

HINEMATAU MCNEILL

A Critical Reflection of Ethical Issues in Māori Research

Te mana o te kupu, te pono o te mātauranga, te wairua o te mahi

Integrity, wisdom and spirituality inform a Māori ethical research framework

The whakataukī inspires an ethical framework for the exploration of Māori mental wellness. The word mātauranga is central to understanding the proverb. Mātauranga infers that the knowledge is tested or credible. Mōhiotanga is the word that refers to accepted knowledge or epistemology. The distinction between mōhiotanga and mātauranga is that the latter has undergone a process of questioning or inquiry.¹ This interpretation of mātauranga is very relevant to an ethical enquiry because it carefully considers different approaches, emphasising ethical implications, to field research. The whakataukī also alludes to integrity in relation to the way knowledge is conveyed, which applies directly to the appropriateness of language used in research. This issue is discussed in some length in this paper. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, for research that is carried out in Māori communities the whakataukī acknowledges the primacy of the spirit.

All of the values embedded in the whakataukī shaped the way that research was undertaken amongst the Tūhoe kaumātua. This particular study was undertaken between 2001 and 2002. Tūhoe is considered to be one of the last bastions of 'traditional' Māori language and culture. The main purpose of the research was to examine the mental health status of Tūhoe kaumātua. Even before the research was

Dr. Hinematau McNeill is a Director of Research at AUT University's Akoranga Campus.

undertaken anecdotal evidence indicated that a significant feature of the Tūhoe aging population was the apparent absence of mental health problems. Kaumātua are however particularly susceptible to physical diseases that afflict modern Māori, regardless of geography or tribal origin.

The underlying (ethical) objective of the research undertaken within Tūhoe was to ensure that the people were not exploited in any way. This undertaking provided the impetus for the research team to develop a paradigm that empowered participating communities within Tūhoe. This process of empowerment generated a number of ethical challenges in relation to the research. Even before the project was finalised a small hui was convened at Waimana in January 2000 to discuss the issues. The ensuing discussion revolved around four interrelated questions:

1. What is the *real* objective of the fund provider in terms of research outcomes?
2. With regard to tino rangatiratanga, who controls the project?
3. Who is the research for?
4. How does the community benefit?

The primary concern of those involved in the discussion at Waimana was the issue of tino rangatiratanga. It was argued that tino rangatiratanga was crucial; that the mana (real control) of the Government Funder, must come under the authority of Tūhoe (invested in Te Kapu a Rangi Trust). The practical application of tino rangatiratanga in relation to the research project guaranteed relevancy in terms of the kaupapa, and also ensured that the delivery outcomes would benefit the community.

As anticipated, the general consensus from the Waimana hui was that Tūhoe participation in the project was subject to the Health Funding Authority (HFA) recognising the tino rangatiratanga of Tūhoe. This resolution, which was accepted in principle by the HFA, involved both parties in lengthy contractual negotiations that culminated in the Trust assuming substantive control over the project. This 'power sharing' defined the relationship between the Trust and the HFA. This was reinforced by a mutual understanding of the

kaupapa that promotes tikanga Māori as fundamental to a collaborative approach to Māori mental health. The 1999 HFA publication, *Kia Tu Kia Puawai*, strengthened confidence that the Trust in partnership with a government agency could produce a unique and effective approach to Māori mental health.

Health promotion, preventative health, early intervention, community health development and intersectoral collaboration are proven health strategies. Yet to date, these strategies have not really been explored in terms of their ability to improve mental health. They are entirely consistent with a tikanga Maori model that reflects the needs and expectations of Maori. *Kia Tu Kia Puawai* is uniquely Maori. We believe it has the potential to lead the way of the future in mental health.²

The strategic plan contained in the document also helped allay any reservations the Trust may have still held regarding the HFA's research objectives. In relation to the benefits of the research, it was envisioned that all Māori would ultimately benefit from the project. This was clearly a long-term objective that would develop as a natural progression out of the research project. The Trust's immediate priority was to focus on those communities within Tūhoe that were targeted research areas. In this respect the research team agreed that tangible benefit(s) to the kaumātua was one of the main priorities in terms of research outcomes.

This seemingly innocuous proposition generated endless discussion about how this objective could be achieved. Eventually an indicative study in the form of a Needs Analysis survey was accepted as the most practical option. The survey gave kaumātua the opportunity to identify their own social and health needs. The research provided the information necessary for the Trust to formulate effective strategies to address kaumātua needs, which in many instances could be translated into tangible benefits. However, the main objective of the indicative study was to explore the potential of research as a collaborative process with communities under research. Despite the best efforts of those involved, the research was not without problems.

Although the indicative needs analysis research achieved a measure of success in relation to achieving the objectives, it

can also be argued, with some justification, that the project was too ambitious. One example, linked to a specific outcome, was the provision of kaumātua transport for Waikaremoana. It soon became evident that some of the other communities involved in the research felt that the same service should be extended to all kaumātua. Most were satisfied with the explanation that the research had identified a real need in the south for kaumātua transport and that Waikaremoana was the only community within Tūhoe without a kaumātua van. The discord over the kaumātua van drew attention to other funding problems. Although the most conspicuous research outcomes were successfully delivered, others were compromised because of funding complications.

The HFA's amalgamation into the Ministry of Health (MOH) signalled a change of direction. There were perceptible differences between the two organisations in terms of their respective philosophical approaches to mental wellness. The HFA was absolutely committed to funding primary health promotion. Although the Māori sector of the MOH has adopted a holistic approach to Māori health there appears to be more of an emphasis on secondary and tertiary health strategies and less on primary health promotion. The corollary is that the minutes from a meeting (MHC Māori Expert Panel) held in Wellington on the 15 October 1999 discussed the Labour Health Policy. The minutes contain criticisms of the HFA's Kia Tu Kia Puawai project (which included Tūhoe kaumātua) thereby verifying the impending shift to secondary and tertiary services under the new Labour Government:

- Does not give sufficient weight to clinical care compared to cultural care. Does not provide for strong clinical services for serious illness.
- Applauds something being done about primary mental health but needs to be set in the whole context of secondary and tertiary care for Maori too. The perception needs to be clear. Has the potential to take away from acute services.

Irrespective of the political impediments, the Tūhoe project outcomes were delivered within the constraints of the original budget. One particular objective, the delivery of research

outcomes to the five research centres within Tūhoe, was delayed as a result of the change in funding criteria. Continuity in funding would have meant that the Tūhoe Kaumātua Māori Mental Wellness research report would have been completed within the projected timeframe. Feedback to the community is an important component of the research, using a medium of communication that is 'user-friendly'. There has been much criticism from Māori about research reports being processed in language that is inaccessible to the communities being researched.

... the people under study rarely benefit from the research; rather it is the researcher/s who accrue academic status and monetary rewards from the study. Furthermore the issue of relevancy needs to be addressed; who is the research for? Past experience indicates that it is the academic community who are the ultimate consumers as the language used in the finished product is usually the language of academia.³

Unfortunately, as already stated, and despite the best efforts of the research team, when the Māori mental wellness research report was finally completed it was an anti-climax. Sadly, many of the kaumātua who participated in the research have died, adding poignancy to disappointment about the delay in feedback presentation. Given the deep suspicion Māori harbour about the real motives of research within their communities, the inability to deliver research outcomes should not be simply dismissed as part and parcel of the research terrain. For research to be meaningful, community involvement is critical, especially when the researchers are members of the same community.

The report, 'Attitudes to Family Violence',⁴ although published nearly two decades ago, clearly identifies problems Māori researchers grapple with when undertaking study within their communities. The following extract from the introduction, and subsequent exegesis of the issues, provides a framework for the discussion on most of the problems of empowerment in research:

There is increasing resistance from indigenous people to being the objects of research. The reasons are well

documented and debated amongst anthropologists.⁵ The resistance has meant that in Papua New Guinea research permits have to be secured before any research by foreigners can be undertaken. Some Indian reservations in the United States have erected huge signposts banning anthropologists. In Aotearoa, Maori people are voicing their opposition to being studied. At a health hui held recently in Tokoroa (May 13-15, 1988) a research project was presented at the Marae which was rejected in no uncertain terms. The objection was based on the monocultural Pakeha bias, structure and the approach of the research design. Disgruntled objectors stated loudly and clearly that they were sick of being studied and analysed. Furthermore when a *kaumatua* was approached as a potential subject for interviewing (for this research) he expressed a ubiquitous sentiment held by Maori people. He was convinced that the research would benefit Pakeha and had to be persuaded that the project would ultimately benefit Maori. His decision to allow the interview to proceed rested on his kinship relationship with most of the interview team and his faith in their integrity.⁶

Other objections about research processes (aired at the Tokoroa hui) were directed towards the academic community, who were identified as the 'ultimate consumers'. The discussion centred on the obvious benefits to the researcher, rather than the researched, in terms of funding and peer recognition. Another consideration raised was the research reports and the use of academic language, which clearly indicates that the intended audience is the academic community rather than the community being researched. These other fundamental problems focus on the question of accountability: 'It is argued that researchers are for the most part "outsiders" alienated from the community being studied apart from sojourns known as field work'.⁷ There is considerable debate amongst social scientists⁸ with regard to the advantages and disadvantages of 'outsider', or participant observer research, as opposed to 'insider' researchers undertaking fieldwork. The argument for proponents of 'outsider' research is based on the assumption that social enquiry, as a science, must be objective. This objectivity enables 'outsider' researchers to better comprehend the

subjective interpretations of the members of the society under investigation. The researcher, whilst being an active participant, is not a member of the society and is considered an 'outsider', and therefore, according to this particular school of thought, is free from subjective bias.

There is equally as much debate over the merits of 'insider' researchers who by definition are members, rather than 'outsiders' of the community or organisation where fieldwork is undertaken. The premise for advocating 'insider' research appears to be simply a matter of reliability in terms of the information. The arguments against 'insider' research focus on the fact that the information cannot be regarded as reliable because it is subjective. The reasoning follows that because the 'insider' is enculturated in the traditions, beliefs and values that inform their practices of their own communities, objective analysis or even reflection is virtually impossible. The reality is that research, whether 'insider' or 'outsider', is rarely value free. The 'outsider' social scientist is as enculturated with his/her own cultural beliefs and values as any 'insider'. This phenomenon is known as ethnocentrism, although a more explicit term, Eurocentricity, may be used to describe the perceived research bias of Europeans studying ethnic minorities, as described in chapter two. The term 'Eurocentricity' is loaded with connotations of racial superiority, which had its genesis in eighteenth century west-European expansionism.

British colonisation of Aotearoa produced Elsdon Best, one of New Zealand's most famous colonisers/ethnographers, who did most of his work with Tūhoe. The following synopsis of his role as an ethnographer is revealing. The biographical details provide irrefutable evidence of the link between ethnographical research and imperialism. Notably both Walter Gudgeon and Percy Smith were also involved in ethnographic research.

Armed Constabulary in Taranaki, which was engaged in facilitating forced surveys and sales of Māori land. Best's company, based at Pungarehu, was called on to arrest groups from the pacifist community at Parihaka led by Te Whiti-o-Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi, who were resisting the government surveys. Best's sister, Edith, had married Walter Gudgeon, an officer in the Armed Constabulary. With

Gudgeon's support Best joined a native contingent, and in November 1881 he took part in the raid on Parihaka involving over 1,500 troops, which resulted in the destruction of the settlement and the arrests of Te Whiti, Tohu and hundreds of their supporters. Gudgeon, along with other influential Taranaki settlers, notably Percy Smith and Edward Tregear, also encouraged Best in the study of Māori history and culture. Best's association with these local scholars of Māori society was to prove of lasting significance for his future career

... In 1892 and 1893 government survey teams met with hostile opposition from Tuhoe when attempting to survey a road through the Urewera district without the tribe's consent. Concerned that further conflicts might arise, the government agreed to a proposal from Percy Smith, then a senior official in the Department of Lands and Survey, that Elsdon Best be sent to the Urewera as a mediator. Tuhoe had been in contact with Pakeha society for more than 50 years and most of the tribe followed the teachings of the Ringatu church. The government, however, also agreed with Smith that Best's appointment afforded 'civilisation' the last opportunity to gather information about pre-European Maori society, in an area that was still relatively isolated. Elsdon Best was, as a result, to become New Zealand's first professional ethnographer, combining these duties with those of paymaster and storeman.⁹

Nearly a century later, in 1968, the celebrated English anthropologist Kathleen Gough famously described anthropology as the 'child of imperialism.' While research is always carried out in a particular historical and social framework, contemporary research that is undertaken in a neocolonial (with previously colonised peoples) setting carries the legacy of imperialism. It is little wonder that many ethnic communities are sensitive, or at times even hostile, to 'outsider' researchers.

The 'outsider' research method, also known as participant observation, provides an ideal platform for the analysis of a range of problems in this type of research. The famous anthropological Freeman-Mead debate provides a detailed case study scenario and elaborates on the 'outsider' question

referred to at the 1988 Tokoroa hui. Incidentally, this debate erupted just a few years before the Tokoroa hui was held. The timing of the controversy places the issue in a contemporary context. However, given the volume of research that has been carried out in Māori communities, the reference to a Samoan case study may appear a little incongruous. The Freeman-Mead debate does provide a unique perspective because the ethical issues were argued, challenged, and scrutinized by anthropologists in an international context. This process cast even more aspersion on the motivation of 'outsider' researchers. Freeman's critique of Mead was construed by some to be an attack on anthropology. Anxious to defend the discipline against a perceived threat, he presented useful insights into problems in participant/observer or 'outsider' research methods.

The Freeman-Mead controversy erupted into a furore within the social sciences community when New Zealand born Derek Freeman published a critique of the eminent American anthropologist Margaret Mead's fieldwork in Samoa in 1925. He presented compelling evidence that Mead's interpretation of Samoan adolescence was wrong and that her ethnography was more fictional than factual. His criticisms of Mead's work was supported by many respected Samoans, including some of Mead's informants who recanted their original statements. Fa'apua'a, an adolescent when Mead interviewed her during fieldwork study in the early 1920s, confessed in the documentary *Margaret Mead and Samoa* that she and the other girls had deliberately and mischievously misled Mead. Margaret Mead's inability to distinguish between 'joking' and reality is a good example of the limitations of 'outsider' research. Members or 'insiders' have the advantage of intimate knowledge of the culture. Their understanding of particular gestures and other non-verbal cues would assist in deciphering real meaning. Few Samoans would have been deceived by the adolescents teasing, especially when it involved descriptions of their own sexual escapades. Freeman's exposé of Mead's blunder is now legendary, but there is evidence to suggest that he was as susceptible as Mead to misinterpreting cultural meaning from behaviour.

Both Freeman and Mead accepted the highest titles in Samoan society, that of the female tūpou and the male high Chief. Interviews with both anthropologists clearly indicate that both misconstrued the honours conferred on them by the local Samoan community. Firstly, as anthropologists who are supposedly expert analysts of the societies they are studying, it should have been patently obvious that the titles conferred were inextricably tied to genealogy. On that basis alone, any anthropologist worth their salt would have been more prudent about flaunting their newfound status beyond Samoan borders. A more credible explanation for such symbolic gestures of honour being extended to 'outsiders', is the strengthening of relationships between different cultures, rather than individuals. It appears that both Mead and Freeman were deluded in believing that the titles signified their high personal worth and status within the Samoan community. The attitudes of the Samoan community towards Mead, expressed in the 1988 documentary, give little credence to that presumption. During Mead's fieldwork in Sāmoa, hospitality, warmth and even an honorary title had been extended to her. Fa'apua'a, as already mentioned, was 86 years old when interviewed for the documentary. When asked to describe her relationship with Mead she replied, 'like sisters'. It was obvious that she, like all of those interviewed, felt aggrieved at the way Mead had presented their culture to the world.

The tiresome professions of friendship for colored informants has now become suspect. Real friends are not treated in such unjust ways ...That anthropology has been for the benefit of white societies is shown by its use to provide education and recreation for white people.¹⁰

The publication of Mead's research in 1928 was intended exclusively for North American audiences. The original title of the ethnography was *Coming of Age in Samoa, Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization* (my emphasis). The book also targeted popular audiences and it became a huge international bestseller. Needless to say, none of the profits that made her both rich and famous went back to the Samoan community. The real issue here is that neither Freeman nor Mead undertook research in Samoa for Samoans. Freeman's

intended audience was the anthropological community. The fame (and notoriety) that he achieved from the controversy catapulted him into the 'anthropological hall of fame.' It is obvious that Freeman had no interest in advocating for the aggrieved Samoans he used to discredit Mead. Both anthropologists demonstrated that they were the quintessential 'outsiders', regardless of the accolades and high ranking genealogical titles they received during their sojourns in Samoa. Participant observation research is 'outsider' research undertaken by representatives of the dominant culture, and this is a factor that needs to be taken into consideration. The analysis of the relationship between the researcher and the researched reflects disparate power relations between the dominant culture and the marginalised culture of the people under study.

On another level, although it was contrary to Freeman's intention, his critique inadvertently challenged the underlying principle of the objectivity in 'outsider' research, and thereby cast aspersion on the scientific validity of this research method when applied to the study of human societies.

Mead's failures were partly those of cultural anthropology then and now; she did not make her claims clear enough to be tested and she did not present sufficient or adequately representative data to support her generalizations. Had she met these requirements of ordinary scientific practice, whatever her predilections regarding culture and biology, she could not without falsifying have written the rather misleading account that she did.¹¹

Orans may be correct in castigating Meads for her 'bad' science. Nevertheless, the inference that the scientific method is invincible, and social scientists trained in this method have the ability to 'know' another's culture better than the people themselves, is difficult to accept. For example, placing the argument within the context of research undertaken in Tūhoe, there is no social scientist who could claim, with any credibility, that they know more than Hohepa Kereopa about Tūhoe tikanga. Advocates of participant observer research methods contest the view that 'outsider' researchers, irrespective of the theoretical differences or differing capabilities, are simply not as good as 'insiders' when it comes

to interpreting their own cultures. The view that, as in the case of Margaret Mead, it is possible to comprehend all the nuances and complexities of a foreign society in as little as three months, is even more questionable. Margaret Mead was also purported to have learnt the language in that time. The underlying principle is that 'primitive' (a word loaded with racist connotations of inferiority) cultures are so simplistic that Europeans with the right training can claim expertise in those cultures. Unquestionably, this typically Eurocentric (and colonial) attitude towards the 'cultural other' defines the relationship between the researcher and the researched in terms of power relations.

The reality is that both Freeman and Mead are unequivocally apolitical. It could be argued, particularly with regard to Margaret Mead, that she was a product of her time and the political implications of social science research is a more recent phenomenon. In fact, Mead was a contemporary of an equally celebrated English anthropologist Kathleen Gough who, as already stated, famously described anthropology as the 'child of imperialism'. As late as 1967 Margaret Mead's political apathy was in evidence when she vigorously opposed anthropologists, including Gough, who were campaigning against the Vietnam war.

Since the 1967 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, the issue of ethical anthropology or action research has been central to debates within the discipline. In that meeting, several anthropologists like Kathleen Gough and Gerald Berreman wanted to pass a resolution condemning the Vietnam war, while others like Margaret Mead opposed it. Mead argued famously that political resolutions were not in the professional interests of anthropology. The floor, however, was swayed by Michael Harner who declared that 'Genocide is not in the professional interests of anthropology', and the resolution was passed.¹²

Freeman fares no better than Mead in terms of political alliance with, and in the interests of, the cultural other (the subjects/objects of anthropological study). His intention was to destroy Margaret Mead's reputation as 'the' leading expert in anthropological fieldwork of her time. This has become his life's work. He claims that the basis of his contention is

theoretical, rather than personal; he argues that Mead manipulated the data on Samoan adolescent behaviour to support her theoretical position with regard to cultural determinism. There are others who are more sceptical of Freeman's motives:

Freeman's views are, in fact, very similar to Mead's. He often emphasizes the importance of culture. Like Mead, Freeman believes that since humans can learn non-genetically and transmit information symbolically, culture often gives meaning to behaviour. He notes that people may attribute different cultural meanings to the same genetically prescribed behaviours. As an example, he cites the genetically prescribed behaviour known as the eyebrow flash, which means 'yes' in Samoa while meaning 'no' in Greece.¹³

Whether methodology or incompetence is the basis of Mead's misinterpretation, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that her own cultural world view clouded her perceptions and understanding of Samoan culture. Mead's American/European cultural 'filters', possibly reinforced by European romantic misconceptions about Polynesia, may have influenced her interpretations of Samoan adolescent behaviour. A leading Samoan academic, Dr Fanaafi Le Tagaloa, insisted that Mead's perceptions were based more on her own experiences, rather than Samoan reality (op cit 1988). It has already been established that her research was intended for Western civilization (*sic*). Samoans were bitterly aggrieved at Margaret Mead's inability to accurately interpret their culture. In particular, the *interpretation* of the intimate details of their lives ultimately reinforced European stereotypes about Polynesian promiscuity. The question arises, 'Is it possible for outsiders to successfully undertake research within a Māori community?'

Recently a Pākehā academic, Paul Moon, was invited to meet with Hohepa Kereopa at Waimana to discuss the possibility of writing his biography. An excerpt from the introduction describes a very different approach to 'outsider' research:

The subject of this work – the tohunga Hohepa Kereopa – gave his unqualified consent for his knowledge and view of the world to be presented in this book. He did so with kindness,

candour and always, humility. But he also made the decision to make known this privileged information out of an acknowledgement that the corpus of learning he possesses would otherwise die with him had it not been recorded. To ensure that the accuracy of the material contained in this volume remained intact, Hohepa scutinised every paragraph and frequently made additional observations on how the material might be enhanced....

How appropriate is it though for a New Zealander of European descent to assume the role of a conduit for this knowledge? In the recent past, concerns have been voiced about the corruption of a Maori worldview when filtered through a Pakeha lens, and there are sufficient instances to more than justify such anxieties. In the case of this work, however, it was Hohepa who nominated me to write it, rather than me approaching him. He also keenly acknowledged and accepted the need for his knowledge to be preserved in a manner that accommodates the characteristics of the present age.¹⁴

The narratives are undeniably Hohepa's, but Paul Moon's expertise is not relegated to that of a mere scribe. The style is deceptive because the research and commentary on the material is skillfully submerged into the narrative. This demonstrates that the expert social analyst need not presume to understand the cultural 'other' better than they know themselves. The technique is beguiling because the depiction of the Māori world view is essentially an 'insider's' view.

The most notable precedents of this particular genre can be found in the work of Ann Salmond and Michael King who, amongst others, have created space for other voices and stories to be told without compromising the integrity of either their profession or the subject. The expertise of the social scientist is evident in the ability to present another world view while retaining its authenticity. Paul Moon develops this paradigm even further, because the writing is imbued with wairua (a sense of the spirituality). Māori who have read the book have expressed a longing to see Hohepa because his wairua permeates the work. However, it also needs to be understood that the Moon biography is not a composite of *all*

of Hohepa Kereopa's knowledge; it is more accurately a glimpse into his world. The work that he has been doing on rongoā Māori in collaboration with The University of Waikato is more reflective of the depth of his knowledge in that field. In this work he reveals the 'whakapapa' relating to each variety of plant life used in rongoā Māori. This does not detract from the quality of what has been achieved. However, there is still a great deal of antagonism to the idea of non-Māori (even the most highly skilled) relating accounts of Māori life ways and world views.

This animosity is understandable and its genesis can be traced to the colonial past. Edward Said (1994) is uncompromising in his critique of the colonial endeavours of the eighteenth century, which marginalised non-western narratives. This notion of marginalised narratives has brought into focus exciting developments in indigenous writing and thought. The marginalisation of indigenous intellectual thinking is the inability of the dominant culture to recognise different intellectual traditions as different but equal. This experience is ubiquitous to 'colonised peoples' and has led to drastic measures on the part of indigenous intellectuals anxious to define their own intellectual realities. Māori now want to do it for themselves. Hohepa when questioned about his choice of biographer/ethnographer simply stated that Paul Moon was the right person. Hohepa is surrounded by Māori academics, members of his whānau, all of who are more than capable of writing about his life as a tohunga. However, having broached the subject, after three years it still had not been done. Paul Moon was taken to meet Hohepa and five months later the manuscript was complete.

Writing an account of a great tohunga presents a special set of challenges. There is the requirement to afford the subject as much latitude as possible when eliciting information, and in many cases, this means the subject dictating many aspects of the structure as well as the content of the final work.¹⁵

If it is possible for 'outsider' research to be credible, is it equally conceivable that 'insider' research can be problematic? It has already been suggested that 'insider' research is equally

prone to falling into the same ethical minefield as conventional 'outsider' research. Although a critique of 'insider' research is emerging amongst Māori researchers, the general response to perceived problems with 'outsider' research undertaken in Māori communities has been for Māori research to be carried out exclusively by Māori:

Insisting that researchers should have Maori ancestry was not seen as 'biological essentialism' but rather a safeguard against obvious exploitation of Maori material, and as a means of guaranteeing accountability of the researcher to those being researched.¹⁶

The inequitable relationship between the research and the researched is not necessarily reconciled by restricting the research to 'insiders'. Nearly all Māori researchers studying within their own communities are to some degree implicated as representatives of the dominant culture, simply because they are 'western' educated, and many uncritically apply western paradigms as the main research tool. There are specific research projects that in order to achieve the desired outcomes need to use scientific methods. However, successful research also depends on other factors. Tāwhao Tioke, a renowned Tūhoe tohunga who is a recognised authority of rongoā Māori, was asked about his views on the harvesting of plants for commercial purposes. He was unperturbed at the prospect because he believed that the researchers had failed to comply with the laws of tikanga (in this context, mores). As a consequence the mauri (spiritual life essence) of the rongoā was missing, and it is the mauri that activates the healing properties of the plants. The research process, which identifies the medicinal properties of rongoā Māori in laboratory conditions, was accepted as a legitimate activity. From the Māori ontological position, failure to recognize the mauri seriously jeopardizes the outcomes of the research.

Māori academics have challenged other aspects of Maori research that relate to tikanga: What is problematic ... is an assumption that regardless of whether one is Maori or Pakeha, the relationship to the researched is the same. It is not. Maori researchers are differentiated according to iwi, hapu or whanau links. Furthermore, age and gender may also be a factor in the research process.¹⁷

These issues were alluded to at the aforementioned health hui at Tokoroa in 1988. At that time, Māori consideration of research problems had only begun, but even at that stage consideration was given to the complexities that have been further developed in more recent analysis of the subject.¹⁸ The Tokoroa hui challenged the fact that in 1988 Māori involvement in a research project did not necessarily guarantee *carte blanche* approval. However, a more muted reaction to the research proposal may have resulted had the researcher concerned secured the support of his tribal *kaumātua* and *kuia*. This oversight had the advantage of stimulating discussion on Māori misgivings about the research methodology:

At a health hui held recently in Tokoroa (May 13-15 1988) a research project was presented at the *marae* which was rejected in no uncertain terms. The objection was based on the monocultural Pakeha bias, structure and the approach of the research design. Disgruntled objectors stated loudly and clearly that they were sick of being studied and analysed.¹⁹

Mindful of the potential for problems that can arise in research methodology, *Te Kapu a Rangi* (in this particular study) canvassed community opinion using small focus group hui (conducted between January and April 2000). From the ensuing discussions it became apparent that the research methodology was of major concern because the entire project, and not just the research, was under the *mana* (authority) of the *tohunga*, *Hohepa Kereopa*.

Within a Maori context, *mana* or power remains with an individual and is not something which can be given. *Mana* may be inherited or achieved, and it can be increased or decreased depending on personal achievement or effort, which enhances group well-being. Individual *mana* is conferred by *hapu* or *iwi* thus providing an obligatory mechanism in terms of individual action. Academic protocols regarding publication of research privileges the names of the researchers as the authors and therefore the authorities. Problems arise when non-Maori keynote speakers are seen to be the voices of Maori at national or international conference venues.²⁰

Hohepa Kereopa is internationally recognised as a *tohunga* and highly respected as an expert in all facets of *tikanga*

Māori. Consequently, his mana is sufficient to legitimise any project undertaken under his guidance. This phenomenon raises some ethical dilemmas. This indifference to research method, based solely on the reputation of participating pivotal individuals, does not imply that research methodology is irrelevant to research in Māori communities. Instead, it merely stresses how crucial tribal kaumātua support is to any Māori community initiative. 'Outsider' researchers who successfully obtained endorsement from recognised tribal elders have enjoyed the same privileges as 'insiders.' There is also some credence to the claim that some 'outsiders' have been accorded more privileges than 'insiders', not because they are extraordinary individuals, but simply because they are 'European'. Arguably, attitudes are changing and the generation of elders that provided Pākehā (like Elsdon Best) with Tūhoe traditional knowledge is being replaced by a more sceptical generation of kaumātua. The work of Elsdon Best is an obvious target because of his dual role as both ethnographer and coloniser. However, it is the covert manifestation of past colonial practices in field research that is perhaps more relevant (and is of more interest) to this study. 'Neo-colonialism' in contemporary research is 'alive and well'. Very recently (February 2003) a Pākehā social scientist expressed an interest in developing a research project on housing in Ruatāhuna. It transpired that the interest in the project had nothing to do with the needs of the community, but was motivated solely by the opportunity to secure research funds. Apparently, the Ruatāhuna housing profile was a perfect match for the funding criteria!

There is a tendency to focus on 'outsider' research to identify ethical problems in research. The reality is that some of these issues are equally problematic in 'insider' research. This fundamental realisation challenges the assumption that 'insider' researchers have a monopoly on authenticity and legitimacy, merely because they are 'insiders.' In the course of this discussion on ethical problems in research this assumption will be scrutinized with the same enthusiasm as that of 'outsider' (participant observation) research. It will become apparent that 'insider' researchers are as susceptible as 'outsiders' to questionable research practices. Therefore,

problems identified in the context of 'outsider' research can provide useful information for 'insider' research, not only in terms of a critique of 'insider' research, but also in developing ethical research paradigms. The Tūhoe kaumātua research project benefited from the insights into ethical issues identified in the Freeman-Mead critique. The analysis of the Freeman-Mead debate is deceptive because it gives the impression that the problems are glaring, but in actuality many of the issues are more obscure than they appear. And there is plausible evidence to suggest that exploitation of Māori communities is not confined to 'outsiders'.

Māori elders have conveyed their disappointment when Māori researchers have 'behaved like Pākehā'. Hohepa Kereopa regretted his personal endorsement for a particular research project because as the work progressed he became more disillusioned with the behaviour and attitudes of the principal Māori researcher. It transpired that Hohepa had supported the project on the assumption that all Māori share the same cultural values, beliefs and practices. This misconception is common – and questionable:

The claim that Maori people are the best qualified to undertake research is also problematic. What needs consideration here is the researchers' knowledge of tikanga, their tribal affiliations, their age and their gender. It must be understood that not all Maori who undertake research are necessarily conversant with tikanga. It is fair to say that the effects of colonisation have ensured that those who are the exception rather than the rule.²¹

In this context the key question is, 'Who benefits?' Generally, Māori are realists and it would be surprising to find any who would object to researchers receiving rewards for their work either as remuneration or in academic status. This is especially applicable to researchers who not only have tribal links into the community but who are also actively involved in tribal affairs. This does not abrogate the researcher from any accountability; in effect the relationship between the researcher and their tribal community defines the relationship. Collective consciousness dominates the Māori psyche. The status that the researcher may achieve as a result of the research is perceived in Māori communities as shared

by all members. Similarly, should any member of the community fall into disrepute, the whole community experiences collective shame. Therefore, accountability is determined by kinship and as such is an integral feature of the interrelationship between 'insider' researchers and their communities. The intricacies of the relationship are manifested in many ways. Many Māori who live in urban cities manage to maintain meaningful relationships with their tribal and particularly hapū (sub-tribe) connections.

On the other hand, Māori academics actively involved in tribal affairs may be subjected to unreasonably high community expectations. Lawyers are perhaps considered the most useful, and those with research capabilities are in high demand, especially with regard to Waitangi Tribunal claims. Throughout Aotearoa, members of Māori communities invariably volunteer their professional services. However, this is problematic because 'paid' labour usually takes precedence over 'unpaid' labour, and regardless of the best intentions of the volunteer the outcomes are seldom satisfactory. The problem is exacerbated when applied to monetary payments either to individuals, particularly informants, or to the community as a whole. There is considerable debate in the 'academic community' about the issue of remuneration.

Another example is the traditional attitude to paying respondents for their participation in research. It is often assumed that payments will result in bias. The conventional view is that the only valuable respondent is one who is willing to engage in the prescribed hierarchical relationship, which necessarily includes the donation of time for the benefit of the social sciences. When money and exploitation is the subject matter of the study, the issue of payment comes into particularly sharp focus.²²

In this respect Social science conventions reflect an arrogance that is borne from exploitation and for non-western communities is reminiscent of entrenched colonial attitudes. It is little wonder that communities are becoming more and more resistant to being the *objects* of research, a trend that is likely to continue if attitudes remain unchanged. The issue of 'intellectual property' (of informants) unacknowledged in the conventional social scientific view is a subject of great interest

amongst Māori. In Māori communities the role of experts, invariably elderly (kaumātua/kuia), as research informants is crucial for two reasons: firstly, because they are the repositories of tribal knowledge; and secondly, their involvement signifies acceptance. This factor is widely recognised not only within the social sciences, but also by most institutions in this country. This is observable in the recruitment of kaumātua as consultants or even as full-time paid employees. The problem is that while there is tacit acceptance of their superior knowledge in Māoritanga, this is rarely matched by comparable remuneration that takes into account their status and expertise. The insinuation is that Māori knowledge and expertise is less valuable than Pākehā. Furthermore, kaumātua employed by institutions for their 'expertise' in tikanga seldom have power in decision making, and many are relegated to performing rituals that are 'openers' for the real institutional business that follows. Te Kapu a Rangi Trust attempted to redress the imbalance, and the office of Te Mauri was invested with real, rather than nominal, power both materially and in the decision-making processes. In spite of this, due to complicating factors the problem of personal remuneration for kaumātua who were interviewed was never satisfactorily resolved. Sonia Thompson examines the complexities that status and expertise engenders in any research environment:

Payments are rarely considered in designing qualitative research. This may be because the researched are often those lacking the power to insist on being compensated for their time, as experts or consultants on their own values, knowledge, skills and experiences. As Madge notes, interviewees may be selected because he (sic) is in a position of authority; or because he possesses special knowledge about other people or things; or because he is one of a class of people in whom the scientist is interested.

Payment can be one way of recognising and beginning to equalise such power relations.

It is not invariably the case that respondents deserve to be paid. For example, when it comes to socially powerful people (who in global terms tend to be white, male, and middle-class) payments are unlikely to be desirable. Not only would it be

impossible to recompense a managing director of a multinational company at a level which would not seem derisory, it would be unnecessary to attempt to redress a power imbalance in favour of such a respondent. Because of the variations in the relative power of the researched and the researcher, there cannot be a prescription for the amount of payment which should be offered to participants, and the issue of payment will need to be resolved on a case by case basis. Researchers should consider the possibility of building the cost of payments into research bids.

Tikanga Māori may provide some guidance and in doing so demonstrates the complexity of Māori conceptualisations. The following analysis may appear to be laboured but it does illustrate the intricacies of Māori cultural values that complicate an ostensibly simple transaction. Many kaumātua are extremely uncomfortable about monetary payment, especially for services. As already intimated, this attitude is deeply rooted in Māori values such as manaakitanga (kindness) that are highly treasured, especially by kaumātua anxious to preserve positive Māori ways of thinking from the past. This attitude towards money, as inferior or even distasteful, is illustrated by an incident that occurred during a tangihanga in the late 1980's. A Tapuika kuia (elderly woman) reprimanded her daughter for leaving early and seemed to be irritated, rather than placated, with the generosity of the koha (gift). The implication is that money is a very poor substitute for personal commitment.

Extending this tangihanga/koha metaphor not only demonstrates the complexity of Māori cultural mores but also explains the way in which Māori values can be misconstrued when taken at face value. Integral to the concept of manaakitanga is reciprocity. It is usual, in most tribes, for a 'reading of the bill' hui to be held after all other rituals have been completed. This involves all interested parties listening to a detailed presentation of the accounts followed by acknowledgements of the exact amounts of koha donated by both individuals and whānau (extended family). When all the names have been read the total amount of koha is compared to the accounts, and the profit or deficit is reported. Incidentally, koha placed on the marae during pōhiri (rituals of

welcome) is not usually considered a contribution to the tangihanga; instead this is given to the marae committee to cover expenses incurred in maintaining the marae. There is also a separate amount known as moni aroha that is the contribution of the kimate (the extended family of the deceased). Only the total amount of kimate is announced at the hui, and that money is given directly to the immediate family. The management of koha for public dissemination requires expert knowledge of whakapapa (genealogy). A mistake can seriously damage intra-whānau relations. A person attending the hui may be inadvertently placed on either the koha (public donation), or the moni aroha list, with dire consequences. In one particular case a man, on hearing his name announced during the reading of the bill, stormed out of the marae shouting, 'Aren't I good enough for this family?' Another wanted to know what had happened to his koha, which had been mistakenly included in the moni aroha list. Despite the hazards, there are whānau who, regardless of the demands, continue to keep records of koha. These whānau consult the account books whenever a death occurs. The amount donated by the family of the deceased is returned as koha or moni aroha (depending on the kinship relationship), and according to Māori etiquette a little extra is added for aroha. On the other hand, an overly generous koha can cause difficulties for a whānau bound by tradition to reciprocate.

Nowadays many Māori are developing more ambivalence towards money: intrinsic Māori values are still seen as important, but due to ignorance they are also seen by many to be open to abuse. It is difficult to predict if the traditions that guide Māori values with regard to money are sustainable in a changing world. Government agencies in particular can take some credit for changing attitudes. A fitting example is the Mātua Whāngai programme, which at the time of its inception was celebrated as the most progressive initiative of the nineteen-eighties. Mātua Whāngai was a social services programme that returned young offenders, from the towns and cities, to their whānau living in marae-based communities. The concept developed from real concerns about the high offending and recidivist rates amongst Māori, and consequently, the unacceptably high numbers held in

institutions. Many Māori were convinced that Pākehā institutions had failed Māori and the alternative was to return 'at risk' members back to their own whānau. Some who had been raised in the city were returned to their tribal/hapū areas. Many Māori, particularly the older generation, embraced the concept. Despite the best intentions of the Māori involved, Mātua Whāngai did not deliver the promised outcomes, and many communities blamed themselves for the perceived failure. It can be argued that the Government is to blame, because it failed to appreciate the hardship this scheme placed on already materially impoverished families. This propensity to rely on the goodwill of a people who occupy the lowest socio-economic status in the country is clearly reprehensible. The success of programmes such as Mātua Whāngai depends as much on a well-managed economic infrastructure as it does on other contributing socio-cultural factors. Economic factors need to be taken into consideration, especially when research is carried out in poor communities; this is certainly an issue in Tūhoe, which has already been described as culturally rich and materially poor.

In this context it is conceivable that the Kia Tu Kia Puawai research team may have been a little hasty in concluding that kaumātua involved in the research had no interest in personal remuneration. There are culturally acceptable ways to provide financial support to Māori informants that would neither compromise nor embarrass. Unfortunately, there are also external impediments that need to be resolved in the process. The most obvious is that the Inland Revenue does not recognise koha as a legitimate form of payment, exempt from taxation. There have been attempts to redefine the koha system for compatibility with standard accounting practices required by both government agencies and most research funders. The problem is that when koha is viewed as taxable income, it is simply no longer koha. The target group for the research was kaumātua, the majority of whom are social security beneficiaries, which meant that any supplementary income would affect their benefits. Sonia Thompson faced a similar dilemma when undertaking research in Jamaica, although her informants were waged earners and she did not have to deal with the complications of welfare benefits.

If the conventional approach to research were to be applied to this situation, the question of financial payment would never be entertained. However, given that the research targeted poor women and centred on their working relationship with those who exploit their labour, the research process itself would have contributed to their financial pressures and put strains on them by taking time away from other essential tasks.

The financial circumstances of most of the kaumātua were similar. The Tūhoe Kaumātua Needs Analysis Research, supported by focus group interviews, intimated that most of the kaumātua were interested in collective (community) rather than individual benefits from the research. Again, traditional attitudes towards money determined the process, which meant that for the most part kaumātua were unaware that tangible assistance to the community was determined by the findings from the Needs Analysis Research. The contributions that did become public knowledge had interesting and unanticipated consequences. Most notable among these was the Waiohau initiative: the kaumātua interviewed in the research process had requested computers for the mokopuna (grandchildren) to be installed at the local primary school. The Trust supported the initiative because it was linked to one of the long-term strategic goals, community computer access to a tribal web site specializing in Tūhoe language and traditions. After the computers were installed at the school it became apparent that this initiative had created some consternation within the community. At a hui held at Waiohau convened to discuss the issues, some younger community health workers argued that they, rather than the kaumātua, were better qualified to decide on kaumātua needs. This assertion did little to advance their cause, despite their having the support of a respected local kaumātua (who had not attended the focus group interview).

It is unrealistic to expect that all members of any given community will be in complete harmony on every issue. More importantly, the research provided information necessary for the Trust to formulate effective strategies to address kaumātua needs that in many instances could be translated into tangible benefits. Nonetheless, the main objective of the indicative

study was to explore the potential of using a collaborative process with communities under research. This process means that the outcomes of research in Māori communities must be subject to scrutiny. Notwithstanding any errors in the delivery of research outcomes, ethical issues that were clearly identified from the outset as the priority established the responsibility of the research team to interact conscientiously with the community.

The Needs Analysis research data also provided an indicative study. It gave the research team the opportunity to assess and trial the research methodology. Given that the project involved Māori communities, the use of conventional sociological research methodology caused considerable consternation. It was decided that the research team would use qualitative research methodology to collect the data, with significant modifications to ensure that tikanga Māori was not compromised. To mitigate the effects of research methodology, Māori was the primary language of communication. Moreover, interview techniques compliant with tikanga were assiduously observed. In an interview situation, Māori etiquette can be a significant impediment. For example, custom dictates that elders are never interrupted when they are speaking, consequently hours can be spent with kaumātua who are under no compulsion to remain focused on the subject. Māori discourses are inclined towards the 'bigger picture'. These times spent with kaumātua are rarely unpleasant, but most have no concept of the constraints imposed by Pākehā time and any attempt to impose it invariably invites censure. One particular kaumātua chastised her mokopuna who tried to terminate an interview after eight hours on one topic with, 'Koinā te āhuetanga o koutou, ngā rangatahi – kāre e taea e koutou te hohonutanga o te mōhio!' ('That's the problem with you young people – you aren't able to understand the deeper aspect of knowledge!') This problem was circumvented in the Tūhoe research by using a survey questionnaire. However, when the findings were collated it became apparent that the study could have been improved if more in-depth interviews had been undertaken – particularly in regard to more conceptual issues. The difficulty lies in trying to achieve balance while obtaining the best possible outcomes.

Other non-western indigenous researchers experience similar challenges. Bryan Brayboy and Donna Deyhle,²³ both Native Americans, complain about the difficulties in applying qualitative research methodology to their own communities. The conflict between cultural etiquette and the demands of scientific rigour caused acute anxiety for the researchers. The source of this conflict is not solely attributable to problems in methodology, but is also a result of the dialectical tension between different ontological positions. Māori ontology is resistant to scientific rationality and is also at variance with a research method that treats social phenomenon as social facts. Emile Durkheim (1951) is credited with devising this method, but historically the collecting of data for census dates back to eleventh century England with the Norman Domesday book. The collection of data for census purposes was an exercise in political control, as it allowed governing bodies to monitor the movements of its citizens. The use of data collection to support commentaries on society was a much later development that coincided with the Enlightenment. There is a general consensus of opinion that the development of scientific method as a tool for the study of human societies has its roots in the philosophies of the Enlightenment, which dominated eighteenth century European thinking.

It was the Enlightenment, not the Reformation or the Renaissance that dislodged the ecclesiastical establishment from central control of cultural and intellectual life. By emancipating science from the trammels of theological tradition the Enlightenment rendered possible the autonomous evolution of modern culture ... Hence natural science occupied the front of the stage.²⁴

The 'Enlightenment,' also known as the 'Age of Reason,' built on the foundations of seventeenth century developments in the sciences. Consequently, scientific advancements made during the Enlightenment that displaced theocratic hegemony in Western Europe created a new discipline, the social sciences. Thereafter, the study of society was undertaken using the same techniques as the study of the natural world. As already indicated, science's incursion into sociology is not without its critics.

Edward Wilson,²⁵ internationally recognised American entomologist and winner of two Pulitzer prizes, is lampooned for his recent attempt to synthesise science with the humanities in a process he calls conscience. 'Dr Wilson admires the organisation and efficiency of ant colonies. He admires them so much, he seems to think that humans will eventually come to their senses and live like them'.²⁶ John Barnes²⁷ presents a more serious analysis of the natural science paradigm in his appraisal of anthropological fieldwork:

... scientists, whether or not they began to specialise in social enquiries, thought they could collect data from members of other social groups as if they were at home in the laboratory studying some natural object. In this respect there was no difference between the anthropologists overseas and the anthropologists studying the poor in the metropolis ... For both sociology and anthropology the intellectual dominance of the natural science paradigm was complemented by the political context in which the paradigm was applied in practice. The focus of scientific attention in both disciplines was the powerless rather than the powerful, the poor working class at home and the conquered tribal peoples overseas. The positivistic ontology whereby social facts were held to exist in their own right was matched by the real world in which the initiative for social action was held by a ruling minority. The two were linked by an investigative praxis whereby these independently existing unbiased facts were assumed to be known by the guardians of the poor rather than by the poor themselves.

From this perspective, the natural science paradigm and inequitable power relations are inextricably linked. The idea that methodology determines power relations provides further insights to the discussion of problems in Māori research. It is suggested that 'insider' research is as susceptible to exploitation (in relation to the researcher and researched) as 'outsider' research. However, the earlier critique of Māori 'insider' research focused on tribal affiliations and knowledge of tikanga Māori rather than research methodology. Barnes²⁸ attributes the genesis of disparate power relations in research to methodology and the ascendancy of the natural science paradigm. When methodology is considered from this position

it places research within an ontological framework. More importantly, it takes into account the historical forces that shape the socio-political settings in which research takes place.

Max Weber²⁹ in the tradition of positivistic sociology advocates research that is 'value free'. The role of the researcher is to collect, collate and interpret the information or data in a way that ensures that it is completely devoid of subjectivity. The value designated to scientific, objective knowledge reflects power relations between the dominant and the dominated. It is reasonable to argue that this bolsters the dominant culture's superior notions of epistemology and standards of scholarship. In this sense non-western indigenous cultures are more inclined towards a more subjective interpretation of the world, which incurs 'inferior' status in terms of knowledge.

West-European's intellectual self-aggrandizement has an impact on Māori (as well as other non-Western indigenous) researchers and intellectuals, who are for the most part educated in mainstream universities. The role of education in any society is to ensure the replication of cultural mores and values. For Māori, the majority of whom are enrolled in mainstream educational institutions, the education system and pedagogy is that of the majority culture, Pākehā. This assertion is complicated by the existence of the same imbalance in power relations within the majority, in this case Pākehā culture.

There is a difference. This method is reflective of the world view of the dominant culture. The positions of power are shaped by the different ontological positions or world views; therefore the scientific method in research is predominant. This approach contradicts the ubiquitous view that the objective of the scientific method is to negate the subjective, the intuitive, and the instinctive. Applying the scientific method to the study of any society is challenging, and even more so in consideration of non-western indigenous societies that value the metaphysical. The Māori world view, irrespective of tribal differentiation, always emphasises the paramountcy of the taha wairua (spiritual dimension). The taha wairua is the antithesis of scientific positivism because the spiritual

dimension is intangible, immeasurable, and therefore supposedly unamenable to scientific scrutiny. Paul Moon³⁰ describes the esoteric difficulties he encountered when working with Hohepa Kereopa:

There was also the critical matter of the convergence of the natural and metaphysical worlds. Tohunga like Hohepa seem to glide effortlessly between the two, whereas the task of transmitting some of the attendant information into a written form can demand considerable exertion at times. Hohepa was appreciative that he frequently operated in different realms, but explained away the conceptual difficulties using the image of a fern leaf. The underside of the fern leaf, he explained, is a different colour from the top side, is shaped differently, and is only revealed to those who look for it. It is never apparent on the surface. In the same way the knowledge and actions of a tohunga operate in both worlds, in which one domain of thinking and action is merely an alternative perspective of the other.

Jerry Mander³¹ identifies a fundamental clash between western and indigenous belief systems; maintaining that indigenous peoples perceive the environment as a living entity. The terminology 'indigenous' and 'western' requires some reflective consideration prior to discussing the ideological differences between the two. The definition of 'indigenous' in modern usage is very broad, but can be loosely interpreted as non-western European. However, this definition does not recognise cultural diversity or, for Māori, tribal diversity. In actuality there are two divergent approaches to contemporary Māori culture, a tribal and a pan-Māori approach.³² The Māoritanga approach is synonymous with nationalism with its genesis in the Māori urban drift of the nineteen fifties. Rural, marae-based communities have tended to resist the development of a national consciousness, preferring to accentuate tribal and even sub-tribal (hapū) differences.

Tribal differentiation is manifest not only in different customs and traditions, but also in language. Tūhoe accentuate the 'n' in 'ngā', pronouncing the place name Ngongotahā as 'Nonotahā', much to the amusement of other Māori because 'nono' means 'backside' and 'tahā' is a

calabash. Within Te Arawa there are noticeable dialectical differences between hapū. Tapuika add 'w' to plural possessives such as 'āku', which becomes 'wāku'. Tribal identification of an individual is invariably based on dialect; therefore the exclamation 'E hika!' identifies the speaker as Ngāti Porou. Similarly, use of the glottal stop for 'h' is a unique characteristic of the Taranaki tribes. The impetus to preserve tribal differences in language (and customs) has been frustrated because of the decline in the use of the language. Understandably, the campaign for the survival of the language has had to take precedence over tribal dialectic. The onus for sustainability of the Māori language has been largely institutional, mainly in education and media. Although aware of the struggle to have Māori taught in school, Tapuika kuia still lament the adoption of generic Māori language and the concomitant standardising of the cultural traditions. They want Te Arawa Māori and traditions to be taught in Tapuika. The kuia, like John Rangihau, had a singular tribal Māori world view. According to them, the well-being of future generations of Tapuika and Tūhoe are absolutely dependent on the peculiarities of their own tribal language and traditions.

In conclusion, arguably the preservation of tribal differences is as important an ethical problem as the insider/outsider issue. Samoan concerns regarding Margaret Mead's misinterpretation of cultural mores apply equally to Māori tribal communities who are perceived as homogeneous. A pan-Māori approach to the study of Māori communities will invariably produce erroneous interpretations, which is an ethical problem for research. John Rangihau³³ best articulates the argument for tribal identity.

Each tribe has its own history. And it's not a history that can be shared among others. How can I share with the history of Ngāti Porou, of Te Arawa, of Waikato? Because I am not of those people. I am a Tuhoe person and all I can share in is Tuhoe history ... I have a faint suspicion that Māoritanga is a term coined by the Pakeha together. Because if you cannot divide and rule, than for tribal people all you can do is unite them and rule. Because then they lose everything by losing their tribal histories and traditions that give them their identity.

Notes

- ¹ N. Raerino, personal communication, June 2002.
- ² Health Funding Authority, *Kia Tu Kia Puawai*, Wellington, 1999, p. 1.
- ³ H. McNeill, 'Attitudes to Family Violence: Maori Study', in *Attitudes to Family Violence*, Wellington, 1986, p. 51.
- ⁴ Op. cit.
- ⁵ K. Gough, 'Anthropology and Imperialism Revisited', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, August, 1990, pp. 1705-1708; J. Barnes, *Who Should Know What? Social Science, Privacy and Ethics*, Middlesex, 1979.
- ⁶ H. McNeill, 'Attitudes to Family Violence: Maori Study', in *Attitudes to Family Violence*.
- ⁷ Op. cit.
- ⁸ J. Barnes, *Who Should Know What? Social Science, Privacy and Ethics*,
- ⁹ J. Sissons, 'Best, Elsdon 1856-1931', in *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Volume Two (1870-1900), Wellington, 1993.
- ¹⁰ W. Willis, 'Skeletons in the Anthropological Closet', in Hymes, D. (Ed.), *Reinventing Anthropology*, New York, 1974, p. 141.
- ¹¹ M. Orans, *Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*, New York, 1996.
- ¹² N. Sundar, *Activism and Academic Angst*. Retrieved 9 February 2003, from <http://www.india-seminar.com/2000/488/488comment.htm>
- ¹³ P. Shankman, 'Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Issue of Evolution', in the *Skeptical Inquirer*, November-December, 1993.
- ¹⁴ P. Moon. *Tohunga: Hohepa Kereopa*, Auckland, 2003, pp. 11 and 13.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., p. 11.
- ¹⁶ R. Bishop and T. Glynn, 'He Kanohi Kitea: Conducting and Evaluating Educational Research', in *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 27, 1992.
- ¹⁷ H. Jahnke and J. Tapiata, 'Maori Research', in C. Davidson, and M. Tolich, (eds.) *Social Science Research*, Auckland, 1999.
- ¹⁸ Op. cit.
- ¹⁹ H. McNeill.
- ²⁰ Health Funding Authority, *Kia Tu Kia Puawai*.
- ²¹ R. Bishop and T. Glynn, 'He Kanohi Kitea: Conducting and Evaluating Educational Research'.
- ²² S. Thompson, 'Paying Respondents and Informants', in *Social Research Update*, Issue 14, England, 1996.
- ²³ B. Brayboy & D. Deyhle, 'Insider-Outsider: Researchers in American Indian Communities', in *Theory into Practice*, 39, 2000, pp. 163-169.
- ²⁴ G. Rempel, *Age of Enlightenment*. Retrieved 9 February 2003, from <http://www.mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/wc2/lectures/enlightenment.html>
- ²⁵ E. Wilson, *Consilience. The Unity of Knowledge*, New York, 1998.
- ²⁶ (anonymous reviewer USA, undated, www.amazon.com).
- ²⁷ J. Barnes, pp. 33-4.
- ²⁸ Op. cit.
- ²⁹ M. Weber, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York, 1949.
- ³⁰ P. Moon, pp. 11-12.
- ³¹ J. Mander, 'In the Absence of the Sacred: The failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations', in *Sierra Club Papers*, San Francisco, 1991.
- ³² R. Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou, Struggle Without End*, Auckland, 1990, et. al.
- ³³ Rangihau, J. 1992. 'Being Maori'. In King, M. (ed) *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga*. Auckland, 190.