>Confidently Māori</p> <p>Things that help me to be Māori</p> <p>Knowing your roots</p> <p>Whakapapa – family tree helps you to be Māori</p> <p>Our culture is dying slowly – and that amps me (motivates)</p> <p>History – how we ended up here</p> <p>History – Māori are at the bottom side of things</p> <p>History/Māori – “the not really thought of people”</p> <p>Conscientisation</p> <p>Social media as a negative factor – a distractor to learning te reo</p> <p>Social media prevents me from learning things that I should be learning.</p> <p>Influence of one parent (and father's side) Dad helps me to be Māori</p> <p>A parent who doesn't help to be Māori</p> <p>A parent who doesn't value things Māori</p>

<p>Angry Annoyed Like out the gate Who uses stereotypes = Pakeha – even a few Māori - no teachers Frequency of stereotypes. If your connection isn't the best you would hear negative stereotypes on a daily basis. If not many people like you – you would hear it often (negative stereotypes) I'm a friend to most people Hates people mocking Māori language Sucking it up is the first option I love being Māori – we're unique – we have our own language 2 worlds – going with a group of Māori is like being with your own, and its like feeling right at home. In a class of Pakeha – being the only brown boy is quite awkward. Separation – its like Māoris have their own community and pakeha have theirs</p>	<p>“I feel tapu” around Māori things Māori things – connection to the past Hearing positive things about Māori – a mood lifter Negative Stereotypes Māori are savages Māori are pohara (poor) Māori are homeless Māori are lower decile Māori are hori Maori are hungry all the time Feelings associated with these stereotypes Drives me Crazy Angry Annoyed Like out the gate Who uses stereotypes = Pakeha – even a few Māori - no teachers Frequency of stereotypes. If your connection isn't the best you would hear negative stereotypes on a daily basis. If not many people like you – you would hear it often (negative stereotypes) I'm a friend to most people Sucking it up is the first option  2 worlds – going with a group of Māori is like being with your own, and its like feeling right at home. In a class of Pakeha – being the only brown boy is quite awkward. Separation – its like Māoris have their own community and pakeha have theirs</p>
--	---

## **Appendix 5**

### **TABLE OF THEMES, AND PARTICIPANT'S FEELINGS ABOUT THEMES: PARTICIPANT 1**

Themes	Feelings
<p><b>Te Reo Māori</b></p> <p>Te Reo Proficiency “I’m positive about speaking Māori”      My gift of being able to speak Māori      A natural gift our tupuna had (he taonga tuku īho)      Te Reo – is the Māori world      More Māori language you know more Māori you feel. More mana you carry      When you speak Māori – it’s a whole different kaupapa!</p> <p>I feel absolutely fantastic – we are unique – te reo      I feel fantastic – we are the only culture that can speak Māori      Hates people mocking Māori language      I love being Māori – we’re unique – we have our own language</p>	+4
<p><b>Negative Stereotypes of Māori</b></p> <p>Māori are savages      Māori are pohara (poor)      Māori are homeless      Māori are lower decile      Māori are hori      Maori are hungry all the time</p> <p>Feelings associated with these stereotypes      Drives me Crazy      Angry      Annoyed      Like out the gate</p> <p>Who uses stereotypes = Pakeha – even a few Māori - no teachers</p>	-4
<p><b>Frequency of negative stereotypes of Māori.</b></p> <p>If your connection isn’t the best you would hear negative stereotypes on a daily basis.      If not many people like you – you would hear it often (negative stereotypes)      I’m a friend to most people      Sucking it up is the first option</p>	-4
<p><b>Things that help me to be Māori</b></p> <p>Knowing your roots      Whakapapa – family tree helps you to be Māori      Knowing te reo</p>	+3
<p><b>Upbringing – influence of grandparents</b></p> <p>Kaumatua (<a href="#">our grandparents/ old people</a>) have the key to our future – and te reo      Te Reo – the old ways of speaking      Grandparents – role models – te reo – help to be Māori</p>	+3
<p><b>Supportive Influence of one parent</b></p> <p>Dad helps me to be Māori (and father’s side)</p>	+3
<p><b>A parent who doesn’t help</b></p> <p>A parent who doesn’t help to be Māori      A parent who doesn’t value things Māori</p>	-3
<p><b>Knowing History - how we ended up here</b></p> <p>History – how we ended up here      History – Māori are at the bottom side of things      History/Māori – “the not really thought of people”</p>	+2
<p><b>Confidently Māori</b></p> <p>“I feel tapu” around Māori things      Māori things – connection to the past      Hearing positive things about Māori – a mood lifter</p>	+3

<b>2 worlds –</b> going with a group of Māori is like being with your own, and its like feeling right at home. In a class of Pakeha – being the only brown boy is quite awkward. Separation – its like Māoris have their own community and pakeha have theirs	-3
<b>Social media as a negative factor</b> Social media as a negative factor – a distractor to learning te reo Social media prevents me from learning things that I should be learning.	-2
<b>Motivating factors</b> Our culture is dying slowly – and that amps me (motivates)	+2
<b>Marae</b> Marae – not significant factor Marae – doesn't go back regularly	+1
<b>Pepeha</b> Pepeha – mentions classical markers including, awa, marae,	+1
<b>Tangi-Funerals</b>	+1

## **Appendix 6**

### **TABLE OF RESULTS: PARTICIPANTS' FEELINGS ABOUT THEMES EMERGED FROM SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW**

Theme*	Participant Number												Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
<b>Negative stereotypes of Māori</b>	-4	-3	-3	-4	-4	-3	-1	-4	-4	0	-4	-4	-3.16
<b>Having fair skin</b>	**-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-2	0	-2	0	-0.66
<b>Being excluded by other Māori</b>	-	-	-	-3	-	-4	-	-	-4	-4	-	-	-3.75
<b>Whakapapa</b>	+3	-	+1	-	0	0	-1	+3	-	0	-	0	+0.75
<b>Whānau</b>	+3	+3	+4	+4	+2	+3	+4	-	-	-	+4	+3	+3.33
<b>Upbringing</b>	+3	+3	+3	+4	+2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+3
<b>Influence of grandparents</b>	+3	-	+3	+4	+2	+4	+4	+4	-	-	+4	+3	+3.44
<b>Te Reo Māori</b>	+4	+1	0	+1	+2	+2	+2	+3	+2	0	0	+2	+1.58
<b>Kapa Haka</b>	+3	+1	+1	-	+4	-	+2	+3	+1	+1	+2	+3	+2.1
<b>Marae</b>	+1	-	+2	+4	0	+2	0	+2	0	0	0	+1	+1.0

\*The themes in this table are only those considered pertinent to the research objectives

\*\* - (dash) = no response

The Feelings Scale and what the numbers in the table represent

+4	Extremely positive feeling
+3	Very positive feeling
+2	Positive feeling
+1	Slight indicator of positive feeling
0	Neutral feeling
-1	Slight indicator of negative feeling
-2	Negative feeling
-3	Very negative feeling
-4	Extremely negative feeling

## **Appendix 7**

### **LOW RISK APPROVAL**

GPO Box U1987  
Perth Western Australia 6845

**Telephone** +61 8 9266 7863  
**Faxsimile** +61 8 9266 3793  
**Web** research.curtin.edu.au

26-May-2016

Name: Jill Aldridge

Department/School: Curtin University

Email: J.Aldridge@curtin.edu.au Dear Jill Aldridge

**RE: Ethics approval**

**Approval number: 10379**

Thank you for submitting your application to the Human Research Ethics Office for the project **The subjective feelings of Maori boys as they construct their Maori identity (at [REDACTED] College), and factors that influence Maori identity construction.**

Your application was reviewed through the Curtin University low risk ethics review process.

The review outcome is: **Approved**.

Your proposal meets the requirements described in National Health and Medical Research Council's (NHMRC) *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007)*.

Approval is granted for a period of one year from **26-May-2016** to **25-May-2017**. Continuation of approval will be granted on an annual basis following submission of an annual report.

Personnel authorised to work on this project:

Name	Role
Hema, Joshua	Student
Aldridge, Jill	CI

**Standard conditions of approval**

1. Research must be conducted according to the approved proposal
2. Report in a timely manner anything that might warrant review of ethical approval of the project including:
  - proposed changes to the approved proposal or conduct of the study
  - unanticipated problems that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project
  - major deviations from the approved proposal and/or regulatory guidelines
  - serious adverse events

3. Amendments to the proposal must be approved by the Human Research Ethics Office before they are implemented (except where an amendment is undertaken to eliminate an immediate risk to participants)
4. An annual progress report must be submitted to the Human Research Ethics Office on or before the anniversary of approval and a completion report submitted on completion of the project
5. Personnel working on this project must be adequately qualified by education, training and experience for their role, or supervised
6. Personnel must disclose any actual or potential conflicts of interest, including any financial or other interest or affiliation, that bears on this project
7. Changes to personnel working on this project must be reported to the Human Research Ethics Office
8. Data and primary materials must be retained and stored in accordance with the [Western Australian University Sector Disposal Authority \(WAUSDA\)](#) and the [Curtin University Research Data and Primary Materials policy](#)
9. Where practicable, results of the research should be made available to the research participants in a timely and clear manner
10. Unless prohibited by contractual obligations, results of the research should be disseminated in a manner that will allow public scrutiny; the Human Research Ethics Office must be informed of any constraints on publication
11. Ethics approval is dependent upon ongoing compliance of the research with the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#), the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research](#), applicable legal requirements, and with Curtin University policies, procedures and governance requirements
12. The Human Research Ethics Office may conduct audits on a portion of approved projects.

**Special Conditions of Approval**

None

**This letter constitutes ethical approval only.** This project may not proceed until you have met all of the Curtin University research governance requirements.

Should you have any queries regarding consideration of your project, please contact the Ethics Support Officer for your faculty or the Ethics Office at [hrec@curtin.edu.au](mailto:hrec@curtin.edu.au) or on 9266 2784.

Yours sincerely



Dr Catherine Gangell

Manager, Research Integrity

## **Appendix 8**

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT SHEETS**



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

---

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT**

#### **Principal**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29/04/2016

#### **What is the Project About?**

A secure Maori identity is a crucial part of wellbeing, however, some Maori boys struggle to form a secure Maori identity. The aim of this research is to identify the factors that influence Maori boys as they attempt to form a secure Maori identity. This is important because it will help researchers to better understand Maori identity, and help schools to better support Maori students. This project seeks the support of [REDACTED] College and would like to interview 6 Maori boys from the school to find out how they feel as they try to form a Maori identity and the factors that influence their identity formation.

#### **Who is doing the Research?**

The project is being conducted by Joshua Hema and will contribute towards a Masters degree in Philosophy from Curtin University in Australia. The Principal Investigator is Dr Jill Aldridge from Curtin University, and the Co-Investigator is Dr

Craig Rose from Victoria University of Wellington. There will be no costs to you and you will not be paid for participating in this project.

**Why am I being asked to take part and what will I have to do?**

We are inviting you to participate in this study because [REDACTED] College has a large number of Maori students and a bilingual unit, and we believe Maori students in your school will have something important to say about Maori identity. Your participation involves identifying 6 Maori boys, 3 in the bilingual unit and 3 in mainstream, who might be willing participants and have something to say about Maori identity. Students will be interviewed individually at a mutually convenient location, and outside of class hours. Each interview will last about 30 minutes.

There will be no cost to you or the school for taking part in this research and you will not be paid for taking part. Students will receive a koha {phone or food voucher to the value of \$40} to compensate for their time. We will make an audio recording so we can concentrate on what the students have to say and not distract ourselves with taking notes. After the interview we will make a full written copy of the recording.

**Are there any benefits' to being in the research project?**

We anticipate that the results of this research will be of benefit to [REDACTED] College. The results will help the school and researchers better understand the factors that influence Maori identity. This information can help to develop education programs that can lead to greater Maori student achievement in education.

**Are there any risks, side-effects, discomforts or inconveniences from being in the research project?**

There are no foreseeable risks from this research project.

**Who will have access to my information?**

The information collected in this research will be re-identifiable (coded). This means that the stored information will be re-identifiable which means we will remove

identifying information on any data and replace it with a code. Only the research team has access to the code to match the student's name if it is necessary to do so. Any information we collect will be treated as confidential and used only in this project unless otherwise specified. The following people will have access to the information we collect in this research: the research team and the Curtin University Ethics Committee. Electronic data will be password-protected and hard copy data will be in locked storage. The information we collect in this study will be kept under secure conditions at Curtin University for 7 years after the research has ended, or until the subject/s have reached 25 years of age, whichever is later, then it will be destroyed. You have the right to access, and request correction of, your information in accordance with relevant privacy laws. The results of this research may be presented at conferences or published in professional journals. You or [REDACTED] College will not be identified in any results that are published or presented.

### **Will you tell me the results of the research?**

We will write to you at the end of the research (in about 12 months) and let you know the results of the research. Results will not be individual but based on all the information we collect and review as part of the research.

### **Do I have to take part in the research project?**

Taking part in a research project is voluntary. It is your choice to take part or not. You do not have to agree if you do not want to. If you decide to take part and then change your mind, that is okay, you can withdraw from the project. You do not have to give us a reason; just tell us that you want to stop. We will destroy any information we have collected from individual students and the school.

### **What happens next and who can I contact about the research?**

For further information or if you have any questions please contact:

- Mr Josh Hema  
Phone: 022 3735311  
Email: [joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)

Or the research supervisor:

- Dr Craig Rofe  
Phone: 04 4639539  
Email: [craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz)

If you decide to take part in this research we will ask you to sign the consent form. By signing, it is telling us that you understand what you have read and what has been discussed. Signing the consent indicates that you agree for [REDACTED] College to be in the research project. You will be given a copy of this information and the consent form to keep.

Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved this study (HREC number 10379). Should you wish to discuss the study with someone not directly involved, in particular, any matters concerning the conduct of the study or your rights as a participant, or you wish to make a confidential complaint, you may contact the Ethics Officer on (08) 9266 9223 or the Manager, Research Integrity on (08) 9266 7093 or email [hrec@curtin.edu.au](mailto:hrec@curtin.edu.au).



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

### **CONSENT FORM: PRINCIPAL:**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that influence Maori boys' identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Mr Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29 April 2016

- I have read the information statement version listed above and I understand its contents.
- I believe I understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of [REDACTED] College's involvement in this project.
- I voluntarily consent to [REDACTED] College being part of this research project.
- I voluntarily consent to 6 senior Maori students being interviewed and those interviews being audio-recorded.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received.
- I understand that this project has been approved by Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee and will be carried out in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) – updated May 2015.
- I understand I will receive a copy of this Information Statement and Consent Form.

Principal's Name	
Principal's Signature	
Date	

Declaration by researcher: I have supplied an Information Letter and Consent Form to the participant who has signed above, and believe that they understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of their involvement in this project.

Researcher Name	
Researcher Signature	
Date	



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

---

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT: PARENT**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Mr Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29/04/2016

### **What is the Project About?**

A secure Maori identity is an important part of wellbeing, but some Maori boys find it hard to form a secure Maori identity. The aim of this research is to find out about the things that influence Maori boys as they attempt to form a secure Maori identity. This is important because it will help researchers to better understand Maori identity, and help schools to better support Maori students. This project seeks the support of [REDACTED] College and would like to interview 6 Maori boys from the school to find out how they feel as they try to form a Maori identity and the factors that influence their identity formation.

### **Who is doing the Research?**

The project is being conducted by Joshua Hema and will contribute towards a Masters degree in Philosophy from Curtin University in Australia. The Principal-Investigator is Dr Jill Aldridge from Curtin University, and the Co-Investigator is Dr Craig Rofe from Victoria University of Wellington.

### **Why am I being asked to take part and what will I have to do?**

We are inviting your son to participate in this study because we think that he may have something important to say about Maori identity. If you agree for your son to participate, we will interview him at a mutually convenient location, and outside of class hours. The interview will last about 30 minutes. There will be no cost to you and your son will receive a koha {phone or food voucher to the value of \$40} to compensate for his time. We will make an audio recording so we can concentrate on what your son says and not distract ourselves with taking notes. After the interview we will make a full written copy of the recording.

### **Are there any benefits' to being in the research project?**

The results of this research will be of benefit to your son and other Maori students at [REDACTED] College. The results will help the school and researchers better understand the factors that influence Maori identity. This information can help to develop education programs that can lead to greater Maori student achievement in education.

### **Are there any risks, side-effects, discomforts or inconveniences from being in the research project?**

There are no foreseeable risks from this research project.

### **Who will have access to my information?**

The information collected in this research will be re-identifiable (coded). This means that the stored information will be re-identifiable which means we will remove identifying information on any data and replace it with a code. Only the research team have access to the code to match your son's name if it is necessary to do so. Any information we collect will be treated as confidential and used only in this project unless otherwise specified. The following people will have access to the information we collect in this research: the research team and the Curtin University Ethics Committee. Electronic data will be password-protected and hard copy data will be in locked storage. The information we collect in this study will be kept under

secure conditions at Curtin University for 7 years after the research has ended, or until your son has reached 25 years of age, whichever is later, then it will be destroyed. You have the right to access, and request correction of, your son's information in accordance with relevant privacy laws. The results of this research may be presented at conferences or published in professional journals. Your son will not be identified in any results that are published or presented.

### **Will you tell me the results of the research?**

We will write to the school at the end of the research (in about 12 months) and let them know the results of the research. Results will not be individual but based on all the information we collect and review as part of the research.

### **Do I have to take part in the research project?**

Taking part in a research project is voluntary. It is your choice for your son to take part or not. You do not have to agree for your son to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to take part and then change your mind, that is okay, you can withdraw your son from the project. You do not have to give us a reason; just tell us that you want to stop. We will destroy any information we have collected from your son.

### **What happens next and who can I contact about the research?**

For further information or if you have any questions please contact:

- Mr Josh Hema  
Phone: 022 3735311  
Email: [joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)

Or the research supervisor:

- Dr Craig Rofe  
Phone: 04 4639539  
Email: [craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz)

If you decide to consent for your son to take part in this research we will ask to sign the consent form. By signing, it is telling us that you understand what you have read and what has been discussed. Signing the consent indicates that you agree for your son to be in the research project. Please take your time and ask any questions you have before you decide what to do. You will be given a copy of this information and the consent form to keep.

Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved this study (HREC number 10379). Should you wish to discuss the study with someone not directly involved, in particular, any matters concerning the conduct of the study or your rights as a participant, or you wish to make a confidential complaint, you may contact the Ethics Officer on (08) 9266 9223 or the Manager, Research Integrity on (08) 9266 7093 or email [hrec@curtin.edu.au](mailto:hrec@curtin.edu.au).



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

### **PARENT CONSENT FORM**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that influence Maori boys' identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29 April 2016

- I have read the information statement version listed above and I understand its contents.
- I believe I understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of my involvement in this project.
- I voluntarily consent to my son taking part in this research project.
- I voluntarily consent to my son being interviewed and the interview being audio-recorded.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received
- I understand that this project has been approved by Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee and will be carried out in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) – updated May 2015.
- I understand I will receive a copy of this Information Statement and Consent Form.

Participant Name	
Participant's Parent's Name and Signature	
Date	

Declaration by researcher: I have supplied an Information Letter and Consent Form to the participant who has signed above, and believe that they understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of their involvement in this project.

Researcher Name	
Researcher Signature	
Date	



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

---

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT: STUDENT**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Mr Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29/04/2016

### **What is the Project About?**

A secure Maori identity is an important part of wellbeing, but some Maori boys find it hard to form a secure Maori identity. The aim of this research is to find out about the things that influence Maori boys as they attempt to form a secure Maori identity. This is important because it will help researchers better understand Maori identity, and help schools to better support Maori students. This project seeks the support of [REDACTED] College and would like to interview 6 Maori boys from the school to find out, how they feel as they try to form a Maori identity, and the factors that influence Maori identity formation.

### **Who is doing the Research?**

The project is being conducted by Joshua Hema and will contribute towards a Masters degree in Philosophy from Curtin University in Australia. The Principal-Investigator is Dr Jill Aldridge from Curtin University, and the Co-Investigator is Dr Craig Rofe from Victoria University of Wellington.

### **Why am I being asked to take part and what will I have to do?**

We are inviting you to participate in this study because we think you might have something important to say about your Maori identity. If you agree to participate and your parent consents to you participating, we will interview you at a mutually convenient location, and outside of class hours. The interview will last about 30 minutes. There will be no cost to you and you will be given a koha {phone or food voucher to the value of \$40} to compensate for your time. We will make an audio recording so we can concentrate on what you have to say and not distract ourselves with taking notes. After the interview we will make a full written copy of the recording.

### **Are there any benefits' to being in the research project?**

The results of this research will be of benefit to you and other Maori students at ██████████ College. The results will help the school and researchers better understand the factors that influence Maori identity. This information can help to develop education programs that can lead to greater Maori student achievement in education.

### **Are there any risks, side-effects, discomforts or inconveniences from being in the research project?**

There are no foreseeable risks from this research project.

### **Who will have access to my information?**

The information collected in this research will be re-identifiable (coded). This means that the stored information will be re-identifiable which means we will remove identifying information on any data and replace it with a code. Only the research team have access to the code to match your name if it is necessary to do so. Any information we collect will be treated as confidential and used only in this project unless otherwise specified. The following people will have access to the information we collect in this research: the research team and the Curtin University Ethics Committee. Electronic data will be password-protected and hard copy data will be in

locked storage. The information we collect in this study will be kept under secure conditions at Curtin University for 7 years after the research has ended, or until you have reached 25 years of age, whichever is later, then it will be destroyed. You have the right to access, and request correction of, your information in accordance with relevant privacy laws. The results of this research may be presented at conferences or published in professional journals. You will not be identified in any results that are published or presented.

### **Will you tell me the results of the research?**

We will write to the school at the end of the research (in about 12 months) and let them know the results of the research. Results will not be individual but based on all the information we collect and review as part of the research.

### **Do I have to take part in the research project?**

Taking part in a research project is voluntary. It is your choice to take part or not. You do not have to agree if you do not want to. If you decide to take part and then change your mind, that is okay, you can withdraw from the project. You do not have to give us a reason; just tell us that you want to stop. We will destroy any information we have collected from you.

### **What happens next and who can I contact about the research?**

For further information or if you have any questions please contact:

- Mr Josh Hema  
Phone: 022 3735311  
Email: [joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:joshua.hema@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)

Or the research supervisor:

- Dr Craig Rofe  
Phone: 04 4639539  
Email: [craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:craig.rofe@vuw.ac.nz)

If you decide to take part in this research we will ask your parent to sign the consent form. By signing, it is telling us that you and your parent understand what you have read and what has been discussed. Signing the consent indicates that your parent agrees for you to be in the research project. Please take your time and ask any questions you have before you decide what to do. You will be given a copy of this information and the consent form to keep.

Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved this study (HREC number 10379). Should you wish to discuss the study with someone not directly involved, in particular, any matters concerning the conduct of the study or your rights as a participant, or you wish to make a confidential complaint, you may contact the Ethics Officer on (08) 9266 9223 or the Manager, Research Integrity on (08) 9266 7093 or email [hrec@curtin.edu.au](mailto:hrec@curtin.edu.au).



## Factors that Influence Maori Boys' Identity

### **STUDENT ASSENT FORM**

<b>HREC Project Number:</b>	10379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Factors that influence Maori boys' identity
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	Dr Jill Aldridge, Associate Professor
<b>Student researcher:</b>	Josh Hema
<b>Version Number:</b>	1
<b>Version Date:</b>	29 April 2016

- I have read the information statement version listed above and I understand its contents.
- I believe I understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of my involvement in this project.
- I voluntarily agree to take part in this research project.
- I voluntarily agree to be interviewed and the interview being audio-recorded.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received.
- I understand that this project has been approved by Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee and will be carried out in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) – updated May 2015.
- I understand I will receive a copy of this Information Statement and Consent Form.

Participant Name	
Participant's Signature	
Date	

Declaration by researcher: I have supplied an Information Letter and Consent Form to the participant who has signed above, and believe that they understand the purpose, extent and possible risks of their involvement in this project.

Researcher Name	
Researcher Signature	
Date	

## **Appendix 9**

### **WHOLE SCHOOL APPROACH FOR DEALING WITH “NEGATIVE STEREOTYPING OF MĀORI” AND “BEING EXCLUDED BY OTHER MĀORI”**

The focus of the whole school approach should be to increase understanding of negative stereotyping of Māori and being excluded by other Māori, and their very negative effects on Māori students and their Māori identity. Regarding negative stereotyping of Māori, the whole school approach should include:

- General information about negative stereotyping of Māori, including: what negative stereotypes of Māori are, and the words, language and attitudes they include; what negative stereotypes of Māori mean and the underlying meanings they carry such as, that Māori are perceived as inferior to Pākehā; why negative stereotypes of Māori occur and are perpetuated, including to justify colonisation and to marginalise Māori; the negative effects negative stereotyping of Māori has on Māori students, including on feelings, wellbeing, academic achievement, and likely effect on Māori identity; and, finally, the negative affect that negative stereotyping of Māori has on an inclusive, fair and just New Zealand society.
- Information about the structural nature of negative stereotyping of Māori, and how negative stereotyping of Māori is ‘taken for granted’ and institutionalised in New Zealand schools, and how negative stereotyping of Māori influences attitudes, expectations and actions towards Māori students.
- Building a culture of inclusion within schools that bring about sustainable change in the way that people think and act towards others.
- Strategies (particularly for Māori students) to deal with negative stereotyping of Māori, including an avenue of recourse such as, a place to lay a complaint, where that place has the power and ability to prevent negative stereotyping of Māori from occurring.

Regarding being excluded by other Māori, the whole school approach should include:

- An inclusive definition and approach to Māori identity based on whakapapa, where whakapapa is the determining and primary indicator of Māori identity (see finding 3 and discussion Section 5.2.3).

- Acknowledgement that many Māori feel uncomfortable in Māori cultural contexts, giving explanations and reasons for this situation. For example, some Māori feel uncomfortable (in Māori contexts) because of not knowing enough Māori language and culture and this is a result of various historical conditions that resulted in culture loss.
- Learning about the effects that ‘excluding other Māori’ can have on Māori, for example, that it can cause negative feelings and be detrimental to a Māori person’s wellbeing. Excluding other Māori can also affect and be detrimental to another person’s Māori identity, which also has a negative effect on Māori collective/group identity and wellbeing.
- Emphasize the values of manaakitanga<sup>43</sup> and the importance of inclusivity in Māori contexts and making people feel welcome.

---

<sup>43</sup> Manaakitanga means to help people and is often considered a value or principle important to māori culture