



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**WAIKATO**  
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato*

**Research Commons**

<http://waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz/>

## **Research Commons at the University of Waikato**

### **Copyright Statement:**

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

# **Treaty People Recognising and Marking Pākehā Culture in Aotearoa New Zealand**

A thesis  
submitted for the degree  
of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
at  
The University of Waikato

**Rosanne Marjory Black**

(Pākehā of Irish & Scots descent)

The University of Waikato  
2010



# Abstract

The suggestion that all people are cultural and live in cultural worlds acts to challenge members of culturally dominant groups as they tend to see their way of life as normal rather than cultural. Dominant group members usually talk about themselves in relation to their national identity (New Zealander, Australian, or American) rather than name being part of a cultural group within their nation state. This study, located in Aotearoa New Zealand, explores with a particular group of New Zealanders, how Pākehā<sup>1</sup> who are members of the dominant group, may come to recognise themselves as being cultural, to name themselves culturally, and to mark aspects of their culture. The contribution that recognising culture makes to a decolonisation agenda is also explored.

This study of Pākehā culture is approached from both a realist and a social constructionist perspective. Culture, an abstract concept, is largely theorised as a constructed notion in a historically structured location. How culture is recognised, and the ways it is produced and enacted, through relationships and interactions in the broader structures of New Zealand society were explored using realist thematic methods of analysis.

Treaty people are a network of mostly Pākehā activist educators who have engaged in promoting knowledge of and support for Māori claims for justice under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi was the document signed by Settlers and Māori<sup>2</sup> leaders in 1840 to establish settlement arrangements). Treaty people are practised in talking about cultural issues largely through their engagement with Māori - Pākehā relationships. The research focused on the situations and processes that stimulated a group of thirty four 'Treaty people' to start thinking about themselves as cultural; about what it meant to have a cultural identity; and what they recognised as markers of their culture. I have been a member of this Treaty People network for many years and carry the dual positioning of being the researcher, and a participant, both as a member of the group and as a Pākehā. Data was collected over an eighteen month period from two focus groups in 2003 and 2005. These sessions were video and audio-recorded and later transcribed. I meet with available participants in their own locations early in 2005 and audio-recorded the conversations. The transcriptions and notes form the data for this study.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'white' European/British people who came to Aotearoa

<sup>2</sup> The 'normal' people – those who were here – tangata whenua

My findings from this study include:

- Culture was often first recognised through encounters with different cultural groups and usually when a person is in a situation where they are in a minority. Although, dominant group members do not always see their own daily practices and values as cultural they often name as cultural the practices and values of people different from them.
- Recognising and naming ourselves as cultural and marking our culture were difficult tasks that go against the grain of dominance.
- Pākehā culture was recognised in a number of ways. Treaty people recognised that there were other forms of knowing about the world and that dominant group members valued being ‘right’ and in control of knowledge. Coming to recognise themselves as cultural unsettled a sense of certainty about their position in the world, and opened up possibilities for new ways to engage in intercultural relationships where participation rather than being in control was valued.
- Accepting the name Pākehā implied having a position of responsibility to tangata whenua and to the land. In turn those who have accepted being Pākehā receive a sense of belonging to Aotearoa and a place to stand in justice alongside Māori and other people who are culturally different from them.
- While this thesis does not make explicit links between ‘being cultural’ and a decolonisation agenda the Treaty People participants named strategies to support decolonisation and challenge Pākehā dominance which include: recognising practices and values that are perpetuated through colonisation, in particular egalitarianism, assimilation and superiority; recognising Māori as tangata whenua (first people of the land) and Te Tiriti o Waitangi relationships; taking up the challenge to seek justice through striving to deal with past wrongs and to engage in equitable relationships with Māori.

This thesis contributes to the psychology and social science literature as it serves to address the question “We don’t have a culture ... do we?” I posit that all psychologists do have a culture and provide some rich descriptions, for those who are Pākehā, of how their culture may be recognised, how it might be described and talked about. This is a core cultural competency requirement for psychologists. My thesis also contribute to a growing body of literature from members of dominant groups, who are developing a discourse to explore and make visible their cultural or raced (whiteness) positions of power and privilege.

# Dedication

To my father Bernard  
and my brother Martin

Your stories of family and culture are alive in our memories

and

to our granddaughters  
Moana and Maëlys

Your stories of culture are unfolding



# Acknowledgements

Throughout this study I have been well supported with the loving care, good will and patience of a great number of people, too many to name in person.

I am deeply appreciative of the energy, inspiration and commitment of the peer support group of Mitzi Nairn, Ray Nairn, Ingrid Huygens and Tim McCreanor which has sustained me in bringing this study to fruition. We have talked through, read and commented on each others work, shared good food, and experienced many celebrations and losses in our lives over the last ten years.

Daily, I am reminded of and thankful for the contributions of the Treaty people, who shared their cultural stories which formed data for this study. I hope that my interpretations of your stories will be a resource to enhance the Treaty work you do.

Thank you to my academic supervisors for the expertise, skills, wise counsel and direction you have shared with me throughout this study. Professor Jane Ritchie, has been my mother-rock, and has shown unstinted faith in my ability to do this research. Neville Robertson and Heather Hamerton, with Jane, have been there to support, guide, read drafts and respond to my many questions.

I am thankful to Kathie Crocket, her listening skills and guidance which enabled me to untangle the battle ground my PhD had become, and bring fresh energy to my study.

My heartfelt thanks and gratitude goes to Brian and my large and lively extended family, for all the ways you have loved and supported me. I would not have got through this project without you.

I have been humbled by the generosity and friendship of Bridgette, Michelle, Moana and Rachel, as we weave our ways through the intercultural dimensions of our lives.

To the most wonderful bunch of friends in the world who have walked, cycled, talked, laughed, cried and shared lots of food and coffee with me throughout this PhD journey, I can not thank you all enough for the ways you have contributed to my well being and understanding of Pākehā culture.





# Table of contents

<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Dedication.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Table of contents .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Chapter One.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>To be in the World is always to be in the Cultural World.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose of this study.....	1
Pākehā, Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi.....	3
Social constructionism, language and culture.....	4
Treaty People .....	7
My story about being Pākehā .....	8
Contributing to a decolonisation agenda.....	12
An outline of the thesis.....	13
<b>Chapter Two .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Concepts of Culture, Marking and Pākehā .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Concepts of culture .....	18
Culture in psychology and the social sciences.....	20
Culture, ethnicity, race and nation.....	20
Cultural identity and culture .....	23
Culture obscured.....	24
Having a culture.....	26
Culture as structure.....	27
Doing culture: Social constructionist approaches .....	29
Cultural markers.....	31
Marking Pākehā Culture.....	32
Who are Pākehā? .....	35
Peoples of Aotearoa: Pākehā in Relationships .....	41
<b>Chapter Three .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>The Socio-Political Context of Culture: Colony, Race and Nation</b>	
<b>.....</b>	<b>45</b>
Colonisation: The New Zealand story .....	45
Colonisation is predicated on beliefs about superiority .....	46
Assimilation: Or was it extermination? .....	48
Melting pot .....	49
Challenges to colonisation: Land issues come back to haunt .....	50
Racism and Race relations .....	52
Race relations in New Zealand: The best in the world? .....	53
Integration .....	56
Whiteness studies and Cultural dominance in Aotearoa .....	58

Dominance as unmarked cultural identity .....	58
Structural dominance in a nation state .....	61
The New Zealanders: Pākehā and the bicultural debate in Aotearoa .....	63
Decolonisation strategies .....	65
Pākehā as a decolonising identity .....	67
Examining Pākehā Discourses that maintain dominance .....	68
Disrupting silence, examining racism and naming privilege .....	71
<b>Chapter Four .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Philosophical and Theoretical Stakes in the Ground .....</b>	<b>75</b>
The social constructionist paradigm .....	75
The turn to language .....	76
Key assumptions of social constructionism .....	77
Taken-for-granted knowledge is approached with a critical stance .....	77
Historical and cultural specificity .....	78
Knowledge is constructed between people through daily interactions and is sustained by social processes .....	79
Knowledge and social action go together and are bound up in power relations .....	80
A community and critical psychology perspective .....	80
Methodological approaches .....	81
Revealing group processes of identity construction through narratives .....	82
Dominant Discourses .....	83
Thematic analysis .....	85
<b>Chapter Five .....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>People and Procedures .....</b>	<b>89</b>
Research design .....	89
Positions and voices in research .....	90
Researcher positioning and ethics .....	91
Voices in the research .....	93
Research with Treaty People .....	95
Ethics forms and confidentiality .....	95
Participants .....	96
Gathering data .....	97
Some reflections: .....	99
Cultural and/or ethnic labels participants used to name themselves .....	100
Ethnic Identity .....	101
Cultural Identity .....	101
Working with data .....	102
<b>Chapter Six .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Treaty People Talk About Symbols of New Zealand .....</b>	<b>107</b>
Symbols of New Zealand .....	107
Better Britons and the Queen .....	107
National anthems and <b>not</b> being British? .....	108
A façade of good race relations .....	112
Stereotypes of National identity .....	115
Travel to 'the centre': London/Britain/England/Scotland/Europe/Canada .....	119
Before travel: 'I was just a New Zealander like everyone else' .....	120
At the 'centre': Heritage and home? .....	121

New Zealand as home .....	124
Conclusion .....	124
<b>Chapter Seven .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Treaty People Recognise Being Cultural .....</b>	<b>127</b>
Being normal and recognising privilege in the dominant group .....	127
Pākehā in relationships with Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi .....	133
One people no more: Pākehā engaging in relationships with Māori .....	133
Having a Māori partner and Māori/Pākehā children .....	138
"We know we are not the whole" DavidJ .....	139
Te Tiriti o Waitangi: Pākehā and the Treaty .....	141
Conclusion .....	146
<b>Chapter Eight .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Treaty People Recognise Being Pākehā .....</b>	<b>149</b>
Yes, I'm Pākehā .....	149
Debating who is Pākehā? .....	150
Calling myself Pākehā – Naming myself culturally or ethnically .....	155
To be or not to be Pākehā .....	155
Accepting Pākehā as the name given to us by Māori .....	156
Being Pākehā when not British .....	161
Assertions of belonging .....	163
Conclusion .....	168
<b>Chapter Nine .....</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>Treaty People Talk About Pākehā Cultural Values .....</b>	<b>171</b>
Egalitarianism .....	171
Community and social justice .....	175
Fairness and orderliness .....	179
Time .....	182
Assimilation .....	185
Superiority .....	187
Rational and reductionist thinking .....	189
Individuality and Independence .....	191
Conclusion .....	195
<b>Chapter Ten .....</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>Marking Pākehā Culture as a Decolonisation Strategy .....</b>	<b>197</b>
Summary of study .....	199
Intentionally recognising Pākehā Culture .....	201
Does saying 'I'm Pākehā' really change anything? .....	203
The Constitutive nature of Culture .....	204
Occupying a cultural space .....	205
Conclusions .....	206
Reflections on the study .....	207
Contributions of the study .....	208
Implications of this study for Psychology .....	209
Cultural competency and practice considerations .....	210
Reflexive coda .....	211

<b>References .....</b>	<b>217</b>
<b>Glossary of Māori words .....</b>	<b>231</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>233</b>
Appendix 1 Information for Participants 2003 .....	234
Appendix 2 Consent form for Participants 2003.....	236
Appendix 3 Participant biographic information form.....	237
Appendix 4 2003 Focus group questions .....	238
Appendix 5 Letter to 2003 focus group participants.....	239
Appendix 6 Collected stories notes for 2005 conference .....	240
Appendix 7 Information for Participants 2005 .....	243
Appendix 8 Consent form for Participants 2005.....	245
Appendix 9 2005 Focus group questions .....	246
Appendix 10 Letter to 2005 focus group participants.....	247

# Chapter One

## To be in the World is always to be in the Cultural World<sup>3</sup>

I have been to university.  
I have a student loan.  
I photocopy my tax returns.  
Most mornings I read the newspaper.  
I make lists of things I have to do and like to cross them off.  
I cut apples into quarters before I eat them,  
Then I cut the pips out.  
I put my name on things.  
I listen to talkback radio.  
I use EFTPOS.

Some people think I am a typical Pākehā.

*From: "Bred in South Auckland".  
(Colquhoun, 1999, p. 36)*

### **Purpose of this study**

This thesis about culture is an exploration of the ways in which Treaty People, who are mostly Pākehā members of the dominant cultural group in Aotearoa New Zealand, come to recognise themselves as cultural<sup>4</sup>. Treaty People is a collective name for those who are activist educators in local and national groups engaged in promoting knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi and supporting Māori, the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, claims for justice under the Treaty. The study was stimulated in part by calls from Māori, such as that by Hone Kaa (cited in Huygens 2007), for Pākehā not only to know who they are as a cultural group but also to recognise the power they have in Aotearoa. As such it is intended to contribute towards an agenda of decolonisation adopted by people within the Treaty Movement, where recognising culture for members of dominant groups is one aspect of examining and disrupting the practices of

---

<sup>3</sup> (McHoul & Rapley, 2001, p. 433)

<sup>4</sup> In this study I use the term cultural to emphasise the notion that people engage in an active process of being cultural rather than describing people as 'having a culture' which implies that culture is part of the 'essence' of a person.

colonisation (Huygens, 2006, 2007; McCreanor, 2005; M. Nairn, 2000; R. Nairn & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, 1997). It is located within the discipline of psychology and is informed by the social constructionist paradigm and the methodological approaches of narrative and thematic analysis.

In this thesis I am exploring the proposition that people who are members of a dominant group have little or no need to name themselves as a member of a culture; rather they see themselves as the fabric of the way things are. Members of a dominant group tend to control the language, social and political agendas of the nation and see themselves largely in terms of their national identity, often to the detriment of other cultural and ethnic groups living within the same national boundaries.

The aim of this study is to establish the ways in which some of those who belong to Treaty people networks and are dominant group members in Aotearoa, come to recognise and name themselves as Pākehā, acknowledge their Treaty of Waitangi relationships and responsibilities, and to mark as cultural their lifestyle, values and practices.

I write about the everyday cultural world that I live in as a Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand. Even although it is the cultural world I am most familiar with it is often a struggle to recognise the very mundane and taken for granted ways (Billig, 1995) in which I and others of my culture carry out our daily lives and relationships. I am a participant in the research process and the author of this account of Pākehā culture. It is a partial account (Hamerton, 2000), an interpretation gleaned from the stories of Pākehā culture shared by the participants in this research. This account of Pākehā culture has also been contributed to by the research group I have been part of for 10 years; by my supervisors and my Māori and Pākehā colleagues; through media stories, literature and theories I have read; along with the many and varied conversations, debates and arguments I have had about Pākehā culture over the last 30 years.

There are many questions which have prompted this study. What is culture? Other people have a culture, but do we? If we do have a culture what does it look like? Is there such a thing as Pākehā culture? Are we only Pākehā because Māori say we are? Why do we have to use a Māori word to name ourselves? How do we know what that name means? Why can't we all just be New Zealanders? Questions such as these and others that arise will be addressed in the pages that follow.

Social psychologists Vaughan and Hogg (2002) describe culture as pervading  
*... almost all aspects of our existence. Perhaps because of this, culture is the often taken for granted background to everyday life (e.g. Garfinkel, 1967), and we may only really become aware of features of our culture when we encounter other cultures or when our own culture is threatened (p.463).*

When I began to research Pākehā culture in the mid 1990s (Black, 1997) there was a sense in which New Zealand culture might have been under threat from two notable sources. There were frequent debates in the media about the impact of large numbers of ‘Asian migrants’ into New Zealand, and concerns were also being expressed about the impact that globalisation might have on local cultures. These debates, I suggest, tend to engender reactive identity constructions. What I aspire to is a basis for just and equitable relationships by proactively discussing the recognition of Pākehā culture in the light of the recent increasing intercultural contact with Māori and many other cultural groups in Aotearoa.

In this chapter I will introduce Māori, Pākehā and Te Tiriti o Waitangi as these are the significant contextual relationships in this study. I will briefly outline the theoretical approach I am using in this study. I will introduce and give some background to the participants and to myself as researcher. The local and international significance of the research will be discussed and I will outline the chapters that follow in the thesis.

## **Pākehā, Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi**

This study is embedded in a history of intercultural relationships that have occurred in Aotearoa New Zealand. These relationships, constructed through a process of colonisation, are primarily between the “colonial subjects: indigene and settler” (Bell, 2004, p. ii), more commonly referred to as Māori and Pākehā. In writing about Māori identity Ranginui Walker (1989) described the naming of Māori and Pākehā. Pre-contact **iwi** or tribal identity was the most salient identity for Māori.

*With the arrival of the European navigators, traders and missionaries, however, the Māori applied the descriptive term **Pākehā** (white man) to these strangers. Conversely, because white skin was a strange and abnormal condition to them they adopted the term **Māori** (normal or natural) to distinguish themselves (p.35)<sup>5</sup>.*

From these beginnings the cultural identities of both Māori and Pākehā, while separate in many respects, are none the less intertwined in the past, present and future stories of Aotearoa. Walker noted that “the binary opposition of Māori and Pākehā ethnicity is as important a determinant of Māori identity as enculturation” (p.35).

---

<sup>5</sup> Unless otherwise stated quotations are reproduced with original emphases and spelling



The relationship between Māori and the British Crown on behalf of settlers was formalised in the 1840 signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi<sup>6</sup>, the Māori text and an English text of Treaty of Waitangi (Belich, 1986, 2001; Kawharu, 1989; Orange, 1987; Sinclair, 2000). The British, influenced by European colonial capitalist discourses of “superiority and exploitation” (Huygens, 2007, p. 1), regarded this Treaty as a sanction to colonise Aotearoa and proceeded to gain land and resources through sale, war, and confiscation for the hundreds of settlers who were promised a new way of life and prosperity (Belich, 1986; Burns, 1989; McNab, 1914). In 1840 when the Treaty was signed, Māori were dominant in terms of numbers and control of land and resources. By the end of the 1860s land wars the Pākehā settlers had gained dominance in numbers and the shift of huge tracts of land into their control was well underway.

Once in a position of dominance, the settlers went about establishing the colony in ways that were culturally familiar to them, usually ignoring the cultural ways of Māori, including their language. The Treaty agreement was consistently breached and ignored by consecutive Pākehā governments, hell bent on colonisation (Ward, 1995/1973) especially through policies of assimilation, establishing the current inequitable access to the country’s resources, and non-recognition of Māori as the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa (Walker, 2004). I discuss the impact of colonisation and the relationships between Māori and Pākehā in depth in chapter three. Te Tiriti o Waitangi had been largely put aside by Pākehā in the quest to colonise, yet it is proving to be an effective tool to use in the process of decolonisation (Huygens, 2007).

### **Social constructionism, language and culture**

*If you know only one culture, it probably means you know no culture  
Cabriní 'Ofa Makasiale in (Makasiale et al., 2008).*

I have taken a social constructionist approach to address the many questions that have cropped up through the course of this study. Social constructionism offers the theoretical means to critically examine as “socially derived and socially maintained” (Burr, 2003, p. 45), the often taken for granted ways that human beings live, through the shared meanings that are created and perpetuated, in their cultures and societies. The way in which language is used to generate and understand knowledge and social processes is a crucial aspect of social

---

<sup>6</sup> There are two versions of this treaty that do not directly translate one for the other. The first is the Māori text Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the second an English text is the Treaty of Waitangi. Most often in this study I simply refer to the ‘Treaty’ although I regard the Māori text as the definitive version.

constructionism (Burr, 2003; Edley, 2001; Gergen, 1994/1982; Parker & Shotter, 1990; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Sarbin & Kitsuse, 1994; Tuffin, 2005).

Language is the facility human beings use to make sense of their world (Campbell, 2005). Language, either spoken or as text, performs a social function and can carry layers of meaning that may be interpreted in a number of different ways (Edwards & Potter, 1992). How do people use language to talk about culture, particularly their own culture? By talking about culture people are constructing their views of culture, and testing them out with others (Hall & du Gay, 1996). Some aspects of culture are accepted and others are hotly debated, depending on the social context and political views of those present. Culture is most often recognised and discussed when interactions occur with peoples who have different ways of doing or approaching tasks, or beliefs. Culture is not a “set piece”<sup>7</sup> that can be pulled out and examined, but rather is always and everyday being constructed and reconstructed.

When writing about putting culture in motion, Chicano cultural anthropologist Renato Rosaldo wrote

*[I]n everyday life the wise guide themselves as often by waiting to see how events unfold as by plans and predictions. When in doubt, people find out about their worlds by living with ambiguity, uncertainty, or simple lack of knowledge until the day, if and when it arrives, that their life experiences clarify matters. In other words, we often improvise, learning by doing, and make things up as we go along (1993, p. 92).*

Examining various texts by members of the dominant group in Aotearoa New Zealand with a view to explicating or interpreting what they might say about Pākehā culture is rather like Rosaldo’s suggestion above that “we often improvise, learning by doing, and make up things as we go along” (p.92). It has been a privilege to be able to collect and explore the various texts about Pākehā culture and unravel the discourses, a little like pulling apart a stitched garment, examining the shape of it then making it up again in a new or reshaped form. While all the details of the initial construction process may not be revealed by disassembling it, accumulated knowledge gained from my own experience with garment making comes into play in the remaking process.

The idea of pulling apart and stitching a garment I find is useful as it draws on my many years of experience in dressmaking for self, family and friends and more than that a family heritage of sewing and tailoring by aunts and particularly my great aunt Ethel who made herself a tailored suit to wear at her 90<sup>th</sup> birthday celebrations. Learning to sew was certainly part of the cultural landscape of

---

<sup>7</sup> Mitzi Nairn, personal conversation

Pākehā New Zealand. It was a compulsory subject in the school curriculum for girls to learn sewing and cooking in years seven and eight (aged 11-12 approximately), and an optional subject in secondary schools. Nowadays sewing is still part of the school curriculum and is available as a subject option for both girls and boys.

Bearing in mind the limitations of any metaphor, it is not a new idea to apply the language of stitching and constructing garments to society and culture. We could consider the phrase ‘the fabric of society’ and explore the meanings associated with that. Then there are patterns of behaviour, a common enough term used in psychology, for example. And we have the pieces that make up the pattern along with the notions required to construct a functional garment. Lastly there is the machinery, a development of the modern era, which helps to make the whole process manageable with ease.

As I started to explore culture the cloak, as a specifically constructed garment, sprang to mind. The cloak may well be a useful representation for the way in which dominant group members tend to favour national labels such as ‘New Zealander’ and ‘Kiwi’ rather than a more specific cultural label such as Pākehā. The cloak, then, as New Zealander, calling up the notion of ‘one people’ covers up the layers of ethnic and cultural identities that lie beneath. The cloak, as used by the fictional Harry Potter (Rowling, 1997) can also render the object below or underneath it invisible. In this thesis the task is to some extent, to examine the cloak itself and the patterns and pieces that make it up but more importantly it is to look beneath the cloak to unveil the pieces of the patterns, the notions and machinery that will mark some of the cultural practices of the dominant group in Aotearoa.

The cloak of Pākehā culture in this thesis has two different strands of thread running through its structure. The first strand is the process of recognising and marking the dominant collective culture. The second is explaining a changing and ‘aspirational’ cultural identification by members of the dominant group<sup>8</sup>. These two strands thread through the thesis particularly in the theorising of how a group comes to recognise their culture. In this study I have primarily focussed on culture and will only refer to the related concepts of race and ethnicity where necessary for clarity.

---

<sup>8</sup> Nairn & Nairn personal conversation, 2008

## **Treaty People**

In this thesis, rather than analysing everyday talk about Pākehā culture, such as that which might appear in media stories, I have initiated storytelling and discussion about Pākehā identity and culture with a specific network of people, who are already conscientized (Freire, 1996/1970) to Pākehā culture. In other words they have developed discourses about their culture and the place of that culture in the wider society of New Zealand (Huygens, 2007). Working on the assumption that culture is shared or collective identity, I was interested in the way in which participants would pitch their own stories about being Pākehā (or their cultural identity if not Pākehā) to a network of peers. What commonalities and what differences or divergences would emerge? The collective aspect of data collection proved to be a dynamic, stimulating and exciting process.

The re-emergence of the Treaty of Waitangi onto the Pākehā political landscape of Aotearoa from the 1970s had, for many Pākehā, the unexpected side effect of being an introduction to recognising their culture. Māori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand, had by the 1970s, as I outline in chapter two, embarked on a process of cultural revitalisation and a quest for justice with a regard to the 1840 settlement agreement, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which from its inception was largely disregarded by successive Pākehā governments and institutions (Awatere, 1984; Belich, 2001; Bell, 2004; Orange, 1987; Walker, 2004; Ward, 1995/1973). New Zealand history was taught in New Zealand schools and universities prior to the 1980s, but usually from a very mono-cultural perspective (Bishop & Glynn, 1999) and rarely examined the place of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Pākehā Treaty networks were established through community groups such as Project/Network Waitangi or with church networks such as the National Council of Churches Programme on Racism (M. Nairn, 2002). They were set up in response to Māori challenges for Pākehā to learn more about their own history and practices and to do something about the injustices Māori had experienced through Pākehā settlement processes (Huygens, 2007).

Treaty people are activist educators who have learned about and gone on to be socially active and to organise and facilitate workshops and training courses, and to develop resources to educate people about the Treaty of Waitangi. I have been involved in these Treaty networks at various times and in different places since the 1980s and carry the dual role of being participant and researcher in both this project and my earlier Masters research (Black, 1997). In gathering material for this study I invited a group of people involved in these Treaty of Waitangi networks, most of whom identify as Pākehā, to talk about themselves as cultural.

During the 1980s Treaty workshop facilitators, noticed that having little or no sense of their own culture was an obstacle in discussions about relationships with Māori and Treaty of Waitangi issues. It was very difficult to argue for the recognition of Māori culture when the facilitators of these discussions had little experience of recognising and talking about their own culture. The sense of cultural deficit, or lack of recognition that we are all members of a cultural group, reinforced a general public perception that Māori were being privileged in discussions about the Treaty. This in turn produced a good deal of tension about, and resistance to, the acceptance of the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis for establishing just intercultural relationships. From the mid 1980s, discussions about Pākehā and Pākehā culture were incorporated in many Treaty workshops. It was from these beginnings of talking about Pākehā culture that the recognition of Pākehā culture has developed.

Over many years, those involved in Treaty networks have developed a social and political understanding of the position of dominance that Pākehā hold in Aotearoa and tend to approach the discussion of their cultural position from a critical perspective (Huygens, 2007). It is this perspective that has enabled them to turn the cultural gaze on to their own experience whereas it is much more common for members of a dominant group or powerful group to "... think of themselves as meta-cultural, as free of interest or bias, neutrally acting for the public good and beyond the need for critical scrutiny" (McCreanor, 2005, p. 53).

### **My story about being Pākehā**

There have been a series of events and encounters over many years that have sparked my interest in studying Pākehā culture. I begin with a story of shame. In my early teens one of my brother's friends, Stephen, who would have been about 12 years old, drowned while swimming in the local Ōreti River. It was a river we all swam in as kids, but Stephen was not a local, and he was Māori, a somewhat novel identity in rural Southland in the 1960s. One of the things I remember an elderly relative said in reaction to this drowning was 'thank goodness it wasn't one of our boys'. I think it was the first time I was made aware that Māori were not only regarded as different from 'us', they were somehow regarded as less than - both inferior and dispensable. I was shocked and upset with Stephen's drowning and felt angered by my elderly relative's comments which I now think lit a fire in my belly about the injustice of racism.

My move in 1971 as a 17 year old to Teachers College in Christchurch created a sense of cultural displacement from the familiar rural Southland landscape and the Catholic family and community upbringing I had enjoyed. Both my parents grew up in Southland and were primary school teachers. I was their second child and daughter with four younger brothers. My paternal grandfather lived with us for many years and my maternal grandmother and lots of relatives lived nearby. My parents were involved in many social and community activities and we all played, listened to and watched various sports. We lived on 20 acres of land, and with friendly neighbours, had lots of wide open spaces to roam in and explore.

In Christchurch I joined the local Catholic Church parish group of the Young Christian Workers movement (YCW) and through that group I was introduced to a world view of critiquing social injustice from within the already familiar Catholic Church, albeit a radical branch. The YCW, like its predecessor, the Catholic Youth Movement (CYM) was based on the method of “See-Judge-Act” which, according to Robert Consedine, gave the “tools, focus and analysis to begin to understand the world in the light of gospel values” (R. Consedine & Consedine, 2001/2005, p. 36). I learned about issues of social injustice and inequality by being involved in collective social action, listening and participating in discussions about the issues of concern and learning more about the detail and actual accounts of social injustice as I went along.

In the YCW group we debated the issues of the day and volunteered in organisations such as CORSO, a New Zealand based aid organisation. Many of us became involved in the anti-racism group Halt All Racist Tours (HART) and although I moved to a number of different places over the next few years I maintained links with people involved in these three social justice networks. I worked in the Auckland office of CORSO during the mid 1970s and was active in both HART and the Citizens Association for Racial Equality (CARE).

The recognition that ‘Pākehā’ was a very different culture to Māori came to me when living in the Bay of Islands town of Moerewa in the late 1970s with my then husband and two small children. That recognition spurred a different journey. Before that, I had met Māori people, and knew about some of the land issues, but most interactions were fleeting. The difference in Moerewa was that the interactions with Māori were everyday occurrences whether they were at the rugby league club where I played netball, the school or Playcentre with other parents of pre-schoolers, in the town shopping, or at social events. Even although I was a new Playcentre mother I immediately got involved with the committee and became the treasurer since I had the confidence to carry out the

tasks involved in this role. In hindsight, I realise that this was a very Pākehā thing to do and while my good intentions were to do well for the Playcentre, I did not question my role in a position of power. I was reminded of my cultural difference at times, though. In the netball team, I was jokingly described as the cream in the chocolate cake (I have blonde hair and fair Irish skin).

We moved to Tauranga in April 1981 and joined the local HART group. I was actively involved in many of the anti-Springbok rugby tour protests during 1981, although I stayed in Tauranga to play netball rather than join the protest on that momentous day in Hamilton when the protestors breached the fence and held their ground on the centre of the pitch preventing the game. Following that 1981 tour a small group of us in Tauranga, as did people in other centres, picked up and started to work with the challenges from Māori about racism and Treaty issues in Aotearoa. As we set about educating ourselves and facilitating workshops about the Treaty of Waitangi, our sense of not having a culture was exposed, both within our group of anti-racism people, and in ‘Treaty’ workshops with participants. We lacked understanding of our own cultural positions and a language to describe who we were. Our sense of not having a culture often resulted in intense arguments about, for example, Māori having a culture and us not having one. We did not know how to relate the concepts of culture to our own experiences of being part of the dominant group in Aotearoa.

Our local Tauranga anti-racism and Treaty group ran a workshop for ourselves on Pākehā culture. In tried and true adult education praxis we started a brainstorming session with large sheets of blank white newsprint, plenty of pens and a long and uncomfortable period of silence. Gradually, as the silence broke and we began filling up the newsprint with aspects of Pākehā culture, there was a marked sense of energy and excitement in the room. We were beginning to expose and explore our own cultural patterns and to debate various aspects of our own culture.

Our local experience of exploring Pākehā culture was also occurring in other anti-racism and Treaty groups in Aotearoa, and became an integral aspect of Treaty education (Huygens, 2007; Margaret, 2002). Project Waitangi developed a kit on Pākehā Culture (Mansell, Tremewan, Packman, & Thompson, 1985) for use in schools and community groups as a tool to get Pākehā to recognise and ‘mark’ their culture. Resources like the Pākehā Culture kit were very useful conversation starters as in general Pākehā had little or no experience to draw on to describe themselves as cultural.

The publication of Michael King's (1985) *Being Pākehā* had a significant impact in mainstream Aotearoa. This was the first time most Pākehā had access to a written version of what it might look like to call ourselves Pākehā. The notion of being Pākehā became a topic of conversation and at times was hotly debated in the media and round the dinner tables. It was through King's writing that I was able to 'recognise' aspects of Pākehā culture, in particular that his experiences of being Irish and Catholic in New Zealand had a great deal of synchronicity with my own heritage.

In 1994, having completed a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Psychology, I was accepted into the Post Graduate Diploma in Community Psychology at the University of Waikato. I felt like I had found in Community Psychology a place where I could develop academically my interests in social justice and the dynamics of culture and power in societies which were stimulated by my involvement in international aid and development, anti-racist and feminist groups. I became a member of the New Zealand Psychological Society's National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues (NSCBI), in 1994 following a student evaluation project where we (Black, Goodwin, & Smith, 1995) evaluated the bicultural development of the New Psychological Society Annual Conference 1994. My masters thesis research (Black, 1997) was an exploration of Pākehā culture. I carried out in-depth individual interviews based on a series of open ended questions, with seven people who were involved with Treaty work, and had developed ways of talking about and working with Pākehā culture. It was a considerable challenge to carry out a piece of research that was in effect part of my own search to understand my cultural identity as Pākehā, although it did open up many opportunities to talk about Pākehā culture and what it might mean.

The next major research influence was my involvement as the project researcher in the bicultural *Mental Health Narratives Project* (Lapsley, Nikora, & Black, 2002). Through this project I was introduced to social constructionist and narrative research. One of the challenges for me in this research was how to tell the 'Non-Māori' cultural stories. It seemed obvious to analyse and write up the contributions from Māori participants as 'Māori' stories but that was only one part of this explicitly bicultural project. I embarked on my own research project, with the permission of the principal researchers and that of the participants, to analyse the non-Māori women's stories for themes and discourses that could be 'marks' of Pākehā culture. This proved to be a difficult task as there were a small number of women's stories, told in a different frame of reference, and the women had a diverse array of cultural identities. While they all lived in Aotearoa at the time of the research some had been born overseas and large parts



of their narratives were not located in Aotearoa. I began to feel like I was torturing the material in my efforts to explicate some cultural patterns that were not very obvious or easy to justify.

As I was working with the women's narratives, I began to think about the concept of culture as a collective or group identity and about how I could go about exploring Pākehā cultural identity in a group context. With a growing understanding of the importance of language in the tenets of social constructionism I set about designing this doctoral research project incorporating the flexible focus group method (Wilkinson, 2003).

### **Contributing to a decolonisation agenda**

Recognising culture for members of dominant groups is an important aspect of the process of decolonisation (M. Nairn, 2002a) as it provides a language to recognise the cultural power of the coloniser and the colonised. I have undertaken this study of Pākehā culture with the intention of adding to the body of critical community and social psychological research which supports a decolonisation agenda.

*Decolonisation, once viewed as the formal process of handing over the instruments of government, is now recognised as a long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power (L. T. Smith, 1999, p. 98).*

The recognition cultural heritage and cultural practices, particularly for members of the coloniser group, is an imperative part of the process. In laying out the central concepts and theories that I am drawing on for this thesis, I intend to focus on the work of psychologists in the areas of social constructionism, dominance, culture and decolonisation.

This work is part of the Pākehā agenda of decolonisation. That agenda was set in the early 1970s by groups such as the Auckland Committee on Racial Discrimination (ACORD) and a little later by New Perspectives on Race (NPR), which shifted an earlier focus on racism overseas to issues of racism in Aotearoa. Susan da Silva (2002/1994) attributes this shift in focus to the teaching of Paulo Freire during a visit to Aotearoa in the early 1970s where he talked about the "... co-intentional tasks of decolonisation" (da Silva, 2002/1994, p. 49). Da Silva, in reporting on Freire's visit, described how he pointed out that the oppressors and the oppressed had different needs and tasks and by developing theory and practice, a process described as praxis, "... they need to develop different but co-intentional processes of education and action" (2002/1994, p. 49). It was crucial

for the oppressor group to consult and sometimes action would be carried out jointly.

Having a sense of cultural recognition does not necessarily lead to socially just and peaceful relationships in a society. Some of the worst atrocities in the world are committed by one cultural group fighting another, whether the fighting is about underlying power, territory, religious or ethnic differences. One of the points of difference in examining cultural recognition within a Treaty framework is the desire by participants to have a level of self awareness that leads to their quest for justice in society. “In decolonisation work, it is crucial to endorse the unique status of indigenous peoples while working with the complex histories and rightful claims of numerous cultural groups” (Glover, Dudgeon, & Huygens, 2005, p. 341). The opportunity to discuss one’s culture, with a network of peers in a framework of social justice and action, may provide some rather specific constructions of that culture. However, what is important in this research project is the way in which the sharing of personal stories of cultural recognition is informed by the experiences of being social activists and educators.

### **An outline of the thesis**

I now provide an outline of the remaining chapters in this study.

#### *Chapter 2 – Concepts of culture, marking and Pākehā*

This chapter focuses on a review of the literature on firstly the concepts of culture and how concepts of culture are closely related to those of identity, race and ethnicity. I examine the ways culture is approached in psychology and the social sciences and explain the particular approach I have taken to culture. Outlining a rationale for ways in which culture is ‘marked’ and named is pertinent to this thesis which will then lead into the particular ways in which Pākehā culture is marked. The final section of this chapter considers the literature on how Pākehā have engaged in intercultural relationships in Aotearoa.

#### *Chapter 3- The socio-political context of culture: Colony, race and nation*

This chapter considers some of the literature that traces the largely British colonial journey in Aotearoa placing it alongside that of settler colonies elsewhere. I trace how early settler beliefs in assimilation and actions such as the acquisition of land by any means possible have impacted on the way in which current intercultural relationships are carried out in Aotearoa. I examine the colonial legacy of superiority, power and domination that operates to obscure the settlers’ recognition of their culture and has supported beliefs about New Zealand having the best race relations in the colonial world. To finish the chapter I consider the literature which focuses on strategies of decolonisation.

#### *Chapter 4 – Philosophical and theoretical stakes in the ground*

The social constructionist paradigm is the guiding philosophical base for this thesis. In the first instance the turn to language is outlined. This is followed by discussion of key assumptions underpinning social constructionism: approaching taken-for-granted-knowledge with a critical stance; understanding knowledge as having historical and cultural specificity; accepting that knowledge is constructed through people's daily interactions and is sustained by social processes; and finally that knowledge and social action are bound together in relations of power. I describe a community and critical psychology perspective, before discussing the specific methodological approaches adopted for this work. These include: revealing group processes of identity construction through narratives; dominant discourses and thematic analyses.

#### *Chapter 5 – People and procedures*

This chapter explains the design of the research. I outline the various positions and voices in the research which will include the researcher positionings and ethics and the contributions that have enabled the project to come to fruition. The chapter then introduces Treaty people and doing research with them, the data gathering procedures and some of the cultural and ethnic identity labels they used. Finally I describe how I worked with the data.

#### *Chapter 6 – Treaty People talk about symbols of New Zealand*

This chapter draws on the way participants discussed some aspects of New Zealand life with a particular focus on the impact the close ties with Britain have had on the formation of nation and culture. I discuss the ways in which there has been a transition from earlier generations of New Zealanders considering Britain as home to more recent generations firmly locating themselves in New Zealand as home. In the next three chapters I explore the ways Treaty people recognise themselves as having a culture in their New Zealand home.

#### *Chapter 7 – Treaty People recognise being cultural*

As a means of analysing the data I have set out a staged approach to the process of recognising a culture but in reality it is a dynamic process that is difficult to capture in the linear logic of written English. In the first of two sections in this chapter, I consider the way that Treaty people, who are conscientized about recognising themselves as cultural, have talked about seeing themselves as normal members of the 'culture defining' dominant group and the privileges they recognise from being in that group. Along with privilege there is recognition of who is included and who is marked out as culturally different. In the second

section two of the key features for Treaty people in recognising their culture: the Pākehā –Māori relationship and Te Tiriti o Waitangi, are explored.

*Chapter 8 – Treaty people recognise being Pākehā*

Yes, I'm Pākehā

This chapter examines the way in which participants talk about the meanings they place on being culturally Pākehā and some of the ways in which they talk about belonging in Aotearoa.

*Chapter 9 – Treaty people talk about Pākehā cultural values*

Having established themselves as Pākehā in the fourth data analysis chapter I now consider some of the ways in which the participants recognise and mark core values of Pākehā as the dominant group culture. These values coalesce under the headings of egalitarianism, assimilation, superiority and the combination of individuality and independence.

*Chapter 10 – Marking Pākehā culture as a decolonisation strategy*

In this the final chapter I give a summary of chapters, then step away from the analysis of the participants stories and discuss some of the themes of the study which include: Intentionally recognising Pākehā culture; the constitutive nature of culture and the importance of occupying a cultural space. To bring the study to a close I offer some reflections on the study, discuss the contribution this study makes, and some of the implications of this study for psychologists. A reflexive coda, which explores my own journey through this study, with a focus on how I worked with the dual positions of researcher and participant in both Treaty networks and the dominant group, ends this study.



# Chapter Two

## Concepts of Culture, Marking and Pākehā

*Culture, with its processes and functions, is a subject upon which we need all the enlightenment we can achieve (Benedict, 1935, p. 14).*

My starting premise for this study was that members of a dominant group have little or no need to see and understand themselves as cultural. I contend that Pākehā culture, the culture of the dominant group in Aotearoa, is so closely entwined with that of the nation, that it is understood by members of that group as the normal way of being rather than being considered as a culture (Pearson, 1990). From the outset of this research it has been my intention to mark what is cultural about the way in which Pākehā live and think of themselves as members of a dominant group. In this chapter I introduce concepts of culture and the closely related concepts of nation, race and ethnicity relevant to the situation of Pākehā in Aotearoa and offer a critical examination of the literature.

Culture is a complex concept to work with and the international body of literature about culture is enormous. There are many different philosophical approaches to culture included in disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, psychology, and cultural studies. This might be expected given that culture is such an all-encompassing dimension of humanity. Anthropologist Margaret Mead indicated the wide-ranging elements of culture.

*[Culture] covers not only the arts and sciences, religions and philosophies, to which the word "culture" has historically applied, but also the system of technology, the political practices, the small intimate habits of daily life, such as the way of preparing or eating food, or of hushing a child to sleep, as well as the method of electing a prime minister or changing the constitution (1955, pp. 12-13).*

I am primarily interested in how members of colonising dominant groups recognise their own culture and have therefore drawn on the literature resources that are relevant in considering the position of Pākehā as a cultural group. This interest leads me to consider the following questions. If culture is so all encompassing, why then is the recognition of culture and sense of belonging to a cultural group so very absent for members of dominant cultural groups? How is it that the cultural practices of one group can become so “normal” and so taken for granted that they are invisible to the members of that group? With these questions in mind, I take a critical approach to culture and the way in which it is

studied primarily in psychology and other social sciences. I also take into consideration the understanding of culture that has been gained through examining a much wider inter-disciplinary source of literature.

In the first section some general concepts of culture are introduced. Approaches in the social sciences, primarily psychology are briefly outlined followed by a discussion about the inter-related concepts of ethnicity, race and nation; and issues of cultural identity and culture are raised. I then set out to examine three concepts of culture that inform this study. These concepts are formed around the notions of a) having a culture; b) how we do culture; and c) culture as structure. I conclude by explaining the way in which I use culture in this study.

I go on to explore some of the ways in which, notions of Pākehā culture have been recognised in the latter half of the last century, and the extent to which 'Pākehā' has become 'our' term. Belich noted that:

*By 2000, an identity crisis had developed among Pākehā. While Māori were becoming increasingly assertive and other ethnicities were more prominent, too, some people are hard put to say what Pākehā culture is, or even if there is any (2001, p. 425).*

Pākehā New Zealanders are being challenged by the increasing assertiveness of Māori to examine the position of dominance they maintain in Aotearoa and what it means to be cultural. I consider some of the literature about Pākehā culture particularly related to aspects of how Pākehā culture is marked, the meanings applied to Pākehā and some of the research about Pākehā in relationships, primarily with Māori.

## **Concepts of culture**

Culture can be understood as the way in which a group of people live together: the way they socialise; the food they grow, prepare, and eat; the location – geography, climate, community, and neighbourhood in which they live; the work that is available and who does different forms of work; the systems of law, education and religion; and the beliefs and ways of thinking about the world they live in and the world outside (Adams & Markus, 2001; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Brislin, 1993; Carr, 2003; Kidd, 2002; Mead, 1955; Novitz & Willmott, 1989; Rosaldo, 1993; D R Thomas, 1986). The Waitangi Consultancy Group (Steele, 1996, p. 7) defines culture in a manner encompassing most of the elements related to this study:

*Culture is what holds a community together, giving a common framework of meaning. It includes how people communicate with each other, how we make decisions, how we structure our families and who we think is important. It*

*expresses our values towards land and time and our attitudes towards work and play, good and evil, reward and punishment.*

*Culture is preserved in language, symbols and customs; and celebrated in art, music, drama, literature, religion and social gatherings. It constitutes the collective memory of the people and the collective heritage which will be handed down to future generations.*

Culture is absorbed as part of the way in which people live their lives in a group. As human beings we are born into a world of cultures. Culture is the milieu in which families and communities live with the beliefs and customs which are passed along through generations and interact with present social practices. In past centuries culture tended to be understood as the way in which quite small groups of people lived – perhaps at village level and, in larger centres, the way in which people in neighbourhoods lived (A. D. Smith, 1986). For example, there are specific cultural practices associated with religious beliefs and it was not uncommon to find people grouping together with those who had these same beliefs.

Culture informs the daily lives of people. Culture is the framework for how people live their lives or come to understand the world about them. Ruth Benedict considered that the role of cultural customs needed to be understood in order to overcome social problems. At the same time she recognised that the main difficulty in the study of cultural customs in 1930s America was that:

*Custom did not challenge the attention of social theorists because it was the very stuff of their own thinking: it was the lens without which they could not see at all (Benedict, 1935, p. 7).*

It could be argued that little progress has been made since in understanding cultural customs, particularly for members of dominant groups, whether in America or for Pākehā in New Zealand.

I have observed that people have a tendency to draw on the cultural frameworks of childhood and family life as a starting point to make sense of the cultural world they live in (Huygens, Black, & Hamerton, 2003; McKinney, 2005). In recent years, people, mainly from wealthy nations, have the privilege of being able to travel throughout the world and to experience different places, peoples and ways of living. Travel beyond the familiar, and interaction with people who are culturally different may provide an opportunity for travellers to reflect on their own cultural and national experiences. The emphasis placed on national identity (Billig, 1995) with the growth of nations over the last 50 years, has to some extent subsumed cultural groups, whether dominant or minority.



## Culture in psychology and the social sciences

Psychologists over the years have taken a number of different approaches to culture. Perhaps the most common approach has been to ignore culture as an integral variable in the way in which all people, including psychologists, live their lives. Wundt, who set up the first experimental psychology laboratory in Germany in 1879, firmly believed that the study of culture as collective phenomena formed the basis of social psychology (Vaughan & Hogg, 2002). However, as the experimental arm of psychology gained in importance, particularly in the United States, Wundt's desire to include culture as a variable was largely ignored. In more recent years as psychologists have moved to re-emphasise the 'social' aspects in the study of social psychology, that the study of culture has come into prominence. Kenneth Gergen, for example, pointed out in a challenging analysis of the scientific basis of social psychology that

*Most social psychological research focuses on minute segments of ongoing processes. We have concentrated very little on the function of these segments within their historical context (1973, p. 319).*

While Gergen referred to the historical context in his paper, it did open up a debate within social psychology about the influence of cultural and identity contexts on human behaviour. Questions that renewed a cultural focus such as 'what is social about social psychology?' were being asked and new paradigms were being introduced. The development of theories of social constructionism (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1994/1982); examining the 'subject' (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984); and the focus on language and discourses (Billig, 1996; Burman & Parker, 1993; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell & Potter, 1992), burgeoned and opened up new avenues of both general and cultural research in psychology. The way in which both individuals and groupings of people in cultures, along with the interplay of race, culture, ethnicity and the formation of nations, are now significant areas of concern and research for psychologists.

## Culture, ethnicity, race and nation

Understanding the collective processes of groups of people are discussed and theorised, at least in a Western world context, through theories and debates about the concepts of culture, ethnicity, race and nation. In this study I have focused on the ways in which Pākehā construct themselves as cultural and are in turn constructed as a cultural group. However, it is imperative that I locate this focus on culture within the broader concepts and practices of ethnicity, race and nation.

An ethnic group, according to Anthony Smith (1986), includes a collective name; a common myth of descent; a shared history; a distinctive shared culture; an

association with a specific territory; and a sense of solidarity. Smith suggested that

*if a group of people feel they are a community, because of shared memories and an association with a territory or a myth of shared ancestry, it will not prove impossible to find a name, extend their solidarity and gradually formulate their own culture (based on separate religion, or customs, or language, or institutions or colour), so as to become an ethnîe in the full sense of the term (1986, p.31).*

To describe Pākehā as an ethnic group, in line with Smith's definition above I suggest is an aspiration and a concept open for ongoing debate.

The notion that Pākehā was an ethnicity was hotly debated during the 1980s and 1990s as Non- Māori people were challenged to take responsibility for their part in the colonisation of Aotearoa (A. Bell, 1996; King, 1985; Pearson, 1989; Pearson & Sissons, 1997; Spoonley, 1986; Spoonley, Macpherson, Pearson, & Sedgwick, 1984). As debates about Pākehā continue in Aotearoa at this stage I do not consider that there is a high enough degree of consensus to argue that Pākehā is an ethnic group.

Therefore, I have placed my study as a contribution towards the formulation of Pākehā as a cultural group, but do not exclude the possibility of Pākehā becoming an ethnic group as we grow in an understanding of our common descent, shared history, cultural practices in Aotearoa, and come to an agreement about what to call ourselves.

Any recognition of Pākehā as a cultural group is, through the context of colonisation, inflected with the notions of race and white superiority that were prevalent through Great Britain and Europe during the 18<sup>th</sup> Century period of expansion into 'new territories' such as America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The argument that groups of people throughout the world were made up of different species of human beings, based on physical characteristics such as skin colour, was brought into question by, for example, Charles Darwin, and finally put to rest in statements issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (Montagu, 1972). According to Montagu (1972, p. 10), "for all practical social purposes "race" is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth".

The social practices of groups based on the myth of race have, however, created an enormous amount of harm to human beings. Differences in skin colour between people in many situations may invoke any number of stereotypical statements about groups of people based on their appearance. The inclusion of the descriptor 'white' along with people of British or European descent is not

uncommon in discussion and descriptions of Pākehā people and culture (Pearson, 1989).

Race talk will be considered as one of the factors influencing discussions about Pākehā culture throughout this study as it is still prevalent in the everyday language of how people recognise and categorise each other in New Zealand society (McCreanor, 1997; R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1991; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

Nations have been theorised by Benedict Anderson (1996) as imagined communities, in the sense that it is impossible for all members of a 'nation state' to know each other. Yet through the processes of government with services such as Military, Police and Customs; registers of births, deaths and marriages; symbols of nationhood such as flags, national anthems, and passports; along with ceremonies such as welcomes to citizenship, medal presentations at Commonwealth and Olympic games the nation is frequently 'flagged'.

These occasions of flagging, described by Michael Billig (1995) as 'banal' representations of nationhood, usually happened below the radar. The nation is flagged in ways that do not always register in the consciousness of the populace but none the less act to promote it. Members of the dominant group in a nation state very often express their national identity first and foremost. They have little need in their daily lives to differentiate themselves from that identity. Their sense of culture is so closely related to that of the nation that they do not experience a need to differentiate as cultural.

In a homogenous nation state a national and cultural identity may well be considered as one and the same. Aotearoa, however, was founded on a bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā as signified in Te Tiriti o Waitangi and has many different cultural groups living within the boundaries of the nation. Just as culture is intertwined with the concepts of race and ethnicity, it is also closely associated with any discussion of nation and practices of nationhood.

In this study I argue that the diversity of cultural groups should not be replaced by the unitary concept of nationality. However, cultural groups are positioned within the boundaries of a nation state and both influence the policies and practices of a nation and are in turn influenced by them. The socio-political context of Pākehā culture and the relationship with the nation is discussed more fully in the next chapter.

## Cultural identity and culture

An important aspect in any study of culture is considering how people identify with their culture. Culture is the social context in which the personal or group sense of identity is recognised. Culture and cultural identity are inextricably linked and based on collective enterprise, as Anthony Smith explained.

*The need for identification with a community in order to achieve individual identity and self-respect, is in part a function of socialization experiences in the historic culture-community; and the modes and goals of identification are given by the group and its past experiences as they coalesce into a collective 'tradition' (1986, p. 14).*

At an individual level, people are born into a cultural world and their identity develops within the cultural patterns of that world. According to Ruth Benedict,

*The life-history of the individual is first and foremost an accommodation to the patterns and standards traditionally handed down in his [sic] community. From the moment of his birth the customs into which he is born shape his experience and behaviour. By the time he can talk, he is the little creature of his culture, and by the time he is grown and able to take part in activities, its habits are his habits, its beliefs his beliefs, its impossibilities his impossibilities (1935, p. 2).*

Cultural identities are, however, mediated by various social contexts, environments and diverse cultural influences. In contrast to the more traditional essentialist approach (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dansen, 2002), where identity is regarded as fixed and emanating from within the person, Stuart Hall (1996) argued for taking a 'strategic and positional' approach to the concept of identities.

*Identities are never unified and, in late modern times, are increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation. ... Actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves (p.4).*

People have multiple identity positions that are claimed variously depending on context, situation and intention. Cultural identity positions are very often only partially self-ascribed in that who a person might think they are is not necessarily how other people see them and may not represent fully their ethnic/cultural heritage. For example, there is seldom space for people of mixed ethnic/cultural heritage to claim all of their traditions and identity positions at the same time. The practices used by dominant group institutions/members typically insist that anybody of mixed ethnic heritage is positioned in the non-dominant group (Campbell, 2005; Moeke-Maxwell, 2003). Strategies such as name calling with put down or derogatory phrases may be used, whether intentionally or

unintentionally, to hinder those of mixed ethnicity from being accepted as members of a dominant group.

While members of dominant groups may not recognise the cultural aspects of their identity, at the same time they fill up the 'centre' (Moreton-Robinson, 1999) of cultural and institutional spaces, thus creating precarious positions for many indigenous peoples. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, in talking about the position of Māori, and the need to 'recentre' indigenous identities said:

*People now live in a world which is fragmented with multiple and shifting identities, that the oppressed and the colonized are so deeply implicated in their own oppressions that they are no more or less authentic than anyone else (1999, p. 97).*

The acknowledgement of colonisation and the resurgence of debate about Māori culture and identity directly influenced my desire to explore Pākehā culture. As Freire (1996/1970) pointed out the oppressor seeks understanding of the conditions of oppression, and possibly change, at the instigation of the oppressed.

Identities can offer a position of inclusion and point of attachment, on the one hand, while also being points of exclusion and marginalisation. Stuart Hall theorised that identities are

*... constructed through, not outside, difference. ... it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its constitutive outside that the 'positive' meaning of any term – and thus its 'identity' – can be constructed (1996, p. 4).*

Hall also refers to the act of power which is invoked through the process of exclusion of the other. Power is enacted, according to Laclau (cited in Hall, 1996) where, for example, in black-white relationships, white is treated as equivalent to 'human being' and thus left unmarked whereas 'black' in contrast, is a marked term. While the notion of marking is discussed more fully later in the chapter at this point I give an example of the way in which the cultural identities of academics tend to be left unmarked in many publications where culture is the main topic of discussion.

### *Culture obscured*

I have observed that very often when academics do approach the study of culture, they seldom state their own cultural context. Academics seem to follow a custom of not naming, let alone discussing, their own cultural identity and positioning, even when they are discussing the culture of others as I observed in a scan of the biographical sections of these referenced texts (Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001; Berry et al., 2002; Hall & du Gay, 1996; McKay, 1999; Moreton-Robinson, 2004b; Ratner, 2008). This omission suggests three possibilities: a) that they are writing from a position of presumed neutrality,

where their own cultural position overlaps so completely with the ‘reality’ of the world they experience that it is invisible to them and becomes so taken for granted as normal and therefore banal (Billig, 1995), that it is not even worth mentioning in the context of doing cultural research; b) that one’s cultural identity is regarded as so private that it is not to be named; or c) it is not an accepted convention in Western academic practice. A fourth possibility was suggested by Cowlishaw “There is the fear of having one’s racial identity named, that is, being positioned as being a specific rather than universal intellectual” (2004, p. 67). Often the only hint to any cultural context is in the descriptions of authors where they state their University connections which may indicate the country the author has written from. I suggest that this practice of not stating a cultural context serves to normalise the position of the author/academic and ‘other’ the cultures they are writing about.

There are a few exceptions to the practice of not stating one’s cultural context. In his book *Cultures, communities, competence and change: a transcultural ethnic validity perspective*, Forrest Tyler (2001, p. vii) wrote

*I was born, socialized, and educated as a psychologist in the United States in the second quarter of the twentieth century. It is my view that all of these factors have contributed to the continuing development of my psychological beliefs and my ways of thinking and functioning throughout my life.*

Margaret Wetherell, in outlining research with Pākehā (white New Zealanders), said

*... one of us (M.W.) is a former member of this culture, and this membership not only explains our focus but was used as a central resource in our research (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 3).*

Two things stand out in these descriptions of cultural context. In the first Tyler, while stating his cultural context, does not name his culture. In the second, Wetherell’s description of being “a former member of this culture” raises questions about the possibility of either vacating a cultural identity or perhaps adopting plural and/or hybrid cultural identities. One is left wondering how she might describe her current cultural identity if being Pākehā was a “former” identity position.

Clearer descriptions of cultural naming were found in James Ritchie’s (1992) *Becoming bicultural* where he is both named as, and in turn names himself, as Pākehā. In the foreword Ritchie is described by Sir Robert Te Kotahi Mahuta to be writing “... as a Pākehā to other Pākehā; but he knows that Māori will be reading and listening too” (p.1). This was followed by Ritchie who, after describing the delicious food available at the Friday night Wellington Māori Community Centre (Ngāti Poneke) dances at the end of the Second World War, said “... here was something a Pākehā boy from a working class suburb could

really get into” (p.14). Glen Colquhoun (1999), a writer from a generation younger than Ritchie, starts his book of poems by saying “My name is Glenn Colquhoun and I am Pākehā” (p.7). He then goes on to describe the cultural context of his family heritage and upbringing. There is no ambiguity in the cultural descriptions of either of these writers, and both are writing about relationships with Māori. Tim McCreanor (2005, p. 296), in his profile, also states that he is “a Pākehā social science researcher ...”. On the other hand, Gerald McGhie in the next profile to McCreanor writes that he was born in Dunedin but makes no further reference to his cultural identity, in a volume that is focussed on New Zealand identities (Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh, & Teaiwa, 2005).

The conflation of culture and nation is another way in which culture is obscured in psychology. Vaughan & Hogg, for example, when exploring the question of whether culture has been neglected in psychology, ask

*If you are an Australian or a New Zealander, which of these countries have you visited: Indonesia, Fiji, Japan, the United States, England or Italy? ... One of the first things that strike you in a foreign land is the different language, along with the appearance and dress of the local people (2002, p. 451).*

The inference here is that culture is located as a form of national identity, and is attached to other places, yet one does not need to travel outside of either Australia or New Zealand to observe cultural variations and differences, a point Vaughan & Hogg make later in the chapter.

## Having a culture

The notion of having a culture, that culture resides inside the person in the form of an essence that makes the person the way they are, is an essentialist view of culture (Burr, 2003). In terms of cultural identity, Hall (1996) refers to the essentialised view as the single self merging into the group with whom they share a history and ancestry in common. In this view, the cultural group acts to

*... stabilize, fix or guarantee an unchanging 'oneness' or cultural belongingness underlying all the other superficial differences (p.4).*

Adams & Markus (2004), extend the notion of culture to that of a group entity, which they argue is the prevailing conception of culture in psychology. In the entity view culture is conceived as “... a relatively ‘fixed’ system of ‘customary beliefs, social forms and material traits’, associated with a readily identifiable ‘racial, religious, or social group’” (p.339). The group entity approach to culture is reflected in the work of American psychologists Tyler, Broome and Williams (1991). They write that in America the majority group is so culturally dominant it is deemed to be the culture-defining group and “... the minority groups do not

define standards for the heterogeneous society, so they are non-culture-defining groups” (p.6). Membership to either of these groups is attributed and people are born into one group or another. They describe culture as

*... the representation of individuals' shared experiences with one another and of groups' shared experiences with other groups. To some extent cultures are dependent on one another for defining themselves and for enhancing their development and growth (1991, p. 9).*

The entity approach to culture has some undesirable consequences according to Adams and Markus (2004). These include the propensity to stereotype people into discrete categories; the notion of homogeneity in categories where there maybe an exaggeration of “... within-group similarity and between-group difference” (p.340); essentialism where groups are believed to share a ‘cultural essence’; and lastly, the materialization of a group from “... diffuse communities of people who share cultural patterns [marking them as] solid group entities who share cultural essence” (p.340).

The essentialist/entity view of culture is the view that I have been imbued with in my psychology training and it is one that I examine with some difficulty as it is what I would term my ‘received view’ of culture and at times it is my unwitting fall-back position. However, I am excited by the theorising of both structural and active views of culture that follow.

### Culture as structure

The work of renowned anthropologists Ruth Benedict (1935), who developed the notion of viewing culture as the everyday patterns in peoples’ lives, and her colleague Margaret Mead (1955, p. 12), who suggested that culture be recognised as a “... systematic and integrated whole”, indicate a structural approach to culture and the way in which it can be understood as inherited and transmitted. Mead is arguing that culture does not reside in the body as such but rather is learned through living with and sharing in the traditions and structures of a group of people. She described “culture” as an

*abstraction from the body of learned behaviour which a group of people who share the same tradition transmit entire to their children, and, in part, to adult immigrants who become members of the society (1955, p. 12).*

A connection between the acquisition of culture and language acquisition was made by Harvey Sacks who came to a similar conclusion to Mead. Sacks wondered how

*... any member encountering from his [sic] infancy a very small proportion of it [his or her culture], and a random portion in a way (the parents he happens to have, the experiences that he happens to have, the vocabulary that happens to be thrown at him in whatever sentences he happens to get) come out in many ways pretty much like everyone else, and able to deal with pretty much anyone else (Sacks, 1992, p. 485)*



Thinking about culture in this way led Sacks to conceptualise the acquisition of culture by applying the notion of ‘order at all points’ (p.484), where culture is present in the whole of the person and also in every fragment of who a person is and what they do and say. While Sacks viewed order and cultural rules as important resources of a culture, he did not agree with how they were understood to be used in the acquisition of cultural knowledge.

A more flexible patterned approach to culture was argued for by Adams & Markus (2001, 2004), where “... culture resides, not in group membership, but instead in the patterned worlds that are sometimes – although not always – associated with group membership” (2004, p. 341). Some features of the culture as patterns view are that culture includes both explicit and implicit or “... unrecognized patterns that are embedded in the structure of everyday life and need not coincide with explicit, cultural-group boundaries” (p.341). Both environmental and psychological forces have an impact on history and what gets selected in patterns of culture over time. Cultural patterns include both mental and material elements. In this way, culture is not just understood as a set of beliefs and values; it also includes the structures of everyday life. For example, Pākehā children are raised to be independent. One of the ways this independence is structurally supported is by living in houses that have a number of bedrooms so that from a young age, children sleep in a different room to their parents and often their siblings.

The concept of the ‘habitus’, the familiar, everyday, often taken for granted dispositions, practices and routines of the social world is the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1992), and is most informative when developing a structural approach to culture. The ‘habitus’ is a product of history which produces individual and collective practices. It is also generative in that:

*It ensures the active presence of past experiences, which, deposited in each organism in the form of schemes of perception, thought and action, tend to guarantee the ‘correctness’ of practices and their constancy over time, more reliably than all the formal rules and explicit norms (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 54).*

Bourdieu theorised that in structured societies where a dominant culture or class prevailed, people in that culture/class benefited from the cultural capital gained through the ‘habitus’ that they accrued from being in that class. The practices of ‘habitus’ operate on one level to perpetuate cultural dominance and at another level to signal members belonging to that group to others (Monk, Winslade, & Sinclair, 2008). Drawing on Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ Nick Crossley (2003, p. 43) described it as

*... both structured and structuring, a product and producer of social worlds, for example, captures both the embodied-performative aspect of social structures,*

*and the mechanism whereby they are transmitted across generations and through historical time.*

By applying the notion of habitus in this way, Crossley is signalling the move to the social constructionist approach to doing culture.

### Doing culture: Social constructionist approaches

Notions of culture, and the way in which we come to understand culture, are socially constructed, or “brought into being through particular historical and political dynamics” (Levine-Rasky, 2000, p. 273). It is not an entirely new idea that language is the medium through which culture is brought into being and recognised, although it has been theorised more fully in recent years. Ruth Benedict, in discussing John Dewey’s view of cultural customs noted that:

*... the part played by custom in shaping the behaviour of the individual as over and against any way in which he [sic] can affect traditional custom, is as the proportion of the total vocabulary of his mother tongue over against those words of his own baby talk that are taken up into the vernacular of his family (1935, p. 2).*

Culture is an active, ongoing process; it is constantly being produced and then verified by being reproduced within a set of cultural rules according to McHoul and Rapley (2001). They contend that to be human is to be cultural and “... to be in the world is always to be in the cultural world” (p.433). They draw on Sacks’ (1992) ‘order at all points’ view where culture is present in every situation of a person’s life and its application to understanding culture fits into the social constructionist paradigm and, more specifically, studies of language and the premises on which discourse analysis operates. McHoul and Rapley relate Sacks’ ‘order at all points’ theory to “the reflexive relation of producibility and recognizability as a condition for cultural action”. They explain this as follows:

*By ‘produce’ and ‘production’ we mean the ways in which cultural members go about constructing such things as insults, armchairs and death. By ‘recognize’ and ‘recognition’, we are not referring to a mental process; on the contrary, we mean the ways in which such members go about publicly co-producing them as insults, armchairs and death. Another way of putting this, using Garfinkel’s (1967) terminology, is to say that members’ cultural activities are ‘accountable’: that is, they are produced and recognized (co-produced) in ways that make them audibly and visibly (i.e. ‘accountably’) what they are, and not something else (McHoul & Rapley, 2001, p. 445).*

As I interpret it, the Sacksian position on culture, discussed by McHoul and Rapley (2001), is that a person’s cultural world is constructed through activities being produced and recognized reflexively, i.e. spontaneously and usually without question. An example of a cultural order (construction) that is both produced and recognised, therefore accountable, within Pākehā culture, especially in earlier pre-feminist generations, is the request ‘ladies, a plate’,

usually part of an invitation to attend an event of some sort. Helen May (1992, p. 273) described the image of Pākehā women's work in the 1970s.

*There persisted a popular image of a housewife as a busy person happily zooming around the house and children, tending to her little ones, devoting time to charitable causes and whipping up sponges for frequent "ladies a plate" occasions.*

On the plate would be home baking which Alexa Johnston (2008, p. 7) described as being

*Once upon a time the normal, rather than eccentric, response to the birth of a baby, the arrival of a new neighbour or a sudden bereavement, was to turn on the oven, bake something appropriate and drop over with a contribution to the affected household. Invitations to community social occasions, whether from church, school or sports club, generally bore the words 'Ladies, a plate' – a signal to the women guests to bring a contribution for a shared repast.*

Growing up in a Pākehā household where home cooking and baking was a prized and much enjoyed skill of my mother, grandmother and aunts and the 'ladies, a plate' request was commonplace, I did not know that there could be confusion about what it meant to 'bring a plate'. I just knew that it meant that the invited 'ladies' would bring with them a plate of home-made food suitable for the occasion. For women from other cultures, this request was a complete puzzle and anecdotally some have been known to turn up with just a plate. While the Pākehā women would not have labelled the 'ladies a plate' activity as cultural it was clearly recognised as such in that it was regarded as 'normal' within the group but not normal for people from different cultures. In fact, the normality of home cooking and the 'Ladies, a plate' tradition are further emphasised by Ray McVinnie in the forward to Johnston's book when he describes it as

*... an important book that records practical and cultural knowledge, but it also counters the antisocial idea that people no longer have time to cook. ... Throughout this fascinating book there is the consciousness that something as ephemeral as a recipe for an excellent cake or an irresistible biscuit carries tradition and significance that is to be celebrated, enjoyed and preserved (Johnston, 2008, p. 6).*

It is interesting to note that while both Johnston and McVinnie are drawing on cultural knowledge and practices, they do not name the culture, showing how the naturalness of a dominant cultural practice remains unmarked. It is also important to note that the underlying assumptions of many cultural practices in the lives of women such as 'ladies, a plate', were questioned and challenged by the 1970s second wave of feminism; that it was the 'ladies' role to cook for and bring the plate, was hotly contested by feminists, thus disrupting the previously taken-for-granted gendered practice.

In this study, I draw on these three conceptual understanding of culture, although my focus primarily has been on working with culture in the social constructionist

framework. In this framework culture in the act of being produced is, in effect, being reproduced and at each point there are possibilities for transformation as each production does not necessarily reproduce in the same context or way.

### Cultural markers

In developing the conceptual basis of culture for this thesis I have used the term ‘cultural marking’ akin to the process McHoul & Rapley (2001) describe as the “study of the material ways in which persons come to be producible and recognizable” as Pākehā. I used the term cultural markers in the earlier study (Black, 1997) as a means of denoting some of the more detailed ways in which Pākehā culture was represented by participants in their narratives of developing a cultural awareness. In that study I marked the following features of families as cultural.

- 1) Many Pākehā families have a [sense of] short lineage as a result of the discontinuity caused by migration.
- 2) Pākehā do search for family origins beyond Aotearoa.
- 3) While the nuclear family image is regarded as normal and ideal, in fact many people do not live in a traditional nuclear family setting.
- 4) Neither older nor younger people are well valued and respected in Pākehā society.

The concept of cultural marking was drawn from the work of anthropologists Chilla Bulbeck (1992), and Lisette Josephides (1995). Bulbeck discussed the ways in which roles of domination and subordination were maintained between the colonisers and the colonised through the use of markers.

*In colonial New Guinea the pidgin word line referred to a group of indigenous workers assembled or employed for certain tasks. [While once] ... the Papua New Guinean was required to stay in line ... [they] were 'marked as powerless through a variety of means, including naming, clothing, hairstyles, language and body marks' (Bulbeck, 1992, p. 165).*

Marking was so important that if a dress length of fabric was sold to a white woman, then none of the same material would be sold to Papuan women, thus maintaining differences in status.

According to Josephides, “... ‘cultural markers’ denote the formal and implicit distinctions made locally between the various domains of social life” (1995, p. 189). She pointed out that, in observations and analysis of the social life of cultural groups attention needed to be paid to the complexity of various roles and activities to avoid the reduction of cultural creativity within the group “... to the recreation of its most visible aspects, its privileged representations” (1995, p. 189). Quite different social patterns and meanings for women and men

surrounding the marriage ritual were observed in a Melanesian context. The complexity of social patterns may be represented, Josephides argued, by attending to particular cultural markers of a ritual event such as marriage and the ways in which they were interpreted differently by men and women. The alternative is to present a dominant view of cultural interpretation rather than a fine-grained analysis. The attention paid to various cultural markers and the different ways cultural markers can be interpreted allows a researcher to look beyond or beneath the presented or represented surface to explore the distinctions and diversity that are present in any social group.

If I combine the notion of culture being present at all points in the way that people carry out every aspect of their lives, (Sacks, 1992), with ‘habitus’ the small daily practices, (Bourdieu, 1992) then practices such as ‘ladies, a plate’ or the design of houses can be described and marked as culturally Pākehā. These are material and structural ways in which culture is recognised and verified through being produced and reproduced.

Factors such as reification are potentially difficult in any approach to marking and describing what is cultural even when one is careful not to draw the boundaries around the cultural group too tightly. None the less, in describing culture one is describing what is recognised as present in a group of people. Problems such as reification in the naming of culture can be mitigated by situating the analysis of a cultural group in historical and political relational contexts. This leads me into an examination in the next chapter of the concepts of colonisation and dominance in relation to the formation of dominant group Western cultures such as Pākehā.

### **Marking Pākehā Culture**

The notions that first, the dominant group of settler peoples in Aotearoa have a culture, and second that Pākehā is the name of that group, are frequently debated by New Zealanders and will be discussed. The term Pākehā has its origins in the early European settlement period of Aotearoa (Belich, 2001; Orange, 1987; Orsman, 1997). In chapter one I quoted Ranginui Walker’s description of Māori identity. From a Pākehā perspective, Avril Bell explains that the terms Māori and Pākehā

*only came into use to name and distinguish groups of people following contact between the hapu and iwi of Aotearoa and the European, Australian and American explorers, whalers, missionaries, traders, colonial administrators, military and settlers who began arriving following Captain James Cook’s voyage of 1769. Prior to that, Māori were identified in terms of their whanau, hapu and*

*iwi relationships and immigrants were identified by their countries of origin – predominantly England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland (2004, p. 4)*

That Māori and Pākehā are terms for heterogeneous groups of people was made clear in the explanations from Walker and Bell. While the term Pākehā has been used by Māori from the time of European arrival, it was largely rejected by most settlers who, by the 1860s when they had gained a position of dominance, took over the use of the term New Zealander to name themselves.

The use of New Zealander as the term of collective national identity for Pākehā remained largely unchallenged until the period which Belich described as the period of decolonisation, “broadly the years 1965-88, and more narrowly to 1973-85” (2001, p. 425). This period signalled the move from New Zealand’s reliance on Britain to becoming an independent state with its own standing on the world stage. There was a shift in a sense of collective identity too.

*In 1960, most Pākehā New Zealanders had little doubt who they were. They were Better Britons: a distinctive Kiwi branch of the British tree, a species of the genus Briton whose superiority to the original was demonstrated in war, sport and the climbing of mountains (Belich, 2001, p. 465).*

Belich’s notion of Pākehā New Zealanders being ‘Better Britons’ was not, however, a new idea, as Jackson and Harré (1969) cite an 1873 report from Anthony Trollope.

*The New Zealander among John Bulls is the most John Bullish. He admits the supremacy of England to every place in the world, only he is more English than any Englishman at home. He tells you that he has the same climate, only somewhat improved; that he grows the same produce – only with somewhat heavier crops; that he has the same beautiful scenery at his doors – only somewhat grander in its nature and more diversified in its details; that he follows the same pursuits and often the same fashion – but with less misery, less of want, and a more general participation in the gifts which God has given to the country (p.42).*

There was an underlying belief of superiority and of achievement often against the odds, along with the value of a ‘fair go’ for those who lived in New Zealand, even from the early settlement years. Jackson and Harré commented that “Well-planned cities, high ideals in social legislation, the early foundation of excellent schools and universities, all bear witness to the foresight and ideals” (1969, p. 42) of the settlers Trollope was describing. These beliefs have become an integral part of the colonising New Zealand character.

Pākehā culture, ethnicity and identity along with issues of race and racism in New Zealand have been hotly debated through both academic and popular literature; and through various media such as magazines (Metro, North & South, and Listener), television and radio programmes and daily newspapers since the 1970s. The tour by the racially selected 1981 Springbok Rugby team and

ensuing protests throughout New Zealand was a major watershed in terms of bringing race issues to the attention of Pākehā. As Claudia Bell (1996) said:

*The analysis of Pākehā values has increased since the events of the 1980s. Simultaneously, the articulation of Pākehā values has multiplied with the growth of television, that claims and expresses (Pākehā!) identity values on behalf of all, for everyday consumption (p.27).*

In referring to many literature and media sources, I will maintain a focus on Pākehā culture rather than engage in the debates about the specific concepts of Pākehā as an ethnicity and an identity.

Researching and writing up any sort of systematic version of a culture, according to James Ritchie, is to “reduce complexity to simple statements or structures, to sharpen and clarify, reduce ambiguity, create understanding” (1992, p. 99). He goes on to qualify the experience of working with culture that may help to explain why it is much more comfortable to say I am a New Zealander, especially for those of us who are part of the dominant group who thus get to define most aspects of cultural life. It is much simpler to maintain a national identity than to have to think about who we are as cultural beings and the responsibilities of relationships with others that may be involved.

*But the real stuff of culture in any of its meanings is messy, confusing, paradoxical, ironical, unclear, allowing alternatives and interpretations on some occasions but not on others. The head stuff gets mixed up with the heart stuff, the realities with the ideals and ideologies. All that gets hopelessly intertwined with the personal motivations of individuals, which may have cultural foundations or relevance, but which may be purely idiosyncratic, the leachate from the deposits of personal histories, the garbage heap of private experience. ... We are all continually negotiating the uses of the term [culture], and also its referents (J. E. Ritchie, 1992, p. 99)*

Definitions of and meanings attributed to the name Pākehā are many and varied. Some draw on the political aspects of Pākehā relationships with Māori and consequences of colonisation. For example,

*To be Pākehā means to identify oneself as being part of that demographic group which is not tangata whenua but to acknowledge one's ethnicity as essentially Eurocentric. It means being prepared to acknowledge that the colonising values, procedures, priorities and structures were, and in many respects still are, unashamedly monocultural. To be Pākehā in Aotearoa in 1986 means to begin taking seriously the possibility of sharing power and inevitably giving up power, and looking to a future which must involve a more equitable use of power. Threatening for many perhaps, but for those who are culturally disadvantaged, there is a vision here of a richer, more mutual, and certainly unique kind of society (Schroeder, cited in Spoonley, 1986, p.2).*

Definitions such as this are often contentious and hotly debated. Later in his book *Racism and ethnicity*, Paul Spoonley (1988) defined Pākehā as

*New Zealanders of a European background, whose cultural values and behaviour have been primarily formed from the experience of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand (p.63-64).*

In this definition of Pākehā the relationship with Māori is implicit in the recognition of dominance, according to Avril Bell (1996) and, “has become widely accepted *among Pākehā themselves*” (1996, p.147). On the other hand given the challenging political stance taken by Schroeder (Spoonley, 1986) where Pākehā are implicitly called to accept their Eurocentrism, the monocultural nature of their practices and policies, and the notion of “giving up power”, I am not surprised to find that it has not been widely accepted.

From Spoonley’s (1988) definition of Pākehā we can then ask – ‘what are the shared cultural values and behaviours that mark out Pākehā as a cultural group?’ In attempting to answer this question I recognise that the process of marking out cultural values for any cultural group is relative to those of other cultural groups. It is the combinations in which the ingredients of culture come together for a group that make it exclusive (King, 1991). Claudia Bell (1996) observes:

*For while it may be almost impossible to sum up what constitutes Pākehā culture, or articulate the essence of this, for Pākehā themselves there is obviously strong awareness of their own cultural distinctiveness. This anthropological-sociological notion is stated in such phrases as ‘people like us’, ‘real New Zealanders’ or ‘kiwis’. In New Zealand the juxtaposition of Pākehā against Māori, or against Australians, or against Asian or other immigrant groups, is a way of affirming boundaries and differences (p193-4).*

In asserting a cultural identity for Pākehā as the dominant group in Aotearoa it is important to acknowledge the slippage between that and what is regarded as the national identity, possibly evidenced in the very title of Claudia Bell’s book *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday myths of Pākehā identity*. Pākehā are, said Avril Bell “more likely to identify nationally rather than ethnically” (2004, p. 89) and to make little distinction between Pākehā culture and the national culture. This is consistent with Forrest Tyler’s definition of a culture defining group (Tyler et al., 1991).

### Who are Pākehā?

Pākehā are the largest identifiable group of people living in Aotearoa. They are the people, largely from Great Britain (English, Irish, Scots, Welsh), Ireland and other European countries who have settled in Aotearoa since the first arrivals in the late eighteenth century (Belich, 2001; King, 1985, 2003; Sinclair, 2000; Spoonley, 1988; Walker, 2004).

In my earlier research (Black, 1997) I concluded that the word Pākehā had three layers of meaning. First, the term Pākehā was used in the preamble to the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi. A literal translation into English of the Tiriti o Waitangi reads



*... Now, because there are numbers of the people living in this land, and more will be coming, the Queen wishes to appoint a Government, that there may be no cause for strife between the Natives and the Pākehā, who are now without law (Orange, 1987, p. 261).*

This is one of the first official uses of Pākehā and in this context it was used as an inclusive term to mean all ‘Non-Māori’ (M. Nairn, 2002). Second,

*Pākehā was used in a cultural and ethnic sense to mean the people of British/Northern European descent who now live in Aotearoa; and [thirdly] Pākehā has political connotations in that it is a unique and indigenous word for the non-Māori settler of Aotearoa and implies an acceptance of Māori as a separate cultural entity (Black, 1997, p. 99).*

The political connotations are expanded by the notion, described by Avril Bell, of Māori and Pākehā being “constituted in relation to each other” (2004, p. 4). In other words they exist as separate cultures/identities in relation to each other; one does not make entire sense without the other. However, as Bell notes, both Māori and Pākehā do have separate pre-contact histories and cultural traditions, and these continue to shape the patterns of each group and their intercultural contacts.

The early waves of British and Irish settlers were encouraged, through advertising by the New Zealand Company (Burns, 1989), to travel the 12,000 or so miles across the oceans with the promise of opportunities to establish a better life than they could expect in the somewhat over-crowded Britain of that time. I do not necessarily want to exclude people from other nations and cultures that have come to settle in Aotearoa, rather, I wish to be explicit about the limits of my focus. I also acknowledge that while the term Pākehā when used in the broadest sense describes all peoples that have come to Aotearoa (A. Bell, 1996; Morgans, 2004); I am using it as a cultural label for people of British and European descent who are living in Aotearoa (Black, 1997). Pākehā, as the culture of the dominant group in Aotearoa, has many similarities with, for example, White Australian or White American culture.

Systems of government and social norms are very much influenced by British and Western origins. However, while I will name and intend to describe Pākehā as a cultural group, I am also aware that, as Ritchie points out,

*... there are many New Zealanders who see an emphasis on group or ethnicity based cultural distinctions as fundamentally divisive and separatist, and therefore publicly reprehensible and aversive. ... The discourse about ‘culture’ and ‘cultures’ will continue (1992, p. 98).*

I also think, as I am writing this review some sixteen years after Ritchie, that there has been over the intervening years a growing acceptance of the reality of different cultural groups in Aotearoa. While resistance to both the label Pākehā

and to the notion of there being a Pākehā culture remains, the level of acrimony towards the use of Pākehā has diminished.

A study by Maria Jellie (2001) of New Zealand University students' ethnic identities found that forty eight percent (48%) of New Zealanders of European descent 'always, often or sometimes' described themselves as Pākehā, and fifty two percent (52%) would never use the term Pākehā to describe themselves.

Jellie reports that the results of her study were

*... reinforced by results from a Herald-DigiPoll in January this year which showed those of European descent were evenly divided, 49% each way on the question: "Do you think of yourself as a Pākehā?" (p.44).*

Her results contrasted with an earlier study by Pearson and Sissons (1997) who reported that only seventeen percent (17%) always or often described themselves as Pākehā and eighty three percent (83%) either sometimes or never used the term. Jellie's study possibly suggests a growing level of acceptance for the term Pākehā, although her 'use of Pākehā' category was more inclusive than that of Pearson and Sissons.

Describing this culture named Pākehā has been attempted over many years. Visiting scholars (Ausubel, 1977/1960; Mitchell, 1972; Winks, 1954) offer some interesting reflections on the way of life that is cultural, although not always recognised as such, for Pākehā in Aotearoa. With the influx of Māori from rural to suburban areas post World War Two and the increasing numbers of immigrants from the Pacific Islands to bolster the New Zealand workforce in the 1960s another source of literature emerged. The *Understanding Pākehās*<sup>9</sup> pamphlet was prepared by the Vocational Training Council (1975) to explain the Pākehā culture, way of life and work, to new Polynesian migrants. In a similar vein the work of Joan Metge and Patricia Kinloch (1978) addressed problems in cross-cultural communication, between the dominant Pākehā and Māori and Pacific peoples, in the publication *Talking past each other*.

From their research, Metge and Kinloch (1978) describe intercultural 'situations of meeting' as follows:

*Māoris and Samoans frequently complain that they went along to meetings about pre-school and school activities, eager to be involved, and 'nobody spoke to us, so we didn't go back'. This may or may not have been literally true: what they really mean is that no one welcomed them, so they felt left out, cold-shouldered, not wanted. This response has to be understood in the context of the great emphasis that both groups place on rituals of greeting involving verbal formulae, direct personal contact and the provision of food. ... Pākehās tend to dismiss introductory formalities as 'empty' and a 'waste of time' and cut them*

---

<sup>9</sup> While in Māori language nouns such as Pākehā are written the same in singular or plural, it was common practice for English speakers to write Māori words adding an 's' to signify plurality.

*down or even out whenever possible. ... Restrained by shyness or fear of appearing patronising, Pākehās all too often fail to speak to Polynesian newcomers. If any welcome is extended it is done briefly and in general terms by the chairman [sic], and the meeting gets down to business as quickly as possible. Unfortunately what seems sensible to Pākehās in view of the limited time available seems abrupt and rude to Māoris and Samoans, devaluing people in favour of business (p.15-17).*

*Understanding Pākehās* was described by Paul Spoonley (1988) as

*... a simple exercise in explaining the cultural customs of Pākehā to outsiders. But few Pākehā seem aware of how they appear to others or how they are culturally different to others. They usually assume that theirs is the correct or universal way of behaving. And yet they are different (p. 64).*

While the descriptions in this publication have been written in plain language, I would suggest that the process of defining cultural customs for Pākehā is far from simple (Black, 1997), particularly in the social context of the 1970s, and subsequently. Both the Vocational Training Council and the Metge and Kinloch publications offer very informative descriptions of the ways Pākehā behave and communicate that disturb the everyday assumptions of being the natural, ordinary or only way things are.

In *Understanding Pākehās*, the culture of Pākehā family life is described in relation to that of a Polynesian family. This is a useful comparison in light of how some of the participants in this study discuss their own or other Pākehā cultural ways of being in and understanding family ways.

*In all societies, social life is organised around the family. However, the Pākehā family is very different from the Polynesian family. The Pākehā family usually consists of a married couple and their dependent children. Uncles and aunts, grandparents, and cousins are not generally regarded as family members, though they are relatives.*

*As a Polynesian you feel a strong obligation towards your relatives because you regard them as family members. You would help them as much as you would help your children. While a Pākehā feels just as strong an obligation towards his [sic] wife and children, this does not always extend to his relatives because to him they are not members of his family. To Polynesians, Pākehās may appear to be mean and selfish towards their relatives. This is not because Pākehās are mean by nature, but because the word "family" means different things to Pākehās and Polynesians (Vocational Training Council, 1975, pp. 4-5).*

Even the notion of family – such an integral unit in any society - is actually cultural. There is no one correct way of defining who is included and/or excluded and what practices occur within and surrounding family life. The construction of the Pākehā family as a married couple with children, while still being a dominant construction, does not reflect the actual lived experience of many families in New Zealand society today. There are many single parent, blended, and co-habiting arrangements between adults either with or without children that constitute families.

Another notable aspect in the reference to family in the quote above is the use of gendered language, which reflects the way in which roles were demarked by gender at that time in New Zealand society. Gendered distinctions were also noted in John Harré's (1966) book about mixed marriages between Māori and Pākehā in 1960s. For example, men have relationships with girls, although sometimes the girls become women, maybe when they marry. The full force of the second wave of feminism was yet to strike.

Aspects of Māori culture/behaviour were described by Harré (1966) which left Pākehā as the default position; in other words, he does not offer any description of Pākehā culture as such or start with 'Pākehā do this and Māori do something different'. The effect is that what-ever it is that Pākehā do or how they behave goes without saying; it needs no explanation, it is just normal.

Public debates about Pākehā culture in the 1980s stemmed from two key sources. Māori, in trying to get recognition of and redress for the injustices they experienced through colonisation, challenged Pākehā to name and understand their own culture (Awatere, 1984). The century old policies of assimilation and integration, while still being applied, were no longer acceptable to Māori, and were replaced by policies of biculturalism (Herbert, 2002; Huygens, 1999; M. Nairn, 2002; Nikora, 1993; Novitz & Willmott, 1989). As a response to Māori challenges and his own work with Māori, journalist and historian Michael King (1985) wrote *Being Pākehā* which was described as "the first book that specifically examines the nature, the problems, and the responsibilities of Pākehā New Zealand" (dust cover). The book, although it received a mixed response, meant that Pākehā culture became a hotly debated topic. Spoonley (1986) described King's book as representing

*... the growing concern with dominant group ethnicity without reflecting its detail. ... [M]ost Pākehā, faced with the ethnic assertiveness of the Māori, have tended to express anger and hostility or have ignored the issues and debates (p.3).*

With a lot less fanfare, but not without heat, discussions about and explorations of Pākehā culture were incorporated into Antiracism and Treaty of Waitangi workshops from the early 1980s (Huygens, 2007; M. Nairn, 2002). Resource materials about Pākehā culture were prepared largely for use in schools, although some were also used in the community. Some examples were: the Project Waitangi *Pākehā Culture* kit (Mansell et al., 1985); the *Cultural identity: A resource for educators: Whakamana tangata* then in its fourth edition (Steele,

1996); or more recently the *Culture and Heritage* resource book for the social studies curriculum in schools (Nauman, 1999).

In an exercise about getting started on culture, the Project Waitangi *Pākehā Culture* kit suggests exploring the following:

*What are the different cultures in this school?*

*(As the class lists them off, group all the European ones – Scottish, Irish, Dutch, English .... Then circle them and label them Pākehā. Discuss what this word Pākehā means – pink skins, European ancestry ...)*

*What is special to Pākehā culture that's different to other cultures?*

*(Maybe the special celebrations like Christmas – compare it with, say, the Chinese New Year. Then there's the language, the food, family size, the role of old people and children, religion, sport, legends, the physical appearance of Pākehās, their relationship to the land ...)* (Vocational Training Council, 1975, p. 5)<sup>10</sup>.

Exercises such as the one outlined above were designed to encourage those participating to think about themselves as cultural and to learn how to describe aspects of their way of life within a framework of being cultural rather than what they probably had taken for granted as being normal or right.

An indication of some of the cultural values, behaviours, traditions or beliefs shared by Pākehā was reported by Michael King in an interview with Spoonley (1986a). King spoke of language having “a New Zealand idiom and vocabulary” (p.7); a New Zealand literature where Pākehā and Māori and writers of other ethnicities can be distinguished from each other; the tradition of warfare; equality of opportunity, everyone getting a ‘fair go’; the belief in racial equality; an attachment to the outdoors; sport and in particular rugby; helping the underdog - someone who’s in trouble; a degree of reliability “having power behind the scrum” (p.8); the Judeo-Christian base for ethics; and having a past in Europe. All of the above can be characterised as being both Pākehā and New Zealand because Pākehā, in Forrest Tyler’s analysis of cultural groups, are the dominant and therefore the culture defining group (Tyler et al., 1991). These values may not be exclusively Pākehā but they are shared by Pākehā to a great extent. The extent to which other cultural groups in New Zealand claim to share these values and beliefs is probably the work for future researchers.

Many of the cultural values, behaviours, traditions or beliefs in King’s list above are echoed in or extended in other publications (Belich, 2001; C. Bell, 1996; King, 2003; Metge & Kinloch, 1978; Vocational Training Council, 1975). King also talked about the belief in racial equality, the enduring myth of New Zealand

---

<sup>10</sup> Reference refers to original publication

having the best race relations in the world. This myth is explored in the following chapter.

### **Peoples of Aotearoa: Pākehā in Relationships**

A salient finding in Harré's (1966) research was the much more structured and also separate lives Māori and Pākehā both lead. Neither Pākehā nor Māori elders actively encouraged intermarriage although Harré notes that Māori families were generally more accepting of having a Pākehā in the whanau than Pākehā families were having a Māori in their family. The families who had been in New Zealand for some time were less accepting. Newly immigrant people did not have the same attitudes of separation from Māori as did many of the established local people. In fact, a newly arrived Dutch man found greater acceptance of his presence here from Māori people that he met than he did from local Pākehā according to Harré.

Harré's research supports the notion that the 'best race relations in the world' beliefs were built on separate development; in other words, Pākehā and Māori co-existed very well along-side each other as long as their paths did not cross the social lines that had been drawn in the sand and clearly inter-marriage did cross the lines. While Pākehā and Māori often worked together they seldom socialised beyond organised work events, and they would seldom visit each other's homes and socialise between families. Even when Pākehā and Māori children were at school together, out of school friendships and visiting each other's homes was more often than not discouraged by Pākehā.

Not all Pākehā were discouraged from engaging in relationships with Māori. Psychologists Jane and James Ritchie actively engaged with Māori in research during the 1950s and 1960s (J. Ritchie, 1964; J. E. Ritchie, 1963, 1964b), initially under the guidance of Jane's parents Ernest and Pearl Beaglehole (Beaglehole & Beaglehole, 1946), who promoted research with Māori. The personal bicultural journey James Ritchie<sup>11</sup> (1992) has taken as a Pākehā in relationships with Māori is documented in his book *Becoming Bicultural*. He describes the knowledge he has gained through his experiences as a young man involved in Ngāti Poneke Young Māori Club, as a psychologist and researcher, and later as an academic working in both the Māori and Pākehā worlds.

---

<sup>11</sup> Emeritus Professor James Ernest Ritchie died on 24 September 2009. Thank you James for the inspiration of your lifetime of bicultural work. Without your leadership at the University of Waikato I may not have had the privilege of studying in Community Psychology and engaging in cultural research.

Ranginui Walker (2004), who is himself in a bicultural marriage, wrote the following description of Māori-Pākehā relationships.

*By the end of the second millennium, Māori were irrevocably integrated into the political economy. This economic coming together of Māori and Pākehā was also matched by social inter-mingling, a mutual love of rugby and netball and a high rate of intermarriage. As early as the 1960s, over 50 per cent of Māori marriages were cross-cultural. The lizards of New Zealand's colonial past were being laid to rest in the bedrooms of the nation (p. 389).*

Carol Archie (2005), picked up Walker's theme in her book *Skin to Skin*, which includes the stories of more than 30 people from 10 New Zealand families of mixed ethnicity. The emphasis is on Māori and Pākehā "because they are the two peoples whose relationship has largely shaped New Zealand's colonial history and development" (p. 9). While Archie stated that she was not trying to put forward any particular point of view, she did, however, note a number of themes from the stories, such as

*... the different experiences of racism from generation to generation; Or the differing attitudes (between Māori and Pākehā) to food, hospitality and concepts of family; Or the sheer diversity in the Māori world. ... [T]here is the pattern of the Māori partner being the most likely one to be making compromises in a mixed marriage (p. 9).*

Michael King presented a rather more symmetrical and less political notion of the interrelationship between Māori and Pākehā when he said

*... while Māori are Māori and Pākehā are Pākehā, each has been influenced by the other and had his or her culture shaped decisively by the other. One essential ingredient of Pākehā-ness, as far as I am concerned, is contact with and being affected by Māori things: Māori concepts, Māori values, Māori language and Māori relationships. ... For a growing number of people, even those who react negatively to the encounter, Pākehā-ness embraces some experience of Māori history, habits, values and expectations (1991, p. 19).*

King's thesis is that Pākehā is not something foreign but rather "it is a *second indigenous New Zealand culture*". By referring to Pākehā as also being indigenous, King is drawing on the notion of the 'level playing field', where all people have the opportunity to be equal. This account "fails to acknowledge the sustained, intense efforts made to assimilate Māori out of existence" (R. Nairn, 2008, personal conversation).

One of the most important ingredients of Pākehā culture is the way in which, according to Avril Bell, "Māori and Pākehā are constituted in relation to each other" (2004, p. 4). Bell describes the relationship as one of colonised (Māori) with coloniser (Pākehā), an essentially asymmetrical power relationship. The beliefs of racial/cultural superiority were being promulgated under the guise of assimilation. Notions of assimilation are discussed more fully in the next chapter.

In this chapter I have delved into some of the complexities of culture and explained the concepts of culture that are prominent in psychology and the social sciences. The related concepts of race, ethnicity and nation have been outlined and the emphasis on culture explained. I highlighted three approaches to culture, that of having a culture, structures of culture and the social constructionist notion of doing culture which informs this study. In the second part of the chapter I examined the literature about Pākehā culture, the ways in which meanings of the term have developed and how it is marked. In the last section I briefly explored some of the research that looks at Pākehā in relationships, mostly those in personal relationships with Māori. In the next chapter I turn the focus on to the bigger picture of the social and political contexts of these relationships in New Zealand society. I examine the processes of colonisation, racism and race relations, Pākehā cultural dominance in Aotearoa, and finally consider decolonisation strategies that are taking place.





# Chapter Three

## The Socio-Political Context of Culture: Colony, Race and Nation

*Colonialism denies human rights to human beings whom it has subdued by violence, and keeps them by force in a state of misery and ignorance that Marx would rightly call a subhuman condition. Racism is ingrained in actions, institutions, and in the nature of the colonialist methods of production and exchange. Political and social regulations reinforce one another (Sartre, 1957, p. xxiv).*

In any study of culture, consideration needs to be given to the broader power, history and relationship context in which it is situated. From the 16<sup>th</sup> century Europeans moved imperially into the hitherto unknown (to them) parts of the world and proceeded to establish colonies there. Those moves were predicated on beliefs of European superiority and theories of race that help us understand culture in today's world. In countries such as New Zealand the development of intercultural relationships and the formation of the nation state are located within that history of colonisation and racism.

This chapter considers some of the literature that maps out the largely British colonial journey in Aotearoa, placing it alongside that of settler colonies elsewhere. In it I trace how early settler beliefs in assimilation and actions such as the acquisition of land by any means possible have impacted on the way in which current intercultural relationships are carried out in Aotearoa. I explore whether there is a colonial legacy of superiority, power and domination that operates to obscure the recognition of culture and, in turn, fuels beliefs about race and race relations particularly focusing on the prevalent myth that New Zealand had the 'best race relations in the world'. Finally, some of the literature that discusses notions of decolonisation as it pertains to race and culture and strategies for a decolonised Pākehā identity is canvassed.

### **Colonisation: The New Zealand story**

McHoul and Rapley's (2001) notion that culture is present at all points, fully situates culture within the socio-political context. Cultures that reside in contemporary New Zealand are those that have been moulded through the history of European colonisation and the ways in which the colonial cultural presence was imposed on the indigenous peoples of the colonised lands (Belich, 1986).

Complex arrays of cultural hierarchies were already established in the homelands of the colonisers, and in many situations they sought to re-establish these hierarchies in the colonies. They were usually predicated on beliefs of European superiority. Racism was both a consequence and a foundation of that superiority. Colonisation did not stop with the imposition of new settlers and governments on indigenous peoples; it also included the movement of peoples from various lands to become the workforce for the colonisers. African peoples were captured in their homelands and taken as slaves to America; convicts from Britain were transported to America and later Australia; the Irish, forced off their homelands by the British, left in their droves for the colonies (USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand); people from India were encouraged to go or were taken to countries like South Africa, Canada and Fiji; and Pacific Island peoples were brought to Aotearoa to build up the manufacturing workforce during the 1950s and 1960s. Nation states were created with boundaries drawn to suit colonial powers rather than the indigenous peoples, creating a legacy of division and competition intensified by practices of ‘divide and rule’.

The colonisation of New Zealand by the British, through the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and the subsequent setting up of “... a settlers’ Parliament after the grant of self-government in 1852” (Jackson & Harre, 1969, p. 45), is well documented from a number of different perspectives (Belich, 1986; Burns, 1989; R. Consedine & Consedine, 2001/2005; Glover et al., 2005; Huygens, 2007; King, 1985; Kirton, 1997; McCreanor, 1997; McNab, 1914; R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1991; Nikora, 2001; Sinclair, 2000; Spoonley, Macpherson, & Pearson, 1996; Walker, 2004). I have selected these authors because they offer a revised view of history and social practices and in many cases critical views of colonisation.

### *Colonisation is predicated on beliefs about superiority*

General processes of Western/European colonisation have shaped the governmental and social structures in Aotearoa. This Northern European or more generally Western origin and focus has shaped Pākehā culture in Aotearoa. While individual Pākehā may claim to have little knowledge of their family history prior to their arrival in Aotearoa, they could generally trace their origins back to Great Britain, Ireland and Europe.

Aotearoa was settled by immigrants who largely came from Britain at a time when beliefs about European/British racial superiority were prevalent. In Aotearoa these notions of superiority, premised on notions of Māori inferiority, form a significant part of the ideology of relations between Māori and Pākehā

(Ballara, 1986; Belich, 1986; McCreanor, 1997; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Most settlers who came to Aotearoa took for granted their believed superiority along with their rights to land and way of life; in that sense they were already 'culturally dominant' if not materially dominant (Belich, 2001). Over the next one hundred years the settlers established their material dominance as a normal way of life through control of systems of government, education, law and religion. However, settler dominance was not established without first going to war against Māori to take land that had been promised as part of emigration packages from Britain (Belich, 1986; Burns, 1989).

*The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict* (Belich, 1986, p. 3), describes the taken for granted beliefs of living in one's own cultural world (McHoul & Rapley, 2001) and not being able to fully 'see' or place value on the experience of a different cultural world. Racial and cultural ideas include the ways in which people see themselves and their society as well as how they see others (R. Nairn, personal correspondence 28/10/08). British beliefs in their own cultural or racial superiority became apparent to Belich (1986) when he summarized the 'dominant' Victorian interpretation of the New Zealand wars. The British expected victory because they believed in the quality of their fighting men. "Military excellence was seen, not as an acquired attribute of the British regular soldier, but as a characteristic innate in all Britons. ... A defining feature of the Briton" (Belich, 1986, p. 322). The Victorians also believed that the British excelled in the higher mental faculties, in particular the ability to invent and theorise and that Māori, while regarded as intelligent, did not possess these higher faculties. Those beliefs informed the way that the British saw the world and made it very difficult for the Imperial and colonial troops to understand how Māori, who were less well equipped and fewer in number, could inflict some severe defeats.

In writing about the New Zealand wars Belich (1986) argued that while the dominant interpretation based on notions of British superiority prevailed, it is possible to find evidence that enables a different interpretation from that presented by the dominant view of those living in their own cultural world. As an example, Belich cited and critically examined the explanation Colonel Despard gave on inspecting the scene of his defeat at Ohaeawai pa in 1845.

*Colonel Despard wrote: 'The strength of the place has struck me with surprise, and I cannot help feeling convinced that the Natives could not have constructed it without some European assistance' (1986, pp. 315-316).*

He presumes that Māori (the Natives) could not have engineered the pa in such a way as to defeat the British without some 'European' help. The Colonel, it would seem, was so tied up in his own cultural view of the world that he could

not see or learn from the techniques Māori used to beat him in battle. His alternative explanation, even although there was no evidence to support it, was the version most acceptable to the British.

### Assimilation: Or was it extermination?

Beliefs of British superiority, driven by ethnocentrism and self-interest have formed the basis of the policies and practices of assimilation through the colonisation of Aotearoa.

*A basic axiom of nineteenth century racial thought was that Europeans in contact with lesser races would inevitably exterminate, absorb, or, at least, subordinate them. ... Extermination was often watered down to read assimilation or subordination (Belich, 1986, pp. 323-324).*

The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi on 6 February 1840 was part of the British sovereignty claim and was described by Belich as an act of “nominal sovereignty” (1996, p. 181). Post Treaty of Waitangi policies of assimilation, the polite term for the subjugation or extermination of Māori, were central to political life and practice in New Zealand. Notions of assimilation, in the form of ‘the New Zealanders being one people’ can be traced to the day that the Treaty was signed at Waitangi. Ranginui Walker (2004, p. 96) reports that

*As each chief signed, Hobson [the Colonial Governor] shook hands, saying 'He iwi tahi tatou' ([literally] We are one people), thereby laying down the ideology of assimilation that was to dominate colonial policy well into the twentieth century.*

Thus, the ideology of assimilation was firmly planted. According to Sinclair (2000), by the early 1850s Governor George Grey,

*... was confident that he had established a basis for 'peaceful co-existence', indeed that the two races were well on their way to the humanitarian goal of 'amalgamation'. The Māoris seemed to be adapting themselves happily to the politics of the sovereign state and to the economy of the marketplace (p. 88).*

Even in the early years of settlement, for example, the 1852 Constitution Act where most Māori men, along with all women, were denied the right to vote, there was an obvious gap between beliefs about the state of Māori/settler relationships as exemplified by Grey in the quotation above and actions taken to gain and develop land and maintain the power to govern. Such actions fit closely with the presumed superiority of Europeans and their culture while at the same time denied Māori the opportunities to live and develop their own culture in their own way.

Perhaps the most blatant drive to subjugate Māori in Aotearoa occurred with the acquisition of land, evident in the land wars (Belich, 1986), and in government actions such as confiscations, through the Native Land Court and other legislation (Ward, 1973; D. V. Williams, 1999). Alan Ward quotes Dillon Bell (1863 letter):

*This [the simultaneous acts of conquest and colonisation] has never been done before since the time of the Romans, and we may preserve the remnant of the New Zealand race by forcing upon them a civilization which they will not accept as a peaceful offer (1995/1973, p. 163).*

Elimination, in this context, was preferred to assimilation.

Through the land wars the British, although suffering a number of defeats, eventually through sheer force of numbers, fire power, and political domination defeated Māori and duly confiscated large sections of their land. There was a prevalent belief that Māori were a dying race; they had suffered terrible losses through war and Pākehā diseases. According to Ward, by the late 1860's policies aiming at racial 'amalgamation' had been put in place which formed the basis of the 'good race relations' myth.

*Because they had supposedly provided both the benefits of full equality with the Pākehā and additional privileges and protective measures as well, it became axiomatic for New Zealand politicians from the late 1860s to boast of how magnanimously they had treated the Māori and how wonderfully well they had provided for them (1995/1973, p. 218).*

The influence of these 'amalgamation' or assimilation policies, was largely invisible to many Pākehā because there was minimal intercultural contact between Pākehā and Māori. These policies were regarded as so self-evidently 'civilised' by the Pākehā majority that they only warranted comment when they were viewed as too pro-Māori. Māori lived very much in the margins of Pākehā dominated political and social life until after World War two.

### *Melting pot*

The policies of assimilation in New Zealand can be likened to those in the USA where Americanisation, in effect "one-way assimilation to the dominant group" (Feagin, 1997, p. 352) particularly for new immigrants, was promoted using the 'melting pot' as a metaphor. Feagin described how Henry Ford, America's best known capitalist, enacted a process of Americanisation for the new immigrants he employed for his auto plants in the 1920s. After being visited at their homes by investigators from Ford's 'Sociological Department',

*... the immigrants had to attend a "melting pot school", where they learned English and certain Anglo-Protestant values of great concern to men like Ford. Remarkably, during graduation ceremonies Ford's employees, at first dressed as in their home countries, walked through a big pot labelled "melting pot" and emerged in business suits holding American flags (p.352).*

While the image of the 'melting pot' appears in itself, rather benign, it glosses over questions of power: who owns the pot; who decides who goes into the pot; who lights the fire; and who decides when the contents are cooked? Ford's little pageant provides very telling answers to such questions. Both in the USA and in Aotearoa policies of assimilation were oriented to Anglo-European immigrants

who were 'white', although there was some resistance from resident populations, predominantly Anglo, to immigrants from other European countries. In the recent television series 'Here to stay' (Gibson Group, 2007), immigrants whose families had come from European countries other than Britain talked about their struggles for acceptance by the resident population in New Zealand.

### Challenges to colonisation: Land issues come back to haunt

One of the ways in which Pākehā gained and have maintained a position of dominance in Aotearoa has been by controlling ownership of land. A major drive by early settlers was to gain land, some of which may have been purchased from the New Zealand Company before they left Britain (Burns, 1989). The New Zealand Wars (1845-72) were fought over land, much of which was confiscated by the Pākehā victors (Belich, 1986). Historians suggest that, by the end of the land wars the settlers had established themselves as the New Zealanders (Belich, 2001; King, 2003; Sinclair, 2000; Ward, 1995/1973), whereas in earlier times that was the term used for Māori (McNab, 1914).

Without land, their way of life became very difficult to sustain for many Māori and protests about the unjust confiscation of their land fell on very deaf Pākehā ears for the better part of one hundred years. Not only did the loss of land affect Māori economically, but also in terms of identity and spirituality. Considine and Considine (2001/2005, p. 105) cite the following explanation of the significance of land to Māori provided by Eva Rickard.

*Whenua is land. It is also the placenta within the mother that feeds the child before birth. When the child is born the whenua is treated with respect, dignity and taken to a place in the earth and dedicated to Papatuanuku – the earth mother of the Māori people. There it will nurture the child because our food and our living comes from the earth. It says to the child that this is your little piece of land – no matter where you wander in the world I will be here. And at the end of your days you can come back and this is your Papakainga and it will receive you in death. This, I believe, is the spiritual significance of the land to the Māori people.*

This explanation by Eva Rickard places a very different value on land to the Pākehā view which generally constructs land as a means of production, which is owned individually, and regarded as a means for capital gain. That is not to say that Pākehā do not care for the land. In recent years there have been substantial moves towards working and caring for the land in sustainable ways. While some land does remain in Pākehā ownership through generations and does acquire a level of spiritual significance, the value placed on it is different from that of Māori.

The Māori land rights movement gained strength in numbers and profile with the 1975 Māori Land March, from Te Hapua in the far the North to Parliament in Wellington, led by Dame Whina Cooper who had formed the organisation Te Roopu o te Matakite. The slogan “‘Not one more acre of Māori land’ to be surrendered to Pākehā” was carried by the marchers (Walker, 2004, p.214). The march, along with the passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act in 1975 which established the Waitangi Tribunal to hear complaints, started to bring to Pākehā public attention some of the unjust impacts of colonisation that have affected Māori. Many Pākehā barely knew the Treaty of Waitangi existed, let alone that it was regarded, by Māori at least, as a living document that set out the ideal relationship between two sovereign peoples.

*To many Europeans, Māori land issues are a source of irritation or even hostility. Unaware or impatient of the special significance their lands have for the Māori in their own culture, some Europeans feel the Māori should forget about their land grievances and the past, and concentrate on preparing themselves to be fitting members of modern society. This idea seeks to ignore different cultural attitudes to the possession of land, and to deny both the violence done to Māori values, and the effects on Māori culture of enforced land alienation (Ballara, 1986, p. 4).*

The public display of grievances by Māori such as the 1975 Māori Land March followed by high profile land occupations (Takaparawha (Bastion Point) in Auckland, Raglan Golf Course) and the 1979 Haka Party incident with engineering students at Auckland University (Walker, 2004), really undermined the belief that New Zealand had the best race relations in the world. There was a vociferous outcry, particularly after the Haka Party incident, from the Pākehā majority which resulted in the Human Rights Commission advertising and seeking answers from the general public on a number of questions related to race relations (R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1990).

The 1967 Māori Affairs Act was referred to by Walker (2004) as the ‘last land grab’ but that has proved not to be the case. The 2004 Foreshore and Seabed Act which legislated for Crown ownership of the foreshore and seabed became another flashpoint of debate about land issues. Fear and confusion reigned, concerning issues of ownership and access to beaches, which the Labour Government of the day played on to get majority support to pass the legislation. This was despite the four thousand submissions, almost all against the proposed legislation and the thousands of Māori (and many Pākehā) who joined a hikoī (march) from all corners of New Zealand to Parliament in Wellington reminding New Zealanders of the 1975 Land March (Ford, 2005; Walker, 2004).



## **Racism and Race relations**

Colonisation, assimilation and the ensuing land issues have occurred through a veil of beliefs about race, racial superiority and racism. Theories of race and the way they were used as a factor in the construction of notions of European superiority and carried out through colonisation have been well documented (Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001; Banton, 1998; Billig, 1995; Darwin, 1871; Dyer, 1997; Essed, 1991; Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001; Fine, Weis, Powell, & Mun Wong, 1997; Glover et al., 2005; Howitt & Owusu-Bempah, 1994; Huygens, 2009; McCreanor, 1989; McKinney, 2005; Miles, 1989, 1993, 1994; Rattansi & Westwood, 1994; Said, 1978; Spoonley, 1988; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Race theories, another version of categorising the 'other', were promulgated to support 'white' superiority, the slave trade and to justify 'white' European moves out into the previously 'undiscovered' world. Albert Memmi (1965, p. 74) argued that racism is an essential weapon for the colonizer.

*Racism appears then, not as an incidental detail, but as a substantial part of colonialism. It is the highest expression of the colonial system and one of the most significant features of the colonialist. Not only does it establish a fundamental discrimination between colonizer and colonized, a sine qua non of colonial life, but it also lays the foundation for the immutability of this life.*

I agree that racism is a fundamental aspect in the relationship between the colonizers and colonized. This foundation of racism, as Memmi suggests, cannot be changed. Racism is not just an historical artefact; rather, it is an elementary factor which impacts on current relationships between peoples. I consider that recognising and examining the practices of racism make possibilities for the creation of a different basis of relationship between peoples.

In a collaborative chapter on race and racism Kevin Durrheim (South Africa), Derek Hook (England) and Damien Riggs (Australia), took a critical psychological approach to understanding racism. They saw it as "... the product of particular historical relationships between groups of people in which some people have unjustly asserted claims to dominance over others" (Durrheim, Hook, & Riggs, 2009, p. 198). It is a categorisation of race that "... reflects particular power relations between groups rather than reflecting actual group attributes (physical or behavioural)" (p. 199). In so doing, they signalled a move away from the biological constructions of race that have been prevalent in psychology. For them, racism is perpetuated through talk, actions and through structural arrangements in societies, dynamics that are particularly applicable when analysing culture and relationships between cultural groups from a social justice perspective.

There are many current studies in psychology and the social sciences which examine the ways in which racism operates. Two strands, in particular, are relevant to this study. Howarth (2006, 2009) has used social representation theory to study the stigma of race, drawing on Fanon's (1986) notions of embodiment. The second strand employs a discourse analytic approach to the way in which racism is reproduced through everyday talk and texts (Bell, 2004; Campbell, 2005; Durrheim et al., 2009; Essed, 1991; Green & Sonn, 2006; Huygens, 2006, 2009; McCreanor, 1989, 1993, 1997, 2005; Morgans, 2004; R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1990, 1991; R. Nairn, Pega, McCreanor, Rankine, & Barnes, 2006; L. T. Smith, 1999; Tuffin, 2008; Tuffin, Praat, & Frewin, 2004; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

Practices of racism and in particular beliefs about race relations influence how Pākehā New Zealanders mythologize their history of relationships in New Zealand.

#### Race relations in New Zealand: The best in the world?

*The race-relations legend is dangerously inaccurate, but it cannot be dismissed as a mere colonialist trick, an oppressor's sleight-of-hand. It is a complex social, political, and cultural phenomenon of enormous power, one of New Zealand's founding myths, a part of national ideology (Belich, 1986, p. 310).*

According to David Ausubel, visiting Fulbright scholar in 1957-58, New Zealand was described by tourist operators and in official Government publications as having "... the most successful mixing of two races yet achieved. This is one thing we New Zealanders are really proud of – the way we handle our race relations" (1977/1960, p. 150). Ausubel presents a rather critical appraisal of life in New Zealand. He describes many occasions when he was challenged by Pākehā because he was an American, and he was not given the opportunity to discuss his views of his own country let alone offer an opinion about New Zealand and New Zealanders apart from praise for the country and people.

Ausubel noted the gap between the view that most Pākehā held that New Zealand had the best race relations in the world and the actual views and practices expressed about Māori. He suggested that, in public, people expressed relatively positive views about Māori but, in private the views were more often than not derogatory and displayed deep-seated prejudice. He was disturbed by the "... almost universal and uncritical acceptance of the unvalidated national belief regarding racial equality and the reluctance of New Zealanders to look unpalatable facts in the face" and the complacent "pride they feel in their fine

native race” (Ausubel, 1977/1960, p. 155). He also pointed out that not all New Zealanders he met were uncritical but they were the exception.

Race relations came into focus in New Zealand in the late 1950s following the New Zealand Rugby Football Union decision to exclude Māori from a team to tour South Africa in 1960. Only ‘white’ players were invited to play in South Africa. This decision was viewed by many people as a violation of the “... almost universal belief in the complete racial equality and harmony in New Zealand, shared equally, it seemed, by both sides in the controversy” (Stone & Stone, 1964, p. 61). A protest group, The Citizens’ All Black Tour Association, was formed by representatives from various churches, trade unions, student organisations, academics and teachers, journalists and public servants with the objective “... to combat racial discrimination in the selection of the 1960 Rugby team to tour South Africa, and to demand the abandonment of the tour if absolute equality of treatment cannot be assured” (Stone & Stone, 1964, p. 56). The protest group explored legal options to stop the tour and found that, even if relevant to the issue, the Treaty of Waitangi had no validity in a court of law. The tour did go ahead, although, according to Stone & Stone, the public debate surrounding it did lead to greater consideration of the

*...means whereby a more real racial harmony could be achieved; this was precisely the object of the Hunn Report on Māori Affairs, which followed in the wake of the controversy and its subsequent petition to Parliament (1964, p. 72).*

While concerns about race relations were brought to the fore during the protests about the exclusion of Māori in the 1960 rugby tour of South Africa, the extent of Pākehā discrimination, prejudice and ignorance about Māori, was examined, for example, in research (Ballara, 1986; M. Nairn, 2002; Pearson, 1990; J. E. Ritchie, 1964a; Spoonley, 1988; D R Thomas & Nikora, 1994; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) and exposed, through actions in the 1970s work of the Auckland Committee on Racism and Discrimination (ACORD). It was assumptions such as ‘because a person looked white they would endorse prejudice and ignorance’ that spurred the ‘race talk’ research by McCreanor (1995), and Nairn & McCreanor (1990).

Both Ausubel a psychologist and anthropologist Robin Winks (1954), another American Fulbright scholar who visited New Zealand in 1952, took care in their books to point out that the culture in New Zealand differed significantly from the American culture in a number of ways; New Zealand had been colonised somewhat later and maintained closer links with Britain. They noted, for example, New Zealanders’ dislike of criticism. While Winks’ focus of study was the Hau-Hau and Ringatu movements, his book was predominantly a travel log

in which he compared American and New Zealand culture rather than Ausubel's critique of Māori-Pākehā race relations.

A major exposure of race relations, particularly in terms of how Māori were positioned in New Zealand society, was the publication of a review of the Department of Māori Affairs carried out by J K Hunn, Deputy Chairman Public Service Commission and Acting Secretary for Māori Affairs in 1960 (Hunn, 1961). After the initial thrust of the coloniser land grab and land wars the pattern of life that had developed in Aotearoa up until the 1950s was relatively stable. Pākehā were predominantly urban dwellers and most Māori lived in rural settings.

Two key factors, less rural work for Māori and an increase in Māori population, converged in post war Aotearoa and led to the migration of many Māori to urban areas. Firstly farming was becoming more mechanised, so there was less work available in rural areas, while at the same time more labour was required in the manufacturing industries developing in urban areas. As Hunn reported

*... Mr N.S. Woods of the Labour Department said recently, we have a potential immigration source right here in New Zealand in the shape of the Māori race. All they need is training and the opportunity to use it (1961, p. 29).*

The second factor was, according to Hunn, an “explosive growth of Māori population from 56,000 in 1920 to 158,000 in 1960” (1961, p. 14). In 1959 Māori comprised 6.65 per cent of the total population. By 2006, as Hunn correctly predicted, their numbers had increased to 14.6 per cent of the total population, the second largest ethnic group in Aotearoa. In that year's census 565,329 people identified as Māori and 643,977 were of Māori descent (Statistics New Zealand, 2007a).

By 1960 Māori were becoming a visible presence in towns and cities throughout New Zealand and while most Pākehā were expecting total assimilation, Māori were maintaining as many of their cultural practices as possible. Ranginui Walker describes some of the ways in which they did this, more often than not through voluntary associations.

*In the alien and hostile environment of impersonal cities, kinship bonds were formalised by the formation of family clubs, adoption of a constitution, and the election of an executive for the collection of subscriptions and disbursement of funds against the contingencies of illness, unemployment and the underwriting of expenses incurred in returning the bodies of deceased persons to their home marae (2004, p. 199).*

That Māori had maintained and would continue to practice their own cultural ways even in the cities, provided a significant challenge to the Pākehā

expectations of assimilation where everyone lived according to the same values, practices and priorities, under the same laws.

### *Integration*

By the late 1950s it had become apparent to those in government that Māori were not succeeding in the same way that Pākehā were in almost every facet of life in New Zealand society. In response to the apparent failure of assimilation and a growing concern for what was becoming known as ‘the Māori problem’, Hunn’s (1961) major recommendation in reviewing Māori Affairs was a call for integration. Booth & Hunn (1962) began a paper on integration with the following statement:

*For many years New Zealand has been recognised as one of the nations in the vanguard of those that are building multi-racial societies. While no one would claim that there have been no instances of injustice and discrimination against sections of the Māori people, relations between the two main groups in our population, Māori and European or “Pākehā”, have not recently been marked by any great degree of friction. The discrimination that has occurred has been neither frequent enough nor serious enough to disturb the appearance of racial harmony throughout the country as a whole (p.1).*

Booth and Hunn are obviously not ready to let go of the best race relations in the world myth, going on to say “... there are some iconoclastic individuals who would claim that this apparent harmony is more the result of self-delusion and lack of contact between the groups than it is of genuine tolerance” (p.1).

There were some Pākehā who were publicly more than tolerant and accepting of Māori, however, Ausubel (1977/1960) during his visit in the late 1950s reported that most people, even government officials, would, in private express quite derogatory views of Māori, while at the same time saying they believed that race relations were good. This is similar to the two-faced dealing that has occurred through-out Pākehā settlement exemplified by Governor Grey who in the early 1850’s spoke of there being “peaceful co-existence” (Sinclair, 2000) between Māori and settler while crafting a constitution act that precluded most Māori from having the right to vote.

Since 1840 there has been a constant stream of legislation that has aided Pākehā, particularly in relation to the acquisition of land: specific examples are given in *How the land of Aotearoa/New Zealand came into Pākehā control – a timeline* (Steele, 1996), and more recently in Huygens (2007). The passing of the Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004, was grounded in the Government’s expressed belief that the legislation was for the good of all, despite knowingly depriving Māori hapu and iwi of the right to test their claims for customary title in a court of law (Tuffin, 2008).

Statistics showing that Māori were not succeeding at the same rate as Pākehā (Hunn, 1961) were not interpreted as a failure in “race relations” but rather as Māori not putting in enough effort to come to the Pākehā party. Booth and Hunn regarded the “... integration of Māori and Pākehā as the making of a whole new culture by the combination and adaptation of the two pre-existing cultures” (1962, p.2). While they concede that “... the Māori people as a whole cannot be expected to give up their entire Māoritanga in the process of adopting the ways of the Pākehā” (p.9), there still appeared to be an expectation that Māori needed to adopt Pākehā values and ways. Pākehā have a different role in the integration process.

*The Pākehā's minimum contribution to the process of integration is a willingness to accept Māoris as Māoris, without expecting that they will conform entirely to his Pākehā ways. Those who go further, and take an active interest in Māori things, will make a still more valuable contribution (Booth & Hunn, 1962, p. 9).*

Laying out the minimum contribution for Pākehā in this way indicated that there was little expectation that Pākehā would or should change their rules and practices, or be required to adapt to any Māori ways; rather, they should learn to become more accepting. In effect, integration, like its predecessor assimilation, was a one way process, with change being constructed as a requirement for Māori and an individual responsibility and choice for well meaning Pākehā. They did go on to suggest that “Māori history, games, and other relevant subjects, including race relations, should be encouraged in the schools, in adult education, and elsewhere by any available means” (p.11).

As I look back nearly 50 years to the Hunn (1961) and Booth and Hunn (1962) reports, three absences of relevance to my study of Pākehā culture stand out. First, neither document mentioned the Treaty of Waitangi; clearly it was not on the Pākehā political agenda in 1960. Second, there are few references to culture or ethnicity. Rather the language used reflects the biological terms of race talk; defining who is Māori using terms like half-blood or full blood; and referring to a “colour” problem (Hunn, 1961, p. 14). Finally, neither Booth nor Hunn identify themselves in terms of either race or culture leaving the reader to make their own assumptions. Curious about this, I found a reference to Jack Kent Hunn in the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography (R. M. Williams, 2007) and even there his cultural identity is not acknowledged. All I can say with any degree of certainty is that in the photo on the web site he looks Pākehā, his parents’ names sound Pākehā and he was born in New Zealand in 1906. While his voice carries the authority of the state in his research about Māori, his own cultural identity remains unmarked as does that of his parents.

## **Whiteness studies and Cultural dominance in Aotearoa**

*"Culture is rarely perceived as white people's daily life; it remains invisible and unnamed, but familiar and common" (Moreton-Robinson, 2004a, p. 30).*

Analyses of patterns of colonisation in Aotearoa, Australia and America, which were grounded in racism and Eurocentrism, show that there have been similar patterns of domination established by the largely Anglo-originating colonisers. The political location of the Treaty of Waitangi and the ensuing bicultural debates in Aotearoa, have tended to focus discussions of dominance in a cultural rather than race frame of reference. However, there are strong connections between focus on culture in Aotearoa and the literature on whiteness as a form of dominance and the invisibility of whiteness in Australia or America, for example (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997; Fine et al., 1997; Frankenberg, 1992; McKay, 1999; McKinney, 2005; Moreton-Robinson, 2004b).

Pākehā, like most other colonisers, established dominance through policies such as assimilation or integration and egalitarianism and through control of legal, political, social and economic agendas, processes and resources. While egalitarianism has had a paradoxical impact in New Zealand in that there have been both positive and harmful outcomes, it does appear to still have currency. The legacy of the egalitarian values such as tolerance, equality, fairness were reported by Larson (2008), in a *North and South* magazine survey, to be third on a list of 'true Kiwi values' by 15.5% of respondents. Larson later pointed out that these attitudes "... didn't translate quite so comfortably when asked which ethnic groups we should allow across our borders" (p. 45). There was no discussion presented about who might be a New Zealander, cultural identity representation was not considered, although age, gender and geographical location categories were. Surveys such as this replicate the dominant notion of New Zealanders being 'one people' in part by concealing any notions of cultural diversity, begging the question as to whose opinions are being represented.

### **Dominance as unmarked cultural identity**

One of the key theoretical propositions of this thesis is that members of dominant groups do not tend to think of themselves as having a culture or see themselves as being part of a cultural group. Further, they do not see themselves as 'raced' or belonging to a 'racial' group. Rather, dominant group members tend to describe themselves in terms of a national rather than cultural or race identity so, in Aotearoa, names such as Kiwi or New Zealander are popular and in common usage. Concurrently there is considerable resistance to cultural labels such as

Pākehā that is often expressed in debates about what the term means, or opposition to accepting a Māori label rather than an English or European one.

Members of a dominant group do not tend to see themselves as having a culture. In contrast 'other people', usually those who belong to a minority group or are from another country, are either said or seen to 'have a culture'. One example, of this labelling comes from a local tertiary institution that has 2 research positions: Coordinator Research Māori, and Coordinator Research. The Coordinator Research Māori is an example of a culturally marked or named position. It is nominated as a position for Māori. The latter position, Coordinator Research, is regarded as a 'normal' position, and is therefore culturally unnamed and unmarked. In the hierarchical structures of tertiary institutions, the Coordinator Research position is, I suggest, likely to be understood as both the senior and also the more inclusive position, and the Coordinator Research Māori, subordinate.

The invisibility of both culture and race is reinforced in Western societies by the emphasis placed on the individual rather than group. Dominant group members are often described as being blind to their race or culture: they do not see themselves as being part of a culture or race (Fine, 1997; McKinney, 2005; Moreton-Robinson, 1999). They tend not to personally relate to race or culture because they are so surrounded by their own people and social structures which are so normal for and beneficial to them. Gillian Cowlshaw (2004, p. 61) suggested that "by not speaking of race, white people – who claimed no race – avoided analysis of the racial source of their privilege". This is a much more active proposition of avoidance rather than the simple or passive absence of cultural or race recognition and signals that there is possibly more at stake. "Bringing the fact of whiteness into salience is thus an anti-racist strategy which forces the meanings of race into view" (Cowlshaw, 2004, p. 61).

The blindness to culture or race need not be a permanent condition. American, Karyn McKinney, who describes herself as "... a white woman from the South" (2005, p. xvii), has collected, analysed and reported on young white Americans' autobiographical stories about their white identities. She notes from her respondents' talk the notion of colour blindness or their sense of invisibility of colour, and how this was felt as a deficit, an interesting finding as colour blindness is usually interpreted as 'I treat them all the same'. The sense of deficit was related to a perception that people of colour look more cohesive and collective, that they have something the white kids do not, that "... whiteness is not cultural" (p. 113). The respondents also express a longing for 'heritage' 'tradition' and 'culture' that they perceive the ethnic 'Others' to have. Whiteness



in itself has no substance in terms of a cultural or ethnic identity for these young people. “The respondents experience the lack of ethnicity not as privilege, but one of the many **liabilities** of whiteness” (McKinney, 2005, p. 113).

The feelings of cultural deficit combined with a sense of liability are echoed by Pākehā who are very quick to point out any perceived privileges of Māori but seldom recognise their own culture and positions of privilege (McCreanor, 1995).

Ruth Frankenberg suggested that

*... if whiteness is emptied of any content other than that which is associated with racism or capitalism, this leaves progressive whites apparently without a genealogy. This is partly a further effect of racist classification that notes or “marks” the race of nonwhite people but not whites (1997, p. 632).*

The ‘colour’ of culture is made visible through race identification as is apparent in the whiteness literature from USA and Australia (Feagin & O'Brien, 2003; Fine et al., 1997; Frankenberg, 1992; Green & Sonn, 2006; Helms, 1992; Levine-Rasky, 2000; McKinney, 2005; Tyler, 2001). Groups of people usually only develop concepts of ‘culture’ when they experience difference in looks, social norms, ways of governing, for example. Anglo and European people immigrated to many countries throughout the world taking with them a belief that their ways of being in the world and their social systems and customs were superior to everyone else’s. As they established dominance in these ‘new’ lands, they formed as the “centre – the mainstream or middle ground” (Moreton-Robinson, 2004a, p. 28) thus marginalising the indigenous peoples as ‘other’.

Terms such as ‘whiteness’ tend to be explored as an identity, a way in which people think about themselves, others and how they think others see them (Kidd, 2002). In the American context, Frankenberg argues that the notion of whiteness

*... does have content in so much as it generates norms, ways of understanding history, ways of thinking about self and other, and even ways of thinking about the notion of culture itself (1997, p. 632).*

She uses ‘white culture’ and ‘white cultural practices’ as descriptors, in preference to culturally oriented terms such as Euro-American or European American that would parallel Native American, African American, Latino or Chicano as other ethnic or cultural groups. She argues that while the latter terms promote a sense of parallel identities they “deracialize” (p. 632), and thus falsely equalise communities, therefore obscuring the position of dominance that Euro-Americans have. My counter-argument is that the biological notions of race are falsities that play into the hands of white supremacists whereas cultural labels do provide a platform or starting point for people to have a collective identity to work towards establishing equitable relationships. Race based identities may be too difficult to untangle amid the ideology of racism and the impact of

unacknowledged cultural dominance. Further, parallel naming can assist the analyses of colonisation, dominance and cultural privilege that are essential tasks for members of dominant groups.

### Structural dominance in a nation state

*As with all human activity, current cultural practices of white people in the United States must be viewed as contingent, historically produced, and transformable through collective and individual human endeavour. ... Whiteness is inflected by nationhood, such that whiteness and Americanness are profoundly shaped by one another. Thus British "whiteness" and U.S. "whiteness" are both similar to and different from one another, those differences being traceable to historical, social, and political processes. Similarly, whiteness, masculinity, and femininity are coproducers of one another, in ways that are, in their turn, crosscut by class and by the histories of racism and colonialism (Frankenberg, 1997, p. 633).*

Modernist notions of egalitarianism which include equality, uniformity and conformity, along with policies of assimilation and integration, are perhaps the strongest influences in maintaining a national identity and can be used to account for the lack of cultural marking of themselves by the dominant group. One of the ways in which the notions of egalitarianism and assimilation are so effective is that the messages they give have become banal, commonsense and so everyday that they go unnoticed in the national landscape (Billig, 1995). Billig argues that the everyday flagging of nationhood is so commonplace and routine that it happens below the radar.

The position of being in the dominant group, in effect the ruling class in a nation state has meant that the sense of being cultural has moved to the margins of identity positions. It would be foolish to assume that the ruling classes do not know who they are and how to recognise their compatriots, but my concern is about how they name themselves. By using a national identity, their power is naturalised and the conflation of cultural values with those of the nation make them appear less obviously self-serving. However, this thesis is not about class, but rather about dominant group culture in Aotearoa because the hierarchical boundaries of class as they were structured in Britain and Europe have been rendered more flexible during the establishment and development of the colonial state.

Michael Billig (1995) has applied a critical analysis to the way in which nationalism has tended to be marked on the fringe or edges. Nationalism, he suggests, is regarded by the West as something 'other' people do or have. He argues that the nation-state exists through the everyday activities and signs of the nation – the banal, taken for granted, benign activities such as the flag on a building, the singing of the national anthem in schools and at sports events, the

creation of and the ongoing protection of the borders of a nation state. Reality television programmes such as *Border Patrol* (Cream, 2009), which bring into view the work of Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), Biosecurity New Zealand's Quarantine Inspectors and the officers of the New Zealand Customs Service at ports, airports and mail centres, are current examples of how not only the nation's borders, but the nation itself, are constructed. Programmes such as this, and there are many others that contribute in a range of ways, reinforce the nation state by highlighting boundaries and border security at points of entry, along with protection of internal resources and people. They routinely bring the nation into existence and reinforce that existence just as programmes like *Here to stay* (Gibson Group, 2007) bring culture to the fore and help to highlight the cultural diversity and also the sense that people do have culture within the national boundary.

Another aspect of structural dominance is the way that Pākehā as a cultural name is not a state-sanctioned identity. Pākehā is not available as an ethnicity option on Statistics New Zealand Census forms. In the lead up to the 2006 Census there were some very heated debates about the inclusion of 'New Zealander' as an ethnic category. Statistics New Zealand (2007b, p. 1) report that in the 2006 census

*... 429,429 people gave New Zealander as the only or as one of their responses to the ethnicity question. This represents 11.1 percent of the total population of New Zealand, and compares with 2.4 percent in 2001.*

Pākehā is occasionally heard on Radio New Zealand National<sup>12</sup>, usually in relation to Māori but recently, to my surprise, I heard reported that the New Zealand Police were looking for a 'Pākehā' male (17 February 2009). Usually 'Caucasian' is the term used for European or "white" New Zealanders by the Police. Usage of Pākehā as a cultural descriptor in its own right by a state organisation is perhaps signalling a shift towards cultural rather than race labelling.

There are some key underlying discourses developed in concert with the processes of colonisation that make it more difficult for members of the dominant group to recognise a cultural identity in Aotearoa. Perhaps the most pernicious is the 'one people' myth that has been central to the agenda of assimilation that was adopted by the early colonists (Huygens, 2007; Ward, 1973; D. V. Williams, 1999). If enculturation is the process of adapting to the norms of a new culture or group (Reber & Reber, 2001), I am arguing that assimilation policies have been used to deculturate (remove from people their

---

<sup>12</sup> Radio New Zealand National is a state funded radio station.

sense of cultural belonging) members of the dominant group while simultaneously using race talk, rather than cultural talk, to name and minimize any minority group. Societies like New Zealand are structured and organised in ways that support the values, institutions and practices of the dominant group and this ongoing colonisation is sustained by institutional and cultural racism. Consequently, members of the dominant group fail to recognise the culture in which they operate and resultant privileges because they are surrounded by what is so familiar and natural to them (R. Nairn & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, 1997).

*The New Zealanders: Pākehā and the bicultural debate in Aotearoa*

There have been discussions and debates about Aotearoa being a bicultural nation for many years (A. Bell, 1996; Bird & Drewery, 2000; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Black et al., 1995; Campbell, 2005; Fiona Cram, 1997; Harré, 1966; Huygens, 2006, 2007; Kirton, 1997; McCreanor, 1995; Mulgan, 1989; R. Nairn & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, 1997; J. E. Ritchie, 1992; Spoonley, 1986). At the heart of this debate lies the notion that two cultural groups, Māori and Pākehā, came together to form the nation state of Aotearoa New Zealand. The starting point of the bicultural nation is deemed to be Te Tiriti o Waitangi, signed in 1840 by rangitira of hapu and iwi on behalf of Māori and by Captain Hobson representing the Crown on behalf of Pākehā and all who have come under the auspices of the Crown since that time (Orange, 1987).

In the journals of explorers prior to Pākehā settlement, and in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori were named as the New Zealanders (McNab, 1914), but once Pākehā dominance was established between 1860 and 1880, through land wars, confiscations and legislation (Belich, 1986), the notion of being cultural was firmly attached to Māori people. The majority of settlers from about that time saw and named themselves as 'New Zealanders', rejecting the label 'Pākehā'. The concurrent use of 'New Zealander' as the national identity and as a cultural identity for European New Zealanders masks not only that group's culture but also its dominance and privileged access to power, especially in defining the nation.

That there is a dominant group, called the New Zealanders, was made apparent by Gordon McLauchlan, who described them as

*A racially and culturally homogeneous group of people who have nurtured in isolation from the rest of the world a Victorian, lower middle class, Calvinist, village mentality, and brought it right through in to the 1970s (1976, p. 1).*

McLauchlan, a fourth generation New Zealander and journalist, is conflating the national identity with that of a cultural identity. From this quote and the opening chapters in the book, a century of assimilation policies are exposed deepening the impression that there really was only ‘one people’ in New Zealand.

Joanne Pellew (1995), found in her study of 20 New Zealanders, that they made little differentiation between the qualities people regarded as the culture of a European/Pākehā New Zealander and those that “... were seen to distinguish New Zealand culture from that of any other country” (p. 135). European New Zealander was perhaps regarded as a safer and more politically neutral label than Pākehā. Pellew did note, however, that it was the ‘presence of Māori culture’ which her participants spoke of most frequently “... almost three times more often than any other characteristic” (p.128), which gave New Zealand a distinctive culture.

Some people who live in New Zealand may choose to call themselves European, a largely meaningless term I contend, given that most New Zealanders are of British origin and Britain appeared to have a somewhat nominal relationship with Europe. Kiwi, on the other hand, is rather like a nick-name for a homogeneous, archetypal New Zealander and the term is frequently used in this way, notably by politicians. Cultural icons such as sport, kiwi bloke, no.8 wire, while regarded as part of Pākehā culture, are more often to be found supporting notions of national identity. For example, every time a game of rugby is played by the national team, to signal our uniqueness and the presence of Māori, the All Blacks (New Zealand players) perform **the haka**. The ‘ka Mate’ haka, usually performed by the All Blacks, is talked about as if there was no other haka, but it is in fact only one of many.

While the label Pākehā has been applied in tandem with Māori, descriptions of Pākehā are noticeably absent. John Harré (1966) studied Māori and Pākehā mixed marriages and described what he saw as Māori but did not do the same for Pākehā. It appeared that Harré could not see where he was standing so looked to the ‘other’ for cultural descriptions which meant that one was left with the impression that Pākehā was different from Māori, but how Pākehā was different was not explained. In some respects Ausubel (1977/1960), Winks (1954) and Mitchell (1972) did the same thing in that they described what they saw as the New Zealanders or sometimes Pākehā but did not always context it with their own cultural lens, although they did reveal where they were from. McLauchlan (1976), used the term Pākehā in contrast to his use of the New Zealander only when he referred to Māori. He quoted Māori novelist Witi Ihimaera.

*Both cultures have a lot to learn about themselves. At present, we are generally emotionally separated with no right to call ourselves one nation of New Zealanders at all. And yet I know that the Pākehā can learn as much from the Māori as the Māori has learned from the Pākehā.*

*I know that I will never be able to call myself a 'New Zealand writer' until things are corrected. I will simply remain a writer, Māori, who just happens to live in New Zealand. It's a sorry thing to say, I know (Ihimaera cited in McLauchlan, 1976, p. 177).*

Although Ihimaera has revealed the extent of Pākehā dominance through assimilation and integration when talking about the absence of Māori fiction and his positioning as "... a writer, Māori" rather than a New Zealand writer, McLauchlan offers no further comment. Pellew's (1995) findings indicate a shift from McLauchlan's (1976) description above and may well reflect twenty years of debate about race relations and the growing literature about issues of culture, race and ethnicity in Aotearoa.

In a bicultural relationship there is a strong argument for not laying out Māori and Pākehā as separate cultural identities. Thus, Barclay and Liu (2003) argue that considerable intermarriage between the cultural groups has "... blurred the boundaries and shifted the bicultural beyond the simple categories that can be defined by subjects and bodies" (p. 4). They draw on Walker's (2001) notion that Māori and Pākehā, rather than being separate categories, are mutually interdependent and constitute each other. Bicultural formations then are described by Barclay and Liu "... as a variety of interrelated social spaces that are constantly produced and reproduced through various contested and negotiated discourses and practices that also constitute relations of power" (2003, p.4). I agree with the idea that Māori and Pākehā identities constitute each other and that there are many interrelated social spaces; however, I am concerned that the description of mutuality asserts a sense of equality that serves to deny the inherent inequality of the coloniser/colonised or, as Bell (2004) terms it, the 'asymmetrical indigene and settler' relationship. I argue that Pākehā is not a well established and understood identity category in its own right at this stage and, further, that moves to blur the boundaries of the bicultural may in fact support the well practised policies of assimilation in New Zealand, rather than 'unsettle' the dominance of settlers.

### **Decolonisation strategies**

For Pākehā, decolonisation is about recognising our own cultural heritage and practices that have maintained our political power and dominance and working to establish non-dominant relationships with Māori as tangata whenua, and with

peoples from other cultural groups who live in Aotearoa. Mitzi Nairn (2002a, p. 210) suggested that “the descendents of the colonisers have different decolonisation tasks from the descendents of the colonised”. She outlined the tasks of decolonisation for Pākehā as three non-sequential phases of learning which include:

- a) Conscientisation or consciousness –raising: To bring to light what has been hidden; To notice what has been ignored; To admit what has been denied;*
- b) Listening more carefully to Māori voices and hearing their critiques and aspirations better; and*
- c) Finding other people to work with.*

Glover, Dudgeon and Huygens (2005) note that decolonisation for members of the coloniser group usually begins with “... making visible the processes and outcomes of colonisation” (p.332), such as colonial capitalism, racism and Eurocentrism. Decolonisation includes personal, individual, collective and political processes. It requires a commitment from people to take the time “to be engaged with, rather than concerned about, others” (Cowlshaw, 2004, p. 67). It is imperative that relationships are based on the values of trust and reciprocity, rather than the engagement being determined by what one can get from these people.

Educationalists Bishop and Glynn (1999) point out that in a classroom situation it is vital to understand “... one’s own culture (its values, beliefs and preferred practices) as well as understanding how one’s own culture differs from the cultures of students from different ethnic groups” (p.135). The inclusion of ‘cultural safety’ (Ramsden, 1990, 2000; Wepa, 2005) or ‘cultural competency’ (Love & Waitoki, 2007) training for professionals has encouraged a move towards recognising professional practices as cultural rather than ‘acultural’ (R. Nairn personal communication 5/3/09). However, this level of understanding, while leading to a greater sense of cultural knowledge at an individual level, does not always lead to changes in practices at a structural or institutional level in society. Bishop and Glynn suggest that analysis of societal structures is essential for changing power dynamics.

*Understandings of the school as an agent of individual change should include knowledge of how the dominant culture has maintained control of the positions of power within the political, social and economic centres of society, how historical and social processes can impact on people’s lives and in what ways power imbalances may shape perceptions of other people in society (1999, p. 135).*

This approach, they argue, will enable critical reflection on the position the dominant culture holds in the classroom and, I assert, in the nation state of Aotearoa.

Just as processes of colonisation are not specific to Aotearoa, neither are strategies to decolonise. The larger project of decolonisation in Australia has been referred to as “decentring the ‘centre’” (Durie, 1999, p. 148). The challenge to examine the ‘centre’ has come from Aileen Moreton-Robinson (1999), a Geonpul woman from Quandamooka. She described White Australians, as having control over the institutions of that land, where their values, customs and social practices fill the ‘centre’, thus marginalising the indigenous peoples. In response to Moreton-Robinson’s call, academics in Whiteness studies have set an agenda which includes offering the possibility of:

*Exploring the ways in which racist discourses and practices are underwritten by the invisibility and normalcy of whiteness; and producing new knowledges about these discourses that will generate new ways of challenging and undermining racist discourses and practices (Durie, 1999, p. 148).*

The challenge to examine racist discourses and practices has been taken up by both indigenous and ‘white’ scholars, on both sides of the Tasman in the last decade (Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001; Bell, 2004; Campbell, 2005; F. Cram, McCreanor, Smith, Nairn, & Johnstone, 2006; Durrheim et al., 2009; Gibson, 2006; Glover et al., 2005; Green & Sonn, 2006; Huygens, 2007; McCreanor, 2005; Moeke-Maxwell, 2003; Moreton-Robinson, 2004b; Morgans, 2004; M. Nairn, 2002a; R. Nairn, 2007; R. Nairn et al., 2006; Nikora, 2001; Sonn & Green, 2006; Tuffin, 2008).

### Pākehā as a decolonising identity

One of the strategies of decolonisation is to examine the tools of the colonisers (Glover et al., 2005). Not having a sense of their own culture but marking others as cultural is a tool that colonisers use to maintain dominance. While people have no say about the culture they are born into, the challenge is to come to an understanding of what their culture is and how that culture is positioned in relation to other cultures in nations and the global world. The discussions about culture in Treaty workshops gave many participants their first opportunity to think and talk about their own cultural identity as a Treaty partner to Māori. Beyond the personal, the issue of how a culture is incorporated in or resisted by institutions and practices of the society is an important decolonisation strategy.

Bishop and Glynn (1999) remind us that it is not enough to simply discover and talk about culture, it is essential to come to an understanding of the way in which cultural groups are positioned in societies. They point out that in Aotearoa, Pākehā need to become aware that they have a culture and then to critically reflect on the dominance of their culture. Pākehā need to notice the ways Pākehā use to maintain their dominance that have a detrimental impact on Māori as tangata whenua (people of the land) and on all of the other cultural groups who



struggle to find equity in participation, and the distribution of services and other resources. Bishop and Glynn focus on the education system which, along with families, is deeply engaged in the understanding and transmission of culture.

### Examining Pākehā Discourses that maintain dominance

A strategy used to support the decolonisation agenda is to examine the discourses Pākehā use to maintain their position of dominance. Members of the dominant group have benefited greatly from the ideology, policies and practices of assimilation. One only need study the statistics of and debates about secondary and tertiary educational achievement over time in Aotearoa, where success rates at every level of educational achievement are disproportionately higher for Pākehā than for Māori or Pasifika peoples for evidence of colonial disparity. Those gaps in achievement have not changed a great deal since they were brought to the attention of government through the Hunn Report in 1960, according to a comprehensive study of the effect of culture in the education system by Russell Bishop and Ted Glynn (1999). Nash (1990), writing about the New Zealand education system, pointed out that a "... dual rhetoric of equality and efficiency" (p.162) had been operating since the late 1930s drawing on notions of egalitarianism. He went on to say that "... differences in educational outcomes of an ethnic, class and gender character have been reported in New Zealand by every researcher to investigate this problem" (Nash, 1990, p.164).

Nairn and McCreanor conducted a discourse analysis of Pākehā submissions to the Human Rights Commission and recognised a number of ways in which Pākehā talked about Māori. The submissions followed the 1979 'Haka party' altercation between Auckland University engineering students who annually lampooned the haka and a group of Māori and Pacific people who, after years of unsuccessful appeals, put a stop to the performances. One of the patterns in Pākehā talk about Māori culture identified in this research (McCreanor, 1989; R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1990, 1991) was that "... Māori culture is fundamentally inferior to that of the Pākehā" (McCreanor, 1993, p. 300).

Education, in a Pākehā dominated system, is one of the platforms provided by the state for Māori improvement. Yet it was clear that Māori were not achieving to the same extent that Pākehā were in this system (Macfarlane, 2005). How the ideology of assimilation operates 'under the radar' in Pākehā views of Māori performance in education was revealed in a paper by Timothy McCreanor (1993). He noted that the mass media are an important source of knowledge about Māori in New Zealand society because many Pākehā have minimal interpersonal contact with Māori people. He subjected a New Zealand Herald

article published on 10 May 1990 under the headline *Māori Pupils Perform Poorly Says Report*, to discourse analysis. To illustrate possible responses to the newspaper article he wrote three different scenarios called Timothy 1, Timothy 2 and Timothy 3. Timothy 1 could be described as a racist rant in which Māori are blamed for their failure not just in the education system but in not

*... get[ting] on with being Kiwis, hardworking and determined to pull this country back to where it used to be, best in the world before stirrers started driving their racist wedges between the two races... (p.304).*

Timothy 2 took a more 'liberal', systems-blaming approach and talked about the schools being the problem where

*...the sooner they make changes which accommodate the needs of Māori people, the sooner we will start to see improvements in the performance of Māori children (p.304).*

McCreanor then pointed out two striking features in the positions taken by Timothy 1 and Timothy 2. First, both presume that education is the way forward for Māori. Second,

*... the positions are locked together in a self-sustaining system of argumentation, [where the] structure is sufficiently dynamic and internally controversial to distract attention from explanations which lie outside its boundaries (p.305).*

Neither the victim-blaming nor the system-blaming arguments employed by Timothy 1 and Timothy 2 opened up any avenues for alternative ways of thinking about the situation presented in the article. Timothy 3 provided an alternative reading of the article in which he took an action oriented approach to the language in the headline and article, concerned about how it was "deployed for its rhetorical ends" (p.309). Timothy 3 started with a description of how the headline worked:

*"Māori Pupils Perform Poorly Says Report". The headline immediately sets up both the context and the tone of the story; its role is to engage and hold the reader and at the same time to convey the essence of the story. Here the caption fits smoothly with the most widely accepted version of the standard story, that is that Māori fail at education (p.306).*

By asking questions such as what is this headline/article doing, he was able to critically analyse the language being used and the rhetorical effects it created. In headlining the source for the article as a 'report', McCreanor suggested

*...that the main statement is a quote from the report or at least a strong implication from it. The other thing is that the word "report" keys into Pākehā expectations of objectively researched and considered analyses – in short, the truth (p.307).*

However, the entire truth is not told; further analysis revealed that in the body of the article is an implication that Māori performance is improved within the Māori designed and run Te Kohanga Reo (Māori pre-school), that is part of the education system. McCreanor points out that Māori initiated schools have

received very limited support from the state-funded Education Department (now the Ministry of Education) and that their very strength and success lies in their autonomy. By contrast, the state funded education system has, as Timothy 2 pointed out, continually failed to meet Māori aspirations.

In providing an action-orientated style of discourse analysis Timothy 3 is able to disrupt the previously accepted cultural order (McHoul & Rapley, 2001), in which reports of Māori ‘failures’ in education are produced and recognised within a set of Pākehā cultural rules or, as McCreanor notes, as a version of the ‘standard story’.

Pat Snedden (2004), a Pākehā businessman, in response to the then leader of the opposition Dr Don Brash’s (2004) needs versus race health funding argument is making points which disrupt the standard story of privilege. He pointed out that:

*Māori males do not on average live long enough to collect their superannuation and the trend is worsening in contrast to non-Māori where long life is increasing.*

And as if that were not enough

*Māori have twice as much heart failure and receive less than half as many life saving interventions (bypasses and angioplasty) than all other New Zealanders on average.*

After he asked about who was privileged in these stories Snedden went on to say

*I picked these two points because the first illustrates the incontrovertible macro level evidence. The second shows at a personal level the dilemma many Māori find themselves in with the health system that should give them access to services to keep them well and it doesn’t.*

In these examples Snedden is positioning the health system as being the problem in that it is not meeting the needs of Māori. Rather than naming tagged funding simply as ‘race based’ he asserts that there is an obvious ‘needs base’ for funding to be directed towards Māori as health services are not meeting their needs.

One of the techniques Pākehā use to maintain their position of dominance is the way they talk about other cultural groups and, in particular, Māori. McCreanor draws on the notion of the standard story and the ways in which it works to keep views and the means to express them alive. The belief that ‘we are all the same’, the one people discourse highlighted by Nairn and McCreanor (1991) in their analysis of Pākehā race talk, is widely used and endorsed in Pākehā society. It was this discourse that Dr Brash, then leader of the National opposition, drew on in his Orewa speech (2004), that stimulated a backlash that led to the erasure of named social support for Māori and Pacific peoples by the Labour government. Such talk is so taken for granted that when spoken, it passes beneath the radar of consciousness. Another effect of the ‘one people’ discourse is to further conflate

the culture of the nation with that of the dominant group so that dominant group members do not appear to have a culture. Therefore, when another group's culture is highlighted in some way that group's 'difference' is exposed while dominant group members may feel a sense of deficit and argue that it is unfair to privilege that group's culture. This thinking allows denial or ignorance of the advantages experienced by members of the dominant group.

In his 2004 Orewa speech Don Brash quoted James Belich saying

*that, once guns fell into Māori hands in the early years of the 19th century, ancient tribal rivalries saw Māori kill more of their own than the number of all New Zealanders lost in World War I. Probably 20,000 Māori were killed by Māori in the 1820s and 1830s (Belich, 1996, p. 157).*

Here we see selective references to history which position Māori as savage (McCreanor, 1995) and maintain the ideological position of the superior European. If Brash had been concerned about equality then he could have chosen to discuss the number of wars in European history that resulted in the deaths, violation and impoverishment of millions of people over the centuries. Brash set up Māori as the victims of their own destructiveness while maintaining a position of colonial dominance.

### Disrupting silence, examining racism and naming privilege

There are various studies that take a number of critical approaches to examining racism and decolonisation. They are all designed to expose the silence and privilege of the dominance. White people, according to American Peggy McIntosh (1997, p. 291),

*... are carefully taught not to recognise white privilege. ... I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was "meant" to remain oblivious.*

Neville Robertson (2004) has picked up McIntosh's challenge to make visible white privilege in New Zealand, a précis is reproduced below.

#### **On Equality and Colourblindness by Neville Robertson**

I like to think that I have been moderately successful in my life. And I'd like to think I have worked pretty hard for what I have achieved. I don't feel guilty when it comes to pay day. But can I say I have done it entirely on my own effort? Was the playing field really level?

I think not. I grew up on a farm carved out of land taken in a dodgy deal from Ngāi Tahu – a farm which gave me and my family a good start in life. My current home is built on land illegally confiscated from Tainui.

I went to schools where the teachers looked pretty much like me. And they taught me about writers, military heroes, political leaders and scientists who looked pretty much like me. I learnt about how "we" were good colonialists who treated Māori rather better than they probably deserved. The officially-sanctioned knowledge of my schooling accorded with my personal experience. Not knowing about tapu, manaakitanga or

whakapapa has never been a serious disadvantage to me. Being able to speak just one language – English – has not hindered me pursuing both my cultural and economic interests.

All my working life I have been hired by people who look like me. No-one ever patronised me by telling me I was a credit to my race. When I've been late to meetings – and I have to say I've been late more often than I care to admit – no-one ever made a comment about "Pākehā time." I've never been expected to be knowledgeable about all things Pākehā. No-one has ever turned to me and asked "What is the Pākehā perspective on this?"

From time to time, I've walked down town late at night and I've never attracted the suspicion of the police. As far as I can tell, shop keepers have never regarded me as a potential shop-lifter. I've made a few stuff ups along the way but never once did anyone say, "Well, what do you expect from a Pākehā?" Truth is, I've been cut quite a lot of slack in my time.

I don't think I'm alone in this. Research conducted by some of my colleagues has tested out this idea of white privilege by inviting people to respond to 22 items reflective of privilege. Majority group (white) participants were much more likely than minority group (Māori, Pacific Island, Asian) participants to agree with the following.

*I can turn the television on or open to the front page of the newspaper and see people of my ethnic group positively and widely represented.*

*When I am told about our national heritage or about "civilisation", I am shown that people of my ethnic group made New Zealand what it is.*

*Whether I use cheques, credit cards, or cash, I can count on my skin colour not to work against perceptions of my financial reliability or status.*

*I can swear or dress in second hand clothes, or not answer letters, without having people attribute these choices to the bad morals, poverty, or the illiteracy of my race.*

*I can criticize our Government and talk about how much I fear its policies and behaviour without being seen as an ethnic outsider.*

*I can easily buy posters, postcards, picture books, greeting cards, dolls, toys and children's magazines featuring people of my ethnicity.*

Karyn McKinney (2005), conducted research with young white students in America and found that often their initial approach to being asked about their whiteness was silence. I noted that silence was also discussed by Helen Gibson (2006), in her research with New Zealand women about being white. McKinney reported that once her participants found their voice, they grappled with the contrasting tensions of whiteness as a liability and whiteness as a privilege. She notes that "collective white identity is constructed through individual white struggles with these two positions" (p. 18). McKinney aimed to turn the critical gaze of race from the "racialized Other, onto racialized whites ... 'othering' whiteness – treating it as exotic" (2005, p. 3). While McKinney is working in a race framework, which I have argued to be a falsity in relation to Frankenberg's (1997) preference for race rather than cultural labels, nevertheless her work has a similar agenda to the cultural and decolonising framework I have adopted.

In her studies of the social and psychological consequences of racism in Britain, Caroline Howarth (2006, p. 446) posits that race as a form of stigma is carried on bodies as a visual representation that cannot be erased, it is always there.

Further, that "... contemporary racist images remain tied to bloody histories of

colonial relations, slavery, the denigration and economic exploitation of particular cultures”. She argues that as race stigma is collectively constructed, in order to resist the stigmatising of raced identities, collective and political understanding and action is required.

The study of the discourses used by white Australian participants in the process of reconciliation between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians which began as a ten year project in 1991, was continued by Meredith Green and Christopher Sonn (2006, p. 379). Through examining these discourses they “... argue that understanding the power relations that underlie the political actions of those in dominant positions is critical to ensuring the goals of anti-racism are achieved”.

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide the historical and socio-political context in which Pākehā culture is located. In it I outlined aspects of colonisation, policies of assimilation and practices of racism that were submerged in the perpetuation of the myth that New Zealand had the ‘best race relations in the world’. I examined the position of dominance that Pākehā maintain and revealed some of the challenges that have disturbed the complacency of that dominance. Lastly, I considered some of the local and international literature that has focused on various ways in which strategies of decolonisation and anti-racism have been employed. The next chapter explains the methodological and theoretical approaches I have taken to this study of Pākehā culture.



# Chapter Four

## Philosophical and Theoretical Stakes in the Ground

*The purpose of research is not the production of new knowledge per se. Rather, the purposes are pedagogical, political, moral, and ethical, involving the enhancement of moral agency, the production of moral discernment, a commitment to praxis, justice, an ethic of resistance, and a performative pedagogy that resists oppression (Denzin, 2005, p. 951).*

Areas of literature that explore the concepts of culture, dominant cultural groups, Pākehā, and the socio-political context of culture in relation to Aotearoa were explored in the last two chapters. The task of this chapter is to lay out the philosophical approach to this research project about marking Pākehā culture keeping in mind that the focus is how dominant group members in Aotearoa come to recognise themselves as Pākehā and to mark what is cultural about their lifestyle, values and practices.

In this study I make no claim to be an objective observer of the culture I am considering, rather, I am a subjective participant in that culture and have, therefore, drawn on the philosophical approaches to meaning making that are expressed in the social constructionist paradigm to inform this study. Meaning making through the ‘turn to language’ as a focus of study along with four key assumptions that are foundational to social constructionism are outlined and discussed. Community and critical psychology perspectives, followed by methodological approaches such as narrative, dominant discourses and thematic analysis, are considered.

### **The social constructionist paradigm**

*At an ontological level social constructionism demands a radical reconceptualisation of the way in which we have understood language to operate. Epistemologically a social constructionist perspective involves a radical reorientation of what we consider knowledge to be (Tuffin, 2005, p. 67).*

The theoretical foundations of this study are to be found in the epistemology that encompasses constructionism, a paradigm which focuses on the making of meaning. Crotty (1998) describes constructionism as

*The view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context (p.42).*



According to Crotty, constructionism, through the notion of intentionality draws together, and holds together, both objectivity and subjectivity. He explains that in this use intentionality or

*... 'in-tending' is not about choosing or planning but about **reaching out into** (just as 'ex-tending' is about **reaching out from**). ... When the mind becomes conscious of something, when it 'knows' something, it reaches out to, and into, that object. ... [I]ntentionality posits a quite intimate and very active relationship between the conscious subject and the object of the subject's consciousness. Consciousness is directed towards the object; the object is shaped by consciousness. (1998, p. 44. Emphasis in original).*

The social constructionist paradigm is appropriate for this research as I am not trying to explain or argue for the whole truth or reality about a culture. Rather, from the stories and experiences of a particular group of people in a community, I am seeking to gain an explicit understanding of the relative patterns of culture that we as Pākehā live and experience.

### The turn to language

Social constructionism has been described as the “turn to language” (Edley, 2001, p. 433) in social psychology. Further than that, it has, according to Edley, “promoted a major reconsideration of some of the most central tenets of Western philosophy” (p. 434), particularly those related to the notions of truth and reality. This ‘turn to language’ has upset contemporary common sense assumptions that “on the one hand, we have the ‘real world’, with all its distinctive qualities, and then, on the other, we have accounts or descriptions of that world” (Edley, 2001, p. 435).

However, the link between the words that describe the world and the world itself were found to correspond in a somewhat arbitrary fashion, not in a straightforward manner as had previously been assumed. The ontological belief that the world is always there was not the focus of social constructionism; rather, what it offered was a different epistemic approach which challenged the way in which people come to know the world. Social constructionists, therefore, made the claim that language

*... is **productive** rather than (merely) reflective. 'Reality' isn't so much mirrored in talk and texts as actually **constituted** by them. Discourse, said Foucault (1972), in an often quoted phrase, constructs the objects of which it speaks (Edley, 2001, p. 435. Emphasis in original).*

The way in which people make sense of their world is primarily through language as “it is inseparably involved with processes of thinking and reasoning” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 9).

For example, when I want to travel from my home in Hamilton, previously named Kirikiriroa, to the nearby coastal town of Raglan, I do not for one minute

imagine that Raglan only comes into existence when it is mentioned or when I locate it on a map. The belief that Raglan exists is an ontological position I take. Rather, the social constructionist viewpoint, or, more precisely, the epistemological position about how I know Raglan exists is much more subtle. Some text about the history of Raglan noted that “in 1858 Whaingaroa became Raglan” on land sold to the Government by “Wiremu Neera, acting for Ngāti Mahanga” (Lawson, 2004). How the town developed over time, where it begins and ends, and what it contains has been a matter of negotiation and agreement ever since. Edley points out that “the argument is not, therefore, that [Raglan] doesn’t really exist, but that it does so as a socially constructed reality” (2001, p. 439).

The ontological and epistemological debates about what is understood as real or existing and the way that the meanings of what is understood as existing are brought into consciousness through language have produced a significant tension in the ways I discuss Pākehā culture through out this thesis. It is one thing to describe the subtle distinctions, as Edley points out above, in relation to a town. While it is my intention to be clear about these distinctions when discussing the many conceptual elements of culture, I have no doubt at times used language that implies that culture ‘exists’ rather than using language which directs the reader towards an understanding of a culture being constructed through writing about it. On those occasions I have slipped back into the familiar 'descriptive' language that naturalises an objective account rather than draw on a constitutive approach to culture more in keeping with.

### Key assumptions of social constructionism

Rather than trying to define social constructionism I will briefly describe how Vivien Burr’s (2003) four key assumptions of social constructionism,

*A critical stance toward taken-for-granted knowledge (p.2), Historical and cultural specificity (p. 3), Knowledge is sustained by social processes (p. 4), Knowledge and social action go together (p. 5),*

that are used to inform this research project about Pākehā culture and identity.

#### *Taken-for-granted knowledge is approached with a critical stance*

Social constructionism encourages people to question and be critical of what is taken for granted as understandings of how the world is or should be, including ourselves. Social constructionist approaches reject the positivist view that the ways of the world can be known through objective, unbiased observation and that these ways of knowing are accepted as the foundation of conventional knowledge. They treat as problematic traditional scientific views such as

“assumptions that the nature of the world can be revealed by observation, and that what exists is what we perceive to exist” (Burr, 2003, p. 3). The way categories are created as a means of understanding the world should not be taken for granted as real divisions; rather, they can be approached as constructed divisions for particular purposes. For example, it may appear natural to categorise plants as desirable (flowers, or vegetables), or undesirable (weeds) in a garden. But these categories can be questioned and debated as the same plant could be categorised as a flower or a weed depending, for example, on what is accepted gardening practice in a culture. In Aotearoa, grass is encouraged to grow as lawn and assiduously weeded out of a garden: same plant, but different locations.

How culture and identity positions are ascribed and understood is approached critically in social constructionism. In their study of national identity, Taylor and Wetherell (1995) point out that a person, rather than conforming to the fixed identity position inherent in the essentialist notion of an autonomous and bounded individual, can change their identity location in interactions. Identity positions in their research were “treated as pieces of discourse rather than as neutral descriptions of personality and individual psychology” (p. 71) as they may carry with them a wide range of meanings. They consider that

*Identity in talk is thus always a collective and personal construction. It is an achievement and an accomplishment as well as an 'effect' of the relational and discursive environment (Taylor & Wetherell, 1995, p. 72).*

Examining the way people think and talk about culture in this way allows for an evolving understanding of what is considered to be cultural rather than accepting what is regarded as normal as the only way things could be.

### *Historical and cultural specificity*

Knowledge is always historically and culturally specific and understandings are products of history and culture and dependent upon particular social and economic arrangements at any given time. According to Burr, all ways of understanding are not only

*... specific to particular cultures and periods of history, they are seen as products of that culture and history, and are dependent upon the particular social and economic arrangements prevailing in that culture at that time (2003, p. 4).*

For example, to study Pākehā culture as it is now, it has been necessary to gain an understanding of the history of Aotearoa New Zealand, of how it was populated, when and by whom. Stories of the social and cultural contexts from which indigenous and settler peoples came and arrived to build their lives in Aotearoa have been explored (Belich, 1996, 2001; R. Consedine & Consedine, 2001/2005; King, 1999; Macdonald, 1990; McNab, 1914; Sinclair, 2000). In this

study of culture the timeframe and the social and political context in which the stories of culture are told, will be specified.

*Knowledge is constructed between people through daily interactions and is sustained by social processes*

This study is focussed on the social processes involved in the way in which people come to recognise and understand themselves as cultural through their interactions with each other and in society.

*Social constructionism emphasises the hold our culture has on us: it shapes the way in which we see things (even the way in which we feel things!) and gives us a quite definite view of the world. This shaping of our minds by culture is to be welcomed as what makes us human and endows us with the freedom we enjoy (Crotty, 1998, p. 58).*

In the social constructionist paradigm, knowledge of the world is considered to be constructed by people in all kinds of daily social interactions, whether they be direct contact or indirectly, through the media, for example. Language, while not the sole means of communication between people, is, however, the main area of interest to social constructionists. “The goings-on between people in the course of their everyday lives are seen as the practices during which our shared versions of knowledge are constructed” (Burr, 2003, p. 4).

Culture is the vehicle of our social understanding in that it is socially constructed and brought into consciousness through language. Cultural learning is an essential part of human development that, in the first instance, takes place in families and neighbourhoods. These are the sites where we learn about how to do things and appropriate ways to be and act in society. Developmental psychologist Vygotsky, who was born into a Jewish family in Russia in 1896, theorised that

*... even a new born baby is fully a member of culture, surrounded by the language of that culture (even though the infant cannot yet speak the language) (Drewery & Bird, 2004, p. 23).*

While growing up, for example, children will learn about what are regarded as ‘good manners’ in their families and communities. This learning is cultural, although the process seems absolute and invisible to the child and is unlikely to be marked as cultural. It is usually not until there is contact with people who have a different culture from the one we have grown up in that we start to see aspects of our own culture. This is particularly so for members of dominant groups as American sociologist Karyn McKinney noted

*In individual white people’s life stories lies a rich source of information about white culture, even though that culture is often invisible to the storytellers themselves (2005, p. 5).*

She also observed from the autobiographies that college students wrote in her ‘Race and Ethnicity’ course that in the students’ families there was a ‘silence’

about race, and being white was not a topic of conversation. However, in their autobiographical narratives it became apparent to McKinney that “many whites seem to construct what it means to be white based on their sense of what they are *not* – a person of colour” (2005, p. 9). In my own experience, it was when I consciously engaged in talk about what my culture might be that I started to gain a sense of having a culture rather than about what I was not.

*Knowledge and social action go together and are bound up in power relations*

There are numerous potential social constructions of the world in which people live, and according to Burr (2003), each construction brings with it different kinds of human action. For example, up until the 1980s smoking tobacco, at work, on public transport, in bars and restaurants, or in people’s homes whether they smoked or not, was a socially acceptable habit in New Zealand. In the late 1970s a few people began a campaign to increase awareness about the harmful effects of smoking. The campaign gained momentum and through social action over a period of 20-30 years smoking tobacco is no longer viewed to be socially acceptable, with both social habits and places where people are able to smoke having changed drastically. Laws have been enacted to prevent smoking in public spaces including bars and restaurants, for example. Burr suggests that

*... our constructions of the world are therefore bound up with power relations because they have implications for what it is permissible for different people to do, and for how they may treat others (2003, p. 5).*

The four key assumptions about how knowledge is understood in a social constructionist paradigm underpin the theoretical perspectives which I will now outline.

### **A community and critical psychology perspective**

By the time I undertook university study in the 1980s I had already been involved in social and community activism for many years and was keen to learn more about the theories and practice of social change processes. My undergraduate degree was science based, with a major in psychology. The emphasis on explicit values and having the opportunity to engage in critical research with a strong focus on social justice in a community context drew me to community psychology (Hamerton, Nikora, Robertson, & Thomas, 1995; D R Thomas & Veno, 1992).

In even a cursory read through the literature on critical social theories it readily became apparent to me that there are multiple versions and approaches that could

be adopted. As a way through the complexity of critical theorising, Kincheloe and McLaren have conceptualised that

*A critical social theory is concerned in particular with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system (2003, p. 436).*

The focus of my research is the way in which dominant group members come to recognise their culture and social systems. Kincheloe & McLaren's conceptualisation is a useful perspective to take into account along with those of community psychology, and my own experiential learning from social activism in social justice, feminist and anti-racism movements.

### **Methodological approaches**

Considering methodological approaches for particular research projects marks the point of transition from the higher level theoretical considerations of epistemological stance and perspectives, which I have outlined above, to the design and strategies that will inform how the research is carried out (Crotty, 1998). Informing these decisions was the social constructionist view of identity construction as an active social process.

*The social processes involved in both the formation and maintenance of identity are determined by the social structure. Conversely, the identities produced by the interplay of organism, individual consciousness and social structure react upon the given social structure, maintaining it, modifying it, or even reshaping it (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 194).*

Implicit in their theorising of the construction of identities are the concepts of instability, and incompleteness. Identities lack totality and, as Hall (1996, p. 4) argued, "they are constructed through, not outside, difference", thus through the very act of inclusion, there is inherent the power to exclude who is determined as 'other'.

With these notions in mind I wanted to explore the way a group of Treaty people, who were familiar with each other, would tell their own stories of recognising their culture in a collective environment rather than as individual interviews. In designing this research project I have drawn on a mix of feminist, focus group and narrative methodologies combined with my own experiences of being an insider in the research group and that of facilitating group processes. I decided that a thematic realist analysis of the Treaty people discourses about Pākehā culture would offer the best fit to the data, although I have also extended my analysis by applying a finer grained interpretive approach to some of the data. I will offer a rationale for the way these methodologies have informed the methods used in this study.

## Revealing group processes of identity construction through narratives

Oral traditions of storytelling to pass on cultural knowledge to new generations are important practices in many indigenous cultures (Bishop, 1996; L. T. Smith, 1999). Storytelling in groups as a political tool to raise women's consciousness about issues affecting their everyday lives was used extensively through the second-wave of feminism (Madriz, 2000).

*Shared stories provide significant ways of understanding the world. In oral cultures, elders tell life stories for the edification and socialization of children in the community. Knowing how and why such stories are true is part of the process of maturing, and is fundamental to intellectual, emotional, and social development. To understand one's own life in light of these stories is to be a full participant in a particular culture (Personal Narratives Group, 1989, p. 261).*

Telling stories is a key feature in establishing connections and building relationships with people, making meaning of our lives, and making sense of our ever-changing world (M. L. Crossley, 2000; Murray, 2003; Riessman, 2008). The process of everyday oral storytelling, according to Catherine Riessman, involves a speaker connecting

*... events into a sequence that is consequential for later action and for the meanings that the speaker wants listeners to take away from the story (2008, p. 3).*

This is the basis of a narrative, although, as Riessman takes pains to point out, not all stories are narratives. However, for the purposes of this study, I suggest that in its simplest form a narrative is a formal term that will be treated as synonymous with story. When used in the research context

*The narrative process may bring order from chaos, reveal hidden patterns and meanings, and move teller and listeners toward clarity while fostering feelings of connectedness or "engaged" knowledge (Mulvey et al., 2000, p. 885).*

Storytelling about everyday experiences is part of the process of getting to know people, in a group or community, and can be a fruitful area of research (Murray, 2003). Doing interviews with individuals is a common method of gathering data in narrative research (M. L. Crossley, 2000; Lapsley et al., 2002; Murray, 2003; Riessman, 2008).

As a vehicle for "collective conversations or group interviews" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 887) focus group research has a history dating back to the 1920s (Wilkinson, 2003). While focus groups have been used in a number of ways, for example, in market research, military intelligence, emancipatory pedagogy and feminist research, they are "important formations of collective inquiry where theory, research, pedagogy, and politics converge" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 888).

Educationalist Paulo Freire (1996/1970) consistently worked with groups of people rather than individuals in Brazil to improve literacy and to encourage a sense of agency and the potential for people to change the oppressive conditions in which they lived. His theorising of processes of conscientization and praxis have strongly influenced social change movements in Aotearoa (Huygens, 2006, 2007).

Second-wave feminist consciousness raising groups were another area of group work that had a profound influence on the lives of participants and facilitators alike. My own experience of being in women's consciousness raising groups was that they enabled a depth and breadth of storytelling about our lives that was previously not imagined. Stories of the lives we lived beneath what was apparent on the surface had a profound impact on many of us as we started to re-vision our individual experiences as collective social practices. Consciousness raising groups were political with a social justice agenda and they aimed "to build "theory" from the lived experiences of women that could contribute to their emancipation" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 893).

There are many variations of telling stories in group situations. Storytelling in a formal research or workshop situation is generally a conscious and orchestrated process, where the focus of the story is shaped by the questions that are asked of the group. To know that the stories will be recorded and analysed as part of a research project means that the stories are constructed by participants for this specific purpose. This does not preclude the notion that research groups are sites where "many of the everyday speech acts that are part and parcel of unmarked social life – conversations, group discussions, negotiations, and the like" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 887) are spoken.

### Dominant Discourses

In his studies, Foucault looked back in time to understand the connections between power and knowledge in the way current discourses are used. Jean Carabine describes the Foucauldian approach as offering

*A lens through which to undertake discourse analysis and with which we can read discourses. As we shall see this lens means that we read discourses as, on the one hand, being infused with power/knowledge and, on the other, as playing a role in producing power/knowledge networks (2001, p.268).*

A key triad in Foucault's theorising is the interplay between discourse, power and knowledge. Gavey (2005) makes the point that discourses vary in their authority; some carry with them more power than others. While discourses are considered to be shared cultural products at the same time they are



*... multiple and they offer competing, potentially contradictory ways of giving meaning to the world. They are not absolute or universal; rather they take shape in specific ways in different times, places, and within different cultural contexts (Gavey, 2005, p. 85).*

Raymond Nairn (2003), in his studies of the way in which various media report stories of mental illness, draws on the multiplicity of discourses when he considers the somewhat fluid and incoherent nature of the everyday language used to describe madness in contrast to the technical and rather well-rehearsed language used in the health system. The way in which mental illness is talked about in the media very often uses a mixture of various discourse strands with a tendency towards using elements of the more technical language to give an air of authority to the story being told.

Dominant discourses maintain authority because they have the appearance of obviousness, naturalness and impartiality, particularly, as Gavey pointed out, “by appealing to common sense or dominant cultural values like science and reason” (2005, p. 85). Cultural dominance may also be maintained both by its taken-for-granted appearance of naturalness and also through silence, the lack of any discursive engagement with what a cultural identity might mean. Heather Hamerton (2000) in her memory work study with Pākehā women reflected that they had little experience in thinking of Pākehā as having a culture.

*Because our culture was the dominant one and we were all immersed in it, it was invisible to us. Secondly, as a Pākehā I am not proud of many of the things that my ancestors have done to the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand. I have never before thought of Pākehā as a group with any cohesion or an identity to be proud of (p. 235).*

Working with the silences in her interviews with participants about race and whiteness was a key challenge for Helen Gibson (2006) as she came to understand that “silences have symbolic rhetorical roles that are available for interpretation” (p. 73). Even in silence there is meaning and the refusal to engage in cultural or race talk may indicate a desire to allow dominance to remain undisturbed.

I was reminded of the taken for granted nature of a dominant discourse that operates in naming a cultural identity when I read Stuart Hall’s (1990) reference to the European presence in the Caribbean as

*... endlessly speaking. ... ‘Europe’ belongs irrevocably to the play of power, to the lines of force and consent, to the role of the **dominant**, in Caribbean culture (p. 232 emphasis in original).*

The way in which Hall ties the identity of Europe to power prompted me to think about why the dominant settler group in Aotearoa call themselves European rather than British. I have been puzzled as to why the term European is so commonly used when the majority of colonial settlers have their origins more

specifically in Great Britain. Historically Britain saw itself as only nominally part of Europe. European is an identity which signifies a position of power in the world. It is not an accidental term but a colonising tool that effectively signifies the maintenance of power. Huygens has pointed out that “many would argue that ‘British’ is the supreme power term so ‘European’ might be a way of obscuring the real (British) cultural power” (personal communication, 14/9/09).

While language itself takes many forms, for the purposes of this study I am examining oral communication that has been largely transcribed into written text (see method chapter for a full description). I am studying the discourses about Pākehā culture of a specific group of Treaty People within a particular social context and at a particular point in time.

### Thematic analysis

The search for themes in qualitative data analysis is widely used and should be one of the first skills that researchers learn, however, as a methodological approach thematic analysis is rarely acknowledged and is usually very poorly demarcated (Braun & Clarke, 2006). My experience of doing thematic analysis in the past has been rather chaotic and very time consuming, so it is with some sense of relief that I am able to draw on the scholarship and experience of Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke (2006) to give some coherence to this very useful research strategy.

Thematic analysis is described by Braun and Clarke as a ‘flexible method’ which is compatible with both essentialist and constructionist paradigms. Research situated within the constructionist paradigm, uses thematic analysis to examine “... the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 81). Thematic analysis can be used as a means to reflect reality and to disturb or untangle the surface of ‘reality’, and it is necessary to make clear the theoretical perspective so that assumptions being made about data are transparent. For example, in the essentialist/realist approach language, discourse is treated “... as a relatively unambiguous pathway to actions, beliefs or actual events” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 34), and meanings are believed to reside within a person. On the contrary a social constructionist approach treats meaning and experience as being

*... socially produced and reproduced ... and seeks to theorise the sociocultural contexts, and structural conditions, that enable the individual accounts that are provided (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 85).*

In this study I have approached the data from both an essentialist and a constructionist view point. I engaged in this research and read the transcript data as a member of the same social group as the participants on the basis that we have a shared social reality. Hence I treated their stories of culture and the meanings they ascribed in that talk in a relatively straight forward fashion where “language reflects and enables us to articulate meaning and experience” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 85). As my fluency with the research data grew I was able to interpret the relationship of the Treaty People talk to the more widely used talk of Pākehā in the general community context using a constructionist approach.

A necessary component of thematic analysis is the theme which

*... captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82).*

There are a number of ways in which a researcher may select themes and, while there are no specified rules, factors such as prevalence need to be examined. A theme may be present across the whole data set, it may only be mentioned in some data items although it may be relevant to a particular research question.

Inductive or deductive thematic analysis are two primary ways in which themes or patterns are identified in a data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the inductive or ‘bottom up’ style, identified themes are strongly connected to the data and may be described as ‘data-driven’ rather than trying to fit them into a “pre-existing coding frame” (p.83). The ‘top down’ theoretical or deductive approach is more explicitly analyst driven, and generally provides a more detailed analysis of some aspect of the data. The inductive style is perhaps most useful in areas where there is little previous research to draw on or the researcher wishes to take a fresh look at data without feeling constrained by previous approaches. On the other hand, taking a theoretical or deductive approach is likely to enable a finer grained analysis of themes that have been identified in earlier research. I decided to take an inductive approach to analysing the data from my participants as there is little previous research or theorising that might serve to guide the ways in which dominant group members talk about their culture. It should be noted that themes are always the reader's creation; an inductive style may be more obviously connected to the data but still it is the reader's eye that sees the themes.

Themes can also be identified at two different levels, and, typically, only one of the levels either the semantic or explicit level, or the latent or interpretive level is used in a research process. The semantic level usually involves identifying themes from the surface meanings that are presented in the data from participants talk or from written material. It starts with the identification and description of

themes and then progresses to an interpretative phase where the researcher attempts to theorise the significance, broader meanings and implication of the themes (Patton, 1990). I was introduced to the semantic level of analysis, although it was not labelled as such, in evaluation research. Patton is one of the key theorists in that field.

Latent or interpretive thematic analysis tends to have its foundations in the social constructionist paradigm and is closely related to some forms of discourse analysis. Data analysis “starts to identify or examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualisations – and ideologies – that are theorised as shaping or informing the semantic content of the data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84). Interpretive work is involved in developing themes and descriptions which are presented as already theorised. I would argue that while either the semantic or the interpretive style may have been used quite separately in most research it is possible to take different readings of the same data set using each approach and they are not mutually exclusive but rather serve different purposes.

Semantic thematic analysis is the primary approach I have taken across the whole data set to provide a descriptive account of the ways in which participants have marked Pākehā culture. I have also employed a finer grained interpretive analysis to examine some of the underlying or latent themes in some of the data sets, particularly as they relate to the dominant discourses used by Pākehā about themselves in wider social structures in New Zealand society.

In this chapter I have put my theoretical stakes in the ground. The social constructionist paradigm underpins this research. Social constructionist approaches enable the theorising of culture as a way of knowing that is embedded in history, sustained by social processes, and always negotiated through elements of language and power. Community and critical psychology offer particular perspectives that have influenced the feminist and social activist approaches to doing group work. Finally the versions of thematic analysis are outlined as, in combination, they will guide the way in which the research material is analysed. Throughout this study I have kept in mind my own relationship to the people and the stories which could be regarded both as a limitation or an opportunity to maintain the context of the research. The way in which I have applied these theories will be described in the next chapter.



# Chapter Five

## People and Procedures

This research is both my individual pursuit and part of a collective endeavour which has inspired and supported the project. What appears in this chapter is a relatively seamless account of a research process in which there has been much stitching together, pulling apart, and re-stitching along the way. While the details are a story for another time and place, I have reported the main stages in the process.

In the last chapter I traversed, albeit selectively, the theoretical parameters, the thinking behind the research, and the insights that were available from the writings of others that have informed the way in which this research was designed and enacted. Research philosophies and theories are only one aspect of a research project. The people and practicalities involved in applying the theories and doing the research are the focus of this chapter. Treaty people participants, who are at the heart of this research, will be described. An account will be given of the design and multiple voices that have influenced this research. The method, which has utilized focus groups and informal interviews as data gathering strategies, along with techniques of thematic analysis, will be described in detail.

### **Research design**

Just as Foucault (Carabine, 2001) theorised that discourses have a genealogy, a complex array of influences, so too does the design of this research project. The design is born out of a long history of involvement in groups associated with anti-racism and Treaty work: women's groups; Playcentre; Church groups along with research experience in focus group and individual interviewing in evaluation and narrative research.

Focus groups were explicitly used in the women's movement as ways to build theory about their everyday experiences and then to use their theories for action towards political change (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). Esther Madriz argued that as a method, group interviews with women were

*Particularly suited for uncovering women's daily experience through collective stories and resistance narratives that are filled with cultural symbols, words, signs, and ideological representations that reflect different dimensions of power and domination that frame women's quotidian experiences (2000, p. 839).*

Feminist consciousness-raising groups include important features such as decentring the role of researcher, the opportunity to advance issues of social justice, and the collective sharing of stories (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005).

For this study I adopted three different data gathering strategies that fulfilled the dual purposes of being compatible with the aims and processes of Treaty People networks while acting as a reflexive relationship building process. The timing of research sessions along with location and space were carefully considered and will be discussed later in the chapter.

The first strategy was to facilitate a focus group using a feminist consciousness raising process in a research session organised in conjunction with my colleague Ingrid Huygens (2007) following the 2003 Treaty People Conference<sup>13</sup>. One technique commonly used in women's groups, no matter what the topic, was to "go round the room" (Piercy & Freeman, 1972). Each person present was given the opportunity to speak and no one was passed over. I followed that practice in facilitating the first focus group session when I asked participants to talk about their cultural identity and what being Pākehā meant for them.

Strategy two, which grew out of the first focus group session, was to go on a road trip throughout Aotearoa and talk to as many participants as were available at the time in their own locations. To round off the data-gathering phase of the research, strategy three was to organise and facilitate a second focus group session to be held during the next Treaty conference in April 2005. This focus group functioned as a plenary group discussion, as that most suited the research questions I posed to the group. Recording procedures and the analysis process are outlined below.

### **Positions and voices in research**

Combining Academic work on community groups has had a chequered history in Aotearoa creating a degree of cynicism and mistrust among the latter about the former. A gap has existed for years between the research and theoretical writing of the academy and the experiential based theory building in the community. Academic work is often critiqued and criticised as being removed from and very often irrelevant to the daily struggles and social change commitments of community groups. "The Western academy has traditionally denied the validity of indigenous worldviews and aspirations, as well as resisting the alternative

---

<sup>13</sup> Conference was adopted as a strategic name for Treaty People gatherings to enable people to access, where possible, institutional funding to attend.

views held by social change movements” (Huygens, 2007, p. 99). Driven by the principles and values of community psychology (Hamerton et al., 1995; Robertson & Masters-Awatere, 2007; D R Thomas & Veno, 1992) I was encouraged as a community psychologist and researcher to work in closing that gap between the ‘community’ and the ‘academy’ to create reciprocal knowledge sharing relationships.

### Researcher positioning and ethics

I have been variously active in anti-racism movements from the early 1970s and then with Treaty education and activism since the mid 1980s. In more recent years I have given my attention to Treaty issues within psychology as a member of the New Zealand Psychological Society’s *National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues* (NSCBI). I have some involvement in the Waikato Anti-Racism Coalition (WARC); and have contributed to organising some Treaty People gatherings and conferences and attended them when possible.

I am the researcher and author of this work, Pākehā and a member of the Treaty People network. Therefore, I am positioned as an ‘insider’ in the research process as I am researching my own culture with a group of people I am familiar to and with. As I make these positional claims I am troubled by the ease with which I do so and the apparent simplicity they portray. Identities are not experienced as either simple or fixed as was indicated by Avril Bell (2004, p. 8) when, in her study of Māori and Pākehā relationships, she spoke of a “shifting sense of self as Pākehā”. Like Bell, Huygens (2006, 2007), Hamerton (2000), Gibson (2006) and I, have carried out studies where there are always insider and outsider positionings. In our research the recognition of our privilege as Pākehā women has needed to be unpacked to show the problems masked by a too easy assumption of Pākehā identity.

Researchers, according to Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005), are positioned both within and against the groups with which they work. In her research with groups of Treaty people about their processes of change, Ingrid Huygens spoke of the positional shift from ‘insider practitioner’ to ‘insider researcher’, a position that carried with it a new form of authority. “There was clearly the potential for betrayal of trust – I had become the ‘outsider within’” (2007, p. 110). I, too, recognised that my position as researcher within the larger group of Treaty people was a shift from being a regular participant and have at times felt like an “outsider within”. There is a sense in which as researcher I am neither totally trusted nor mistrusted, but work within the margins of trust set between community and academy.



There are some advantages to being an insider, particularly in a network where there has been a history of distrust with academic research. As a colleague and friend I was able to access a directness of expression from many participants and had credibility because of my social activism and relationships. I am therefore able to give readers access to a depth of information that may not have been so readily available to an unknown researcher.

Treaty work, to use the adage of feminism, is both political and personal. Treaty people work in a number of different fields and there is a high level of personal commitment and much voluntary time contributed towards changing the way in which the Treaty of Waitangi is understood and positioned in Aotearoa. Alistair Bonnett (1994) argued that in anti-racism work, a process of reflexivity, being self-conscious and actively self aware, was required to maintain a role in social activism. More is required than the self-consciousness from a fixed identity position, such as Pākehā woman, which, while providing insight may also act to reify that position. Bonnett advocates a critical social constructionist approach where the researcher/activist needs to engage in a 'social self-consciousness of social processes'. This form of reflexivity, "allows social representations to be understood as re-presentations. It disrupts the power and process of appropriation and enables political implications to come into focus" (Bonnett, 1994, p. 178).

I have embraced the process of reflexivity to maintain, as Bonnett suggested, a degree of self consciousness and active self awareness as I have journeyed through this study. This is apparent in my choice of topic and participants and through the evolving research design I have described above. I made a conscious decision to work with 'my own people' to explore 'our' cultural positioning rather than focus the dominant gaze on the cultural 'other'. The engagement with reflexive processes is described, for example, in the next section where I discuss the 'voices' that have contributed to this research. I engaged in critical and reflexive relationships with both Pākehā and Māori academic colleagues, and my supervisors, where I have checked out my writing and thinking in such a way as to disturb the 'insider' cultural position I am writing from and the social representations that are produced in that writing.

Anti-racism and Treaty education, political activism and reflexive practices are par for the course for most Treaty people. The set of ethics and traditions which inform and guide our Treaty and anti-racism work has been developed over at least a 30 year period and includes:

*an ethic of Pākehā taking responsibility for our institutions and culture and their outcomes (the kawanatanga article of the Treaty)*

*an ethic of respecting the Māori world as a self-determined and self-legitimated entity (the tino rangitiratanga article of the Treaty)*

*responsiveness and accountability in our work with the Treaty to Māori collectives and their aspirations*

*processes for accountability to and support for each other as non-Māori working with the Treaty*

*respecting our own local experience and local dynamics with Māori collectives as a source of knowledge*

*a tradition of recording our group brainstorming as collective knowledge*

*an ethic that researchers show respect for and acknowledge collective authorship in presenting knowledge generated through Treaty work*

*attending to our holistic needs such as food, rest and emotional support in our gatherings (Huygens, 2007, p. 99).*

These ethics and traditions, the values of community psychology, along with the *Code of ethics for psychologists working in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002) have guided my practice throughout this research.

### Voices in the research

In the introduction to this chapter, while claiming this work as my own, I also want to position it as a study that has involved a high level of collegial reflexivity. At the outset of this research journey five of us Ingrid Huygens, Ray Nairn, Mitzi Nairn, Tim McCreanor and I, met as Pākehā, colleagues and fellow academics committed to Treaty work. We made a decision to act as a peer mentor group for each other as we undertook, PhD study or other forms of research and writing related to Treaty social justice issues. Collectively we have a long history of involvement in anti-racism and Treaty work, both in the community and the academy. We made the following commitments to each other and to the wider Treaty movement as part of our ethic of accountability and transparency:

*That we intended our PhD studies and academic writing to support social justice efforts in Aotearoa with respect to Māori;*

*That we would report back regularly to our colleagues in Treaty/anti-racism work;*

*That we would support each other; and,*

*That we would seek ways, within the academic regulations, to link our areas of study to collective work supporting the Treaty of Waitangi (Huygens, 2007, p. 100).*

This group has been a vital link in the development of my academic voice. We brought our own work to meetings, more or less monthly, where: offered each other support, discussed ideas, theories, practical aspects of research and writing processes, gave feedback on writing and suggested ways to develop it. There has been ongoing emotional support and we enjoyed sharing food together as well as the ups and downs of our everyday lives as we met in each others' homes.

The opportunity to reflect on our work at regular intervals has been a very productive experience with both Ray (R. Nairn, 2004) and Ingrid (Huygens, 2007) completing their PhD's. Tim, who completed his PhD (McCreanor, 1995) before the group began, and Ray have produced numerous research reports and publications (McCreanor, 2005; McCreanor & Nairn, 2002, 2002a; R. Nairn et al., 2006). Mitzi edited and had published the *Programme on Racism newsletters 1985-2002* (M. Nairn, 2002a, 2002) and continued to facilitate Treaty workshops when requested. Ingrid has published a number of resource materials for the Treaty movement as well as other publications (Huygens, 2001, 2006, 2009; Huygens et al., 2003). Ingrid and I co-wrote a chapter for a handbook of psychological practice (Black & Huygens, 2007) as did Ray (R. Nairn, 2007). We have all been involved in organising and/or attending conferences and presenting our work at them. I have given an indication only of the work people are involved with and the work goes on.

Being a part of a collegial group such as this has enabled an ongoing critical reflection and the maintenance of a critical stance in our work through the process of interactive and collective reflexivity (Huygens, 2007). The engagement with each other over time, while not always comfortable, did, as Bonnett (1994) suggested, allow for the examination of the power, privilege and the political implications of our positions and publications.

Both Ray and I have been actively involved in the National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues (NSCBI) of the New Zealand Psychological Society. Through our involvement in this intercultural group I have developed strong links with Māori colleagues in Psychology. They have encouraged my study of Pākehā culture as an important step to demystifying the unacknowledged privileging of settler culture, and view it as a contribution towards local decolonisation strategies.

## **Research with Treaty People**

At the heart of this research are the participants who have so generously contributed their stories of Pākehā culture. Early in 2003, Ingrid Huygens (2007) and I suggested to the group organising the Treaty Conference planned for that October, that we would organise and facilitate a research day on the day following the conference. Ingrid, who was actively engaged with many local Treaty groups as part of her own PhD research, was keen to have a further research session and had funding to bring some people from around the country to the conference in Auckland. It was a wonderful opportunity for me to run a focus group session about Pākehā culture with people from throughout Aotearoa.

Invitations, through email, word of mouth and conference materials, were sent out to people in Treaty networks to participate in a focus group session to discuss Pākehā cultural identity the day after a two-day national Treaty worker conference at the Nga Kete Wananga Marae, Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT) on Sunday 5 October 2003. Twenty two people participated in this group. As a follow-up to that focus group I embarked on a road trip in early 2005 to visit as many participants as possible in their own locations. I visited sixteen people in centres from Whangarei, Auckland, Hamilton, Whanganui, Wellington, Palmerston North, Christchurch and Dunedin. A second focus group discussion on collective Pākehā identity was held on 30 April 2005 during the Treaty conference in a classroom at MIT, where nineteen people were present.

### *Ethics forms and confidentiality*

At the beginning of each of the two focus group sessions participants were handed out an information sheet about the research, a biographic form and a consent form (Appendices 1-10). All signed consent forms although one participant did not hand in a completed biographic form. One participant withdrew from the project after the first focus group session and their data was withdrawn.

Those who were interviewed on the road trip agreed that their participation was covered by the initial consent form and I agreed to consult further if I had concerns about any of the interview material. On the road trip I met with the Network Waitangi Whangarei group and discussed my research with them. At the time I did record the conversations but have not used them as data because I did not carry out a formal consent process with all those present.

The consent form served two functions: first, as a signed agreement to participate in the research, second, to ask participants the name they wished to be known by in the research. Most participants chose to use their own names, although some chose a nom de plume for the research. No distinctions are made between the chosen names. I have only used first names in writing up the analysis, except where it was necessary to add an extra identifier as for the two David's – DavidJ and DavidT, and the two Joan's – JoanC and JoanM.

### *Participants*

Thirty four people in total agreed to participate in the research, of whom twenty seven were female and seven were male. This is probably a reasonable representation of the gender split of those involved in Treaty work. As my research project developed I made a decision to accept on each research occasion those people who volunteered to attend. This meant that the people who were available for each session varied. Seven people participated in all three research sessions (Rose, JoanM, Suzanne, Bridget, DavidJ, Jane and Marisa). Eleven participated in two sessions (DavidT, Moea, Alex, Jo, Karen, Pal, Suze, Moyra, Kathy, Kati, Victoria), and sixteen in one research session (Sarah, Catriona, JoanC, Louise, Susan, Tim, Ingrid, Jen, Kevin, Angeline, Kathryn, Mitzi, John, Wendy, Jackson and Averil).

The 2003 Pākehā identity focus group participants were:

Rose (facilitating with Ingrid making notes), Jane, DavidT, Catriona, Wendy, Pal, Suze, Jen, Moyra, Kati, Moea, Karen, Victoria, JoanM, Suzanne, Bridget, Marisa, DavidJ, Alex, Angeline, Jo, and Kathy.

Road trip visits with recorded conversations were made with:

DavidJ, Moyra, Suzanne, Pal, Suze, Victoria & Jane, Kati, Karen, JoanM & DavidT, Moea, Marisa, Bridget, Alex, and Kathy.

Participants in the 2005 Collective Pākehā identity focus group:

Rose (facilitating with Alex video recording), Ingrid, Averil, Jackson, Marisa, Sarah, Bridget, JoanC, Susan, Tim, Jo, Mitzi, DavidJ, Louise, Kathryn, JoanM, Kevin, Suzanne, and John.

As I read through what the participants said about being Pākehā or Pākehā culture, in general, I realised that one way to derive meaning from what they said was to think about it in terms of their own generational experience. For example, most of those in the older generation group would have lived through the Second World War and the ensuing period in New Zealand when it was truly believed that we had the best race relations in the world, as discussed in Chapter three. The childhood cultural memories for middle generation people were noticeably

different than for many of those in the younger generation. In order to give a timeframe context to the participants' cultural experiences I have used three age groupings, from the ages participants stated on their biographic forms: younger, middle and older generations.

- In the younger age group, those who indicated they were aged up to thirty five years old at the time of the research, were two males Jackson and Alex; and six females: Marisa, Sarah, Jen, Kati, Victoria, and Angeline.
- The largest group were in the middle generation and were aged between thirty six and fifty five years old. There were fourteen females: Rose, Jane, Ingrid, Wendy, PAL, Suze, Moea, Suzanne, Bridget, Kathy, Jo, Louise, Kathryn, Averil; and two males: DavidT, and Tim.
- The older generation were those over the age of fifty six years. There were seven females: JoanC, Susan, Mitzi, JoanM, Catriona, Moyra, Karen; and three males DavidJ, Kevin, and John.

### **Gathering data**

The first focus group session was held on the afternoon of Sunday 5 October 2003 in the main meeting room of Nga Kete Wananga Marae at the Manukau Institute of Technology in Auckland. Participants were familiar with the meeting house as it had been the venue for the two-day conference and the morning research session with Ingrid Huygens. Twenty-two people gave a brief account of their cultural identity in response to the following questions which I had prepared.

Would you like to briefly tell the group something about yourself?

- How do you name yourself culturally/ethnically?
- When did you start to become aware of having a cultural identity?
- What were the circumstances of that awareness?
- What does being Pākehā or having a sense of Pākehā identity mean to you?
- Are there particular things about Pākehā culture that you notice?

These questions were written on a white board and copies, along with research information and consent forms, were given to each person present. Once any initial questions were answered and consent forms were completed there was a short discussion about the process. It was agreed that we would 'go around the room' and each person told their identity story to those present. Due to the number of participants present in the focus group session there were time constraints on how long each person could speak. I had allocated two hours for the research session and it became clear as we progressed around the room that

this was not going to be enough time. We negotiated that those who needed to leave at a certain time would have the opportunity to tell their story and others who could stay longer would wait until later. It took nearly four hours, with breaks to rest and to acknowledge those leaving, for all 22 stories to be told.

These stories were both video and audio-recorded and I transcribed them using both forms of recording to get clarity about each speaker and what they said. Each person was sent, either by post or email, the transcript of their individual story for checking and a return date was set. One person withdrew her story from the research at this point. With the permission of the participants, I then prepared a collection of the stories, which were printed and a copy was posted to each participant.

As I was engaged in a reflexive research process, the next phase of the research was prompted by two factors. During the 2003 research session I was challenged to incorporate follow up visits to participants in their own locations as part of the research. Behind this challenge was the concern that as a researcher I would disappear back into the University, never to be seen again. The second factor was that, as I started to analyse the stories, I realised that the question - Are there particular things about Pākehā culture that you notice? – had not been addressed to any great extent in the focus group due to time constraints. These were sound reasons to embark on a road trip.

In March 2005, having contacted as many participants as possible, I set out on a road trip to visit those available from the 2003 focus group in their own locations. The collection of stories from the 2003 session had been sent to participants and I had also let them know that I wanted to explore further the question of what they noticed about Pākehā culture, along with other questions they might have about the research. I visited 16 of the 22 people who participated in the first group and audio recorded and/or took notes of the conversations. The road trip was also a way of letting people know about the next focus group session I had arranged to take place at the Treaty People Conference to be held on 30 April 2005.

At that conference twenty people gathered at the prearranged time, in a classroom at the Manukau Institute of Technology. Alex offered to video and audio record the plenary session and took no part in the group discussion. To begin the session, I asked those present to go round the room to introduce themselves and name themselves culturally. I then presented my interpretations to date of the earlier stories (See Appendix 6). The third part of the focus group was a

discussion based on the following two questions which were displayed on the wall using an overhead projector:

**How does being in a group of self-identified Pākehā** stimulate, strengthen, and/or reinforce a sense of collective identity as Pākehā in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners and to other tangata tauwiwi groups?

**How do the identified\* cultural markers relate to**

A sense of collective identity

The kind of Pākehā we are seeking to become?

*\* Some cultural markers apart from those in the feedback were identified on the white board in the room but unfortunately they were not recorded at the end of the session.*

Recorded material from this focus group was transcribed, with the transcript being circulated to participants via email for checking. The transcript then became the third data set in my corpus, of some 224 pages of transcribed material.

#### *Some reflections:*

When organising the 2005 focus group I felt that there was enough acceptance of the term Pākehā in the group to direct the discussion to how a sense of collective Pākehā identity might develop. I was hoping that participants would reflect on their own experience of developing a Pākehā cultural identity through their participation in the Treaty movement. Framing the question as “how does being in a group of self-identified Pākehā ...” created a lively discussion which took me by surprise as I had not expected the notion of being a ‘self-identified Pākehā’ to be interpreted in the way it was. The main direction of the discussion was that Pākehā who were self-identified were different from those who did not identify as Pākehā. Being part of a group of people who identified as being Pākehā in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners did appear to create a collective sense of identity but there was a disjunction between being Pākehā in this group and also being a member of the dominant group of Pākehā. Initially I was puzzled by this conversation as I thought that people were perhaps suggesting that they did not identify as Pākehā. I later noted that all of the participants had written down Pākehā as their cultural identity on the forms I handed out. On reflection, the questions I asked about a sense of collective identity were a big leap from simply asking about Pākehā culture and there were people who were new to the research in that focus group. I emphasised that it was the experiences in groups such as this that I was keen to draw on rather than a general discussion about Pākehā culture or a debate about who might or might not recognise themselves as Pākehā. Asking a question such as this did perhaps signal a need



to shift our thinking from that of individual Pākehā to what it might mean to construct ourselves as a collective identity.

### Cultural and/or ethnic labels participants used to name themselves

Most of the information in this section has come from the biographic form which participants completed. I included questions about both cultural and ethnic identity as I was interested to see if participants made a distinction between these two constructs in light of the debates about whether Pākehā could be described as an ethnic group (A. Bell, 1996; Pearson, 1989; Pearson & Sissons, 1997). I was also curious about these distinctions in light of debates in Aotearoa particularly when it came time to fill in census forms. First, there are debates about the options for ethnic identity that are provided on the census form, and second, there were quite heated exchanges about how people answered the question of their ethnicity and the insistence of some that 'New Zealander' be included as an ethnic identity category. These debates frequently drew on the 'one people' discourse (R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1991).

When preparing the biographic form I omitted to ask participants about their place of birth and now find that it would be a useful piece of information to have as a background to considering how people then described themselves ethnically and culturally. From my personal knowledge of the thirty four participants and information gleaned from various conversations with regard to this research I worked out that 22 people were born in Aotearoa, two in England, one each in Scotland, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom. I am not sure where six people were born although most were likely to have been born in Aotearoa.

The biographic form included questions about cultural and ethnic labels participants used to name themselves. Below is a summary of labels participants used to describe themselves for the 2003 and 2005 focus groups. Nineteen people gave ethnic identity labels and twenty gave cultural identity labels in the 2003 group. All 20 participants gave ethnic and cultural identity labels in 2005. Of the eight people who were in both groups one gave labels in 2005 but not in 2003 and another gave different labels in each group. The six people who gave the same details for both groups have only been included once.

I did not give any definitions of what I understood to be either a cultural or an ethnic identity. I was interested in the way in which participants named themselves and whether they would make a distinction between the ethnic and cultural labels they used and, particularly, whether and how they would use the label Pākehā. There was no discussion about these terms so the data presented

below are the participant's own interpretation of the terms and in most cases people used different labels to distinguish their ethnic identity from their cultural identity.

### *Ethnic Identity*

In naming their ethnic identity most participants gave a description of their ancestry, related to people and place. Nine people named their ethnic identity as only Pākehā. Eleven participants (11) described their ethnic identity in terms of where they and their families may have come from including Pākehā. Ethnic identity names used were:

Pākehā New Zealander (2); Tangata Tiriti Pākehā; Pākehā - Irish, Welsh, English; Pākehā - Irish, Scots; Pākehā with Scots, Oxfordshire, Lincolnshire, Irish ancestors; Anglo-Pākehā; Pākehā (English & Scottish); Pākehā/European (2); Samoan-Pākehā.

A further fourteen people used descriptions that did not include the name Pākehā rather they named their ethnic identity as:

New Zealand; White western /Southern /Northern; Samoan/Tongan; Irish/Scots/English/Antiguan; Scots/Irish; Australian/European; European New Zealander; European(2); New Zealander of English descent; European (Irish); English/Scots/Irish; UK-European; Dutch.

One participant changed their ethnic identity description from New Zealand in 2003 to European in 2005.

### *Cultural Identity*

The names people used to describe their cultural identity varied in many cases from the ethnic identity, although six participants did use the same name. This variation could be seen as a way of describing an ancestry which is different from the cultural experience of living in Aotearoa.

Twenty participants described their cultural identity as Pākehā. A further ten used Pākehā along with a variety of other names (Scottish origin Pākehā; Pākehā New Zealander (3); Pākehā/European/Capitalist/Change Agent/Stray Zygote; Pākehā of English background/Quaker; Samoan-Pākehā; Pākehā of English and Irish descent/lineage; NZ-Kiwi & Pākehā!; Dutch Pākehā).

The term Tauīwi is used as part of a cultural descriptor (e.g. Tauīwi Pākehā; Pākehā/Tauīwi (this land), advocate of (global) justice and creativity) but was not used by any participant to describe their ethnic identity.

Two participants described their cultural identity as a) NZ born Samoan; and b) Canadian - Western Culture. In a later discussion with the NZ born Samoan participant we agreed that I would use the stories told in the research very sparingly as that person was concerned about the ease with which they could be identified, given that they were the only person of that identity. The Canadian – Western culture person’s contributions are analysed along with all the participants as she did refer to herself as Pākehā in a later discussion.

### **Working with data**

Thematic analysis, because of its ‘flexibility’ especially when used in the social constructionist paradigm, allows for the reading of the data corpus, or data sets (sections of data) based on a range of analytic questions to explore different patterns and meanings (Braun & Clarke, 2006). While it tends towards the production of rich or ‘thick descriptions’ (Geertz, 1973) rather than fine grained interpretive analysis, it fits with one of my research aims which is to produce accessible findings that can be read by those who are not necessarily familiar with more complex research methods and jargon.

Early on I undertook a semantic, inductive level thematic analysis, particularly of the 2003 data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In it I was looking to identify themes from within the explicit or surface meanings of the data rather than fitting the data into a pre-existing coding frame. As familiarity with the data and confidence in my analyses developed, I moved towards a more interpretive analytic style. All such analyses require analysts to immerse themselves in the data.

My immersion in the data began with listening to audiotape recordings and watching video recordings and fully transcribing the two focus group sessions, producing a verbatim account of what was said and by whom. I included some utterances such as coughs and laughter where I thought they added to the meaning of what was said. The road trip conversations were more informal and wide ranging so I made extensive notes while listening to the audio recordings rather than transcribing the stories in full. It is this entire body of material which makes up the data corpus for this research.

As I was immersed in the data, I was constantly asking questions of and thinking about what Treaty People had said and drawing connections with conversations I had with the people around me about Pākehā culture. I was influenced by the social and political debates about culture and in particular about the ways in

which the relationships between Māori and those in the dominant group were being negotiated. A significant influence on my thinking about Pākehā culture was the public reaction to the January 2004 *Nationhood* speech by Dr Don Brash, as Leader of the National Party. The main thrust of Brash's speech was that New Zealanders are one people and government funding should be allocated on the basis of 'need' not 'race'. His speech was in reaction to policies the then Labour Government was putting in place to allocate funding and develop programmes for Māori and Pacifica peoples to 'close the gaps' between Pākehā and Māori/Pacifica achievement.

Prior to embarking on research with Treaty People I had worked with the nine Non-Māori women's stories which formed a data set in the *Success Stories: Narratives of recovery from disabling mental health problems* research project (Lapsley et al., 2002) in an attempt to develop themes or markers of Pākehā culture. After a number of readings and noting common threads of talk in these stories, I divided the ways the women talked about family into three thematic areas which I labelled as: western cultural heritage; colonisation; and the experience of being gendered. Within the western cultural heritage theme I developed a series of sub themes such as individualism as it was represented both in the participants' individual experience and the way in which the notion of family is constructed as an individual unit in Pākehā society.

The experience of developing themes from this data set influenced my early readings of the Treaty People data where I initially focussed on developing a theme around family life as a marker of Pākehā culture. The major difference in how I was able to work with these two data streams was that the women's stories were told in a frame of reference that drew on their experiences of recovery from mental health problems, and the group was small and quite diverse in its makeup. Of the nine women, five were born in New Zealand although most had lived in New Zealand for a significant amount of time. They were not directly asked to name their cultural identity, hence the collective label of Non-Māori was used to differentiate these participants from the Māori participants in this bicultural project. In contrast, the Treaty People stories were told in response to direct questions about Pākehā culture and their cultural identity.

For the 2003 data I read and re-read the transcripts, highlighting key words, sentences and other sections and making notes of possible codes in the margins, which were then colour-coded under various headings with 'post-it flags'. Some of the noting was based around my earlier work with the women's mental health recovery stories, such as noting the way Treaty People talked about family. The

margin notes were then transferred to a large sheet of paper where I listed the key words I had noted under the various headings such as travel overseas, or relating to Māori. On another sheet of paper using a mind-map process I grouped together a wide range of key words under various headings to get a visual picture of what they looked like. I was then able to see and draw lines between headings or shift key words into a different heading. Through various iterations of this process I came up with a series of initial themes. I then went back to the transcript on the computer and copied and pasted the flagged sentences and sections into separate files based on the identified themes.

I presented some of these initial analyses to participants at the 2005 focus group. At this point I centred on three broad themes that were closely related to the research questions I posed to the 2003 participants. They were: ‘Coming into a Pākehā identity’; ‘What being Pākehā means to me’; and ‘Things I notice about Pākehā culture’. I chose a series of headings and data extracts to illustrate each theme (Appendix 6).

The same inductive level thematic analysis was used on the road trip notes and the transcript of the 2005 focus group. Writing up the themes identified through this inductive approach I felt it was a useful way to identify patterns of meaning across the corpus giving an initial coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Reflecting on that feeling, I saw I was not getting at the heart of the research questions. I was being a faithful reporter of what participants were saying, who could present a narrative of sorts based on the themes that emerged from that surface view of the data now I needed to adopt the dual analytic positions of “cultural *member* and cultural *commentator*” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 94, emphasis in original) and relate the themes I identified to an academic analysis of how culture operates.

Culture as a concept was proving, as ever, to be far too slippery and the inductive level of analysis unequal to the task of marking as cultural what is usually left as unmarked. I needed to ask different questions of the data. My task was to identify themes which could be recognised as cultural markers and to offer an interpretation of what I saw as the assumptions being made, the language resources utilised, and the way the resources were used to mark what was unmarked for the speaker and, presumably, their audience. I therefore needed to consider a different level of analysis which Braun and Clarke describe as the latent level where “*underlying* ideas, assumptions, and conceptualisations – and ideologies” (2006, p. 84) are examined. This led to my developing a thematic discourse analytic approach to examining the data, where the wider social

context of what participants said about Pākehā culture and identity was taken into greater consideration.

The change of approach to the data meant that I had to move my thinking from an analysis that sought to establish markers of Pākehā culture as something ‘real’ and defensible to a focus on the notion of constructing markers of culture through referencing experiences and evidence relative to other cultures and to broader socio-political contexts both past and present. I did this by asking questions of the data such as ‘what is achieved by this text?’ or ‘How do symbols of New Zealand serve to construct Pākehā culture?’

Participants in this study were very often processing aloud their cultural identity views and experiences as there are not many opportunities to engage in conversations like these. The questions I asked were very general so I could hear how others framed their understanding and experience of Pākehā culture. In the following chapters, I have organised the findings from my various readings of the data corpus. The themes I have identified are descriptive and not considered definitive as other people reading the same material may well highlight or identify different patterns.

This chapter has provided an outline of the people involved and the procedures used in this study. I have described the research design where a combination of focus groups and informal conversations with Treaty People were used as data gathering techniques. My position as an ‘insider researcher’, and the contributions my fellow researchers, supervisors and colleagues have made to this study were discussed. I introduced Treaty People, the participants, and outlined some of the relevant bibliographic information about them particularly the cultural and ethnic labels they used to name themselves. Ethical procedures, data gathering strategies and the ways I have worked with the data were outlined.

Over the next four chapters I present a detailed account of the themes identified through the combination of thematic analyses described. Each chapter describes a major theme in Treaty People’s recognition and marking of Pākehā culture: Symbols of New Zealand (Chapter six), Recognition of being cultural (Chapter seven), Recognition of being Pākehā (Chapter eight), and finally Pākehā cultural values such as egalitarianism, assimilation, superiority and the combination of independence and individuality (Chapter nine).



# Chapter Six

## Treaty People Talk About Symbols of New Zealand

*National identity is the mask that obscures the cultural nature of the dominant group (Raymond Nairn, personal communication 9/2/09).*

### **Symbols of New Zealand**

Nation hood is expressed through a series of symbols and practices that usually become so familiar in peoples' everyday lives they are hard to recognise. These everyday symbols and practices are described as the banal ways in people which perform national identity (Billig, 1995). This chapter examines some of the ways in which the participants talk brings to mind and constructs views about New Zealand and the New Zealander. Symbols of the nation discussed in this chapter relate to the colonial connections between Britain and New Zealand and are central to the ways in which Pākehā culture, as the culture of the dominant group, is constructed.

### Better Britons and the Queen

One of the defining features of New Zealand as a nation is the close connection with Great Britain. A connection that can, in part, be explained by the numbers of British immigrants to New Zealand. Claims that '98.5 per cent' of New Zealanders were British could be heard into the 1960s according to Belich (2001). New Zealand was a successful British colony, a land the settlers were proud of. New Zealanders were 'Better Britons' (Belich, 2001), and the Queen as head of this albeit distant land was none-the-less a respected figurehead as DavidJ, a new immigrant from Britain, discovered.

DavidJ    Yeah, for us [New Zealand] right down to the 1970s there was no doubt that London was the centre of the universe. ... In fact in rural Northland in the Pākehā community in the 1960s I had to watch my step very carefully because we were used to treating the Royal family, from an English background, with considerable disrespect. Make jokes about the Queen and people started to freeze up.

DavidJ's description of London being "the centre of the universe" gives the impression of a planet (New Zealand) in the margins revolving around the centre (London) with its orbit determined by that centre. Looking back to the 1960s the interconnections between the planet and centre were strong; the schism had not yet occurred. The phrase also emphasises the enormous separation between the 'rural Northland' based speaker, DavidJ, and London, the place he had left



behind. These worlds could not be further apart geographically or in terms of the difference in lifestyle between the bustling, crowded urban centre and the sparsely populated remote rural backblocks.

In spite of the distance and differences, Pākehā in Northland convey a close relation of the heart in the respect they show towards Crown and Monarchy. In contrast to Pākehā, people in Britain, appeared to view the Queen and Royal family as part of everyday life, familiar figures, who could be criticised and joked about, rather like members in an extended family. The “freeze up” at jokes about the Queen by New Zealanders’ was conceivably a device used to maintain a sense of superiority (Better Britons) – we would not stoop so low as the ‘common’ English person.

### National anthems and **not** being British?

The attachment to Britain and the monarchy and the ambivalence displayed in that attachment is underscored by New Zealand having two official national anthems of equal standing. *God Save the Queen/King* was New Zealand’s official national anthem until 1977. *God Defend New Zealand* was adopted by Parliament as the second anthem, after permission was sought from the Queen. Seeking the Queen’s permission could be described as a procedural cringe which supports DavidJ’s assertion about London being the ‘centre’.

For those who are not familiar with its origins, *God Defend New Zealand* was penned by Irish born new settler Thomas Bracken in 1870s and set to music by South Otago school teacher John Joseph Woods in response to a competition. The Māori language version was produced by Thomas H Smith, a Native Land Court judge, at the request of Sir George Grey in 1878, and in 1979 this was back-translated into English by former Māori Language Commissioner, Professor Timoti S. Kāretu. It was accepted as New Zealand’s national song in time for the 1940 Centennial celebrations (Te Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage).

*God Defend New Zealand* was first played at the 1950 British Empire Games in Auckland and was officially used at the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich as Suze recalls.

I remember at the 72 Olympics when the rowing eights won at Munich and they played it, and no one knew it was going to happen – and the New Zealanders just went mad – everyone was crying – it was such a big deal and we didn’t have to be xxx poms you know.

*God Defend New Zealand* was first sung in te reo Māori only, by Hinewehi Mohi, before a Rugby World Cup game at Twickenham, England in 1999. This caused a considerable stir, and back home in New Zealand was viewed by many as a step too far at that time. It did not help that New Zealand lost to France in the semi-final game that followed. *God Defend New Zealand* is now regularly sung in both Māori and English on official occasions.

The following data extract from road trip conversations, displays some of the ways in which nationalism operates and how it is brought to attention by participants. It draws on comparisons with other nations and discord with heritage.

- JoanM Although we're not nearly so nationalistic as the Americans, for example, and some other countries. We're not or haven't been as nationalistic as that have we?
- DavidT I don't know about that. Nationalism and patriotism- Americans the flag and all that sort of stuff – but both here and in Australia the National anthem in schools is a regular thing and it might only be once a week at a school assembly but all the kids are expected to know that National anthem and stand and have reverence.
- JoanM Maybe it wasn't like that when I was at school
- DavidT No you had to stand up in the middle of the pictures and sing God Save the King.
- JoanM We did do that – that was weird
- Rose I remember the discussions – will we stand or will we not
- DavidT And the fear of being picked on if you don't – there's that peer pressure stuff. My father tells the story of when the radio was on there was always the fear of that when the National anthem came on the radio and somebody was in the toilet – they would have to stand in the toilet. And this is funny cause this was an Irish family – and I think it was something that granddad had pushed as a way of belonging – he was only second generation here – they'd come from Australia and before that Ireland. I think my grandmother might have been less happy as she bred in me a great dislike for the English.
- JoanM Yeah that's still around a lot in the Irish communities.
- Rose Distrust of English

JoanM starts off in this extract by setting up a comparative image of how Americans do nationalism with the question “We're not or haven't been as nationalistic as that have we?” It is a question which DavidT attempts to address with a sort of yes and no response. My impression, gained through news, movies and literature mostly as I have not been to America, is that in America nationalism is overtly and routinely practiced through, for example, the daily pledge of allegiance being recited with hand on heart, and the *Star Spangled Banner* being sung in schools. These acts, along with the frequent waving of the

flag, appear as active attempts to create the symbolic nation or imagined community (Anderson, 1996; Said, 1978). It does not, however, work uniformly as not all American people go along with these displays of nationalism.

Britain was the 'centre' from which both New Zealand and American nations were peopled and where strong ties remain. But America is a nation on the ascendancy and has long since surpassed Britain in size, wealth and as a world power. America flags its presence overtly to its own people and to the world as it acts to establish and maintain itself as a world power. New Zealand could be described as maintaining a deferential relationship to mother Britain while being a somewhat defiant sibling to America. Britain is the long established nation, so long established that the flag waving there has become understated, and largely invisible. To some extent flag waving in New Zealand has followed this more subtle pattern.

To 'stand and have reverence' when the national anthem is being played or sung is one of the ways of displaying a sense of national spirit or pride. It is a public demonstration of respect and conformity that takes precedence over any activity. We did not just stand, we 'stood to attention', as I recall in the 1950s and 1960s. This was particularly highlighted in the story DavidT told about the way his father had a fear of being caught (with pants down?) in the toilet if the National anthem came on the radio. Even in the privacy of a person's home reverence was an expectation. It brings to mind the notion, from my Catholic upbringing, of the 'all seeing eye of God' which is always watching you. The private fears of being caught out indicate a strong pressure to conform to the practices of the nation.

Institutional displays of allegiance are practiced in schools and at public gatherings such as international sporting events and in picture theatres where the custom was to stand when God Save the Queen was played at the beginning of movies. A custom described by JoanM as 'weird' in hindsight. But it did not seem 'weird' in the context of pre-television days where newsreels were shown prior to entering the fantasy world of movies in darkened picture theatres throughout the land. It was one of the ways in which New Zealanders became part of the outside world and moving images of the outside world entered New Zealand. It probably acted to reinforce the notion of the Crown being present through the anthem, and the anthem in turn did duty for the 'centre' represented by the Crown.

The impact English patterns of colonisation had on Irish people, for example, has tended to be lost through the use of the term 'British' as a shorthand way to describe the majority settler population in New Zealand. Tensions and differences existed and were expressed between settler groups in New Zealand, as they had come from different parts of the United Kingdom and other European countries. The show of reverence, at that time to *God Save the Queen*, was remembered by DavidT possibly because it stood out against the family's Irish heritage. DavidT spoke of his grandmother actively passing on a 'great dislike for the English' which could undoubtedly be traced back to the troubles in Ireland and the English colonisation there. In the following extract Bridget draws our attention to some of differences between communities.

I mean when I think back to my own upbringing it was we were ghettoised as Catholics, particularly in this city – it is very Anglican dominated – and with our Irish background and we thrived on that but that's not a healthy place in the ghetto. ... Those of us who were brought up particularly in the Catholic church in the environment of a colonised culture from Britain, predominantly Protestant society in those days, and we grew up knowing that we were not accepted – there was a difference – we grew apart. ... [A]nd it was a bit of a shock horror to me when I realised that I was now actually in my generation part of the dominant culture that my ancestors had fought against or resisted for hundreds of years.

The notion of a unitary nation may have been displayed through acts of conformity such as standing for the national anthem but in the streets differences were experienced as Bridget highlights.

There have been changes in the last 50 years. By the 1960s -70s during the playing of *God Save the Queen* people began to stay seated and silent. For some this was a form of protest to get *God Defend New Zealand* accepted as an anthem. These protests were a sign of New Zealanders 'coming of age' in their desire to establish their own identity. Suze considered these same tactics being used as a form of protest about the Treaty when *God Defend New Zealand* is played, were disrespecting the struggle to get that anthem accepted in the first place. Suze said

And I get pissed off when some of my mates who are younger than me go on and on about God Defend NZ – like they wouldn't stand when it was being played at graduation etc – and I understand about the Treaty not being honoured and stuff – but I remember going to movies etc where we had to stand up for God Save the Queen – and there was this big struggle to dump God Save the Queen for God Defend NZ which was something about us.

The acceptance of *God Defend New Zealand* as a National anthem was a significant marker of a settler shift in mindset: regarding New Zealand rather than Britain as home and was, for some, a step towards acknowledging Pākehā identity.

The talk of getting “pissed off” and “...the New Zealanders just went mad – everyone was crying – it was such a big deal and we didn’t have to be fxxx poms you know”, displays the considerable emotional investment in the anthem, which the younger people Suze referred to did not experience. The processes of social change keep happening and involve juggling tensions between the personal and the political.

*God Defend New Zealand* has become a banal representation of national identity (Billig, 1995) in New Zealand and as such became a point of protest for some in the younger generations. *God Defend New Zealand* usually sung with Māori and English verses, acts as a signifier of the bicultural relationship within the nation, and at the same time the performance glosses over the lack of recognition of the Treaty and the impacts of Pākehā colonisation on Māori. That sanitising glossy, version of the bicultural relationship extends to the way in which Māori as an official language is largely ignored. One of the few times public attention is widely drawn to New Zealand being a bilingual nation is during the annual Māori language week.

#### A façade of good race relations

*White New Zealand’s good relations with its indigenous people, real and alleged, were considered a central plank of New Zealand identity (Belich, 2001, p. 519).*

In the following conversation Jane, Victoria and I (Rose) draw on some of the ways “good race relations” or symbolic biculturalism (Sibley & Liu, 2004) operate in patterns of Pākehā talk (McCreanor, 2005) in New Zealand society. We are sounding out views about the way in which Māori are asked perform, particularly on official occasions, and the way in which this view of Māori has become a showcase of the bicultural relationship which is a cornerstone of Pākehā and New Zealand identity. In this conversation we are drawing on the “good race relations” myth that may still be heard in Pākehā talk. There are a number of phrases that stand out to me as I read this passage of conversation that could be described as Pākehā cultural baggage. The phrases are: “the whole noble savage thing”; “they kind of trot them out”; “a façade of good race relations”; plastic tiki version; “grass skirts; and “small trappings”.

Jane        But they [Māori] have always been publicly visible in a ritual sense. The government has used them for welcomes and things like that –

- Victoria Yeah like when the Queen comes, and the EXPO<sup>14</sup>.
- Jane And even before that you can see it on old film footage of the 1920s and 30s and stuff like that
- Victoria That's the whole noble savage thing – that they were better than Aborigines
- Jane Exactly – so there has always been a visible official presence of the trappings of Māori culture – let's put it that way cause there's never been a recognition of them.
- Rose Have you read Patricia Grace's *Tu*, her latest book. That was really interesting talking about – must have been early in the second World War in Wellington – she talks about the EXPO – must have been a trade EXPO that was out at Rongotai and about the Ngāti Poneke Club performing there night after night and some of the impact of that from a Māori perspective.
- Jane That will be interesting to read – cause its kind of weird you know the government's approach to Māori – they kind of trot them out for these ceremonial occasions like a façade of good race relations while they have totally and consistently to this very day – to this very second – refused to recognise them as peoples - but trotting out the grass skirts and everything – its like a split in their thinking.
- Rose Yeah it's like we will have Māori performance – Its us being a New Zealander
- Victoria That's what makes us special – it's like the whole rugby thing – we have the haka
- Rose That separates us out from the rest of the world
- Jane So that's the National identity stuff
- Rose Yeah it says who we are in New Zealand as New Zealanders is Māori Culture
- Jane Except that its not Māori culture – that official thing is not Māori culture it's the plastic tiki version of Māori culture
- Rose Yeah it's a performance aspect of Māori culture
- Jane It's not though – it's not performed in a cultural context. There's none of the background to it – it's like ahhh a plastic thing – Does that make sense?
- Rose Yeah I think to some extent it does
- Jane It's like the small trappings of a part of culture are pulled out for official occasions.
- Rose I wouldn't minimise it to quite that extent personally. I think it's a significant show that we build on rather than something that's critiquing or criticising
- Victoria And I think it is changing attitude towards - umm I don't know it can be a real double edged sword.
- Rose yeah it has symbolic meaning but the enactment of the whole relationship is crap

---

<sup>14</sup> The 1940 NZ Centennial Exhibition <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/culture/centennial/centennial-exhibition>

- Jane      yeah that's what I'm trying to say
- Rose      the enactment of the relationship is hollow but the symbolism
- Victoria   that's what makes us special and yeah there's some genuineness in that
- Rose      of the performance if you like I think is real – but it becomes dishonest in the ongoing relationship
- Jane      It's the performance from the start – I don't know how to describe it
- Victoria   Yeah I know what you mean – it comes from a history of trotting out the Māoris
- Jane      In their grass skirts and everything else and pretending that is Māori culture
- Victoria   It's not ownership of land or anything
- Jane      Or language or health care or religion
- Rose      then there's the whole good Māori bad Māori discourse so like Ngāti Poneke were seen as good Māori cause they performed and stuff. I don't know the current history but that's certainly the impression you get from reading about it.

An acceptable face of Māori is presented through cultural performances in the 'good race relations' talk. This is, however, as Jane suggested, a façade – a smokescreen that masks what lies behind the face; the maintenance of Pākehā superiority and dominance. There is a long history of Māori performing on official occasions such as Royal visits and the 1940 Centennial Exhibition (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Updated 14 Nov 2008) or EXPO that Victoria referred to; other Heads of State visits; in tourism (Te Awēkotuku, 1991; Walker, 2004); and at international sporting events. Māori cultural performances are a key feature of public life in New Zealand and form an integral part of New Zealand identity. I want to make clear that I am not referring to cultural performances initiated by Māori such as kapa haka, but rather to Pākehā views about Māori performance.

Māori performance is used in official capacities to present a particular view of Māori, such as the 'noble savage' which the haka or war dance invokes. It is an idealised and static view of Māori culture that keeps Māori locked into a form of traditional culture, an idealised version of a now distant past (McCreanor, 2005). Or as Jane described the 'pretend' view which acts to obscure the reality of culture as a living dynamic which is constantly being negotiated in the present.

The promotion of Māori cultural performance by Pākehā supports the Pākehā "good Māori" (R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) pattern of talk. Māori who

perform and entertain are generally regarded as “good Māori”, as compliant and responsive. The being “trotted out” phrase conjures up the image of horses trotting at the behest of the riders. It implies a sense of ownership of ‘our Māori’ rather like the relationship parents might have with their children, or even that of people with their pets. This is when they can be seen and heard. There is also the rather uncomfortable connotation of exploitation of Māori as they put on such a good show.

It is customary for people to dress up in particular ways, often in traditional forms of dress, for cultural performances. Many cultural groups including Māori, Pasifica, Chinese, Dutch, Irish, and Indian communities, for example, do so of their own volition in New Zealand for festivals and cultural performances. The references to “grass skirts” and “plastic tikis” imply that cultural forms and performances are inauthentic when presented out of context. These phrases act to cheapen the value of the genuine garments and adornments that are worn and call into question the authenticity of both people and performance.

The more serious issues of land ownership, language, health care, or religion, as Victoria and Jane point out, tend to be glossed over when the focus is placed just on cultural performance. Cultural performance masks the reality by offering a polished, ‘familiar’ performance of ‘our Māori’ serving the national identity. It is not that we wanted Māori cultural performance to be stopped or ignored: rather we are saying that the Pākehā-Māori relationship operates at many more levels than sanctioned cultural performance. Culture performance, without strong inter-cultural relationships at all levels to back it up is a hollow rendition of biculturalism. As Jane said “It’s like the small trappings of a part of culture are pulled out for official occasions”. I get the impression that many Pākehā may only want to see the trappings, the accessories and the outward signs of Māori culture rather than to engage in what Ingrid Huygens (2007) calls ‘right relationships’ between Māori and Pākehā.

### Stereotypes of National identity

*"Encouraging a belief in an identity in common – one New Zealand – is a form of social control" (C. Bell, 1996, p. 189).*

The idea of the quintessential ‘kiwi bloke’, is a favourite stereotype of the New Zealander, whether he be in the guise of farmer, hunter, fisherman or rugby player. These images can be recognised in the following discontinuous data extracts.

Victoria ... and obviously there are diverse Māori realities as well but we can easily think there is a Māori culture but for us there’s – um – I couldn’t put my finger on anything, well I



could obviously there are stereotypical things that come to mind, but they are usually about men and sport and farming, which have nothing to do with me, you know I don't play rugby, I've never lived on a farm and when you go overseas people say New Zealand is all about sheep and rugby and I think for ... sake I'm a woman who has spent my whole life in a city. So what else is there if you take away the Fred Dagg<sup>15</sup> type rugby playing bloke?

- Alex We don't often take that step back. We talked yesterday about the census forms – not being able to define clearly what kiwi is or I'm a New Zealander – so what does that mean. People can usually rattle off oh its rugby, its innovation, its no 8 wire, its being the underdog or whatever, but those are sort of, I think, shallow constructions of what I think an identity is. There's no kind of foundation there's just this need to be all encompassing and not understand differences.
- Bridget One of the things and I think that Suze mentioned it earlier about rugby and the sort of Kiwi blokish culture and that's what I notice very much that is promoted I suppose through the media. And the use of the word WE when there is a national bloke's team playing something somewhere and people say oh isn't it great that we won. Pardon you know, that WE doesn't represent me, I don't feel any part of that at all.
- Suze The other thing that pains me most is that the only thing that seems to be able to bring us together as people is rugby. You know its become a real tribal thing which I can't bear and umm its only time that people feel like they can be together and be one and be happy about who they are. So that's what I notice about Pākehā culture.
- Rose ... to become a citizen of New Zealand you must support the All Blacks.
- DavidT Some of that about the fitting in is to assimilate – and some may be to do with – whether it's our nationalism or our concept of nation state or our concept of loyalty to the state. So if you accept citizenship here there is a package about being “a good New Zealander”. Interesting experience where primary school kids could name more of New Zealand cricket team than I could and they saw me as umm ?disloyal for not knowing what my national image was – cause I didn't know the key people. ... Part of national identity, part of being a citizen in a country is to join the barracking, supporting and knowledge of those who represent the country outside. Even the whole image of the cricket or rugby unions selecting a team and saying you now represent New Zealand – there's a bit of arrogance there. There's this small group of people that now give you the title of representing New Zealand on the world stage. And then the expectation is that all New Zealanders will be behind you.

---

<sup>15</sup> In the early 1970s the satirist John Clarke invented the comic figure of the black-singletted, gumboot- wearing Fred Dagg. As urban culture began to develop, some people began to laugh at these traditional stereotypes(Phillips, updated 4 Mar 09).

In her efforts to think about ways of marking Pākehā culture Victoria immediately made reference to how easy it was to

... think there is Māori culture but for us there's – um – I couldn't put my finger on anything.

Notions of Māori culture are used in this phrase as a reference point to ideas about Pākehā culture. Māori are positioned in a cultural frame by Pākehā more readily than they position themselves in that frame. Using Māori as a reference point for culture fits with my theory that dominant group members, while identifying that others have culture, find it much more difficult to describe the way they live as cultural. It also indicates that culture is often thought of as a relational identity.

As a way into talking about Pākehā culture Victoria drew on some of the most readily available stereotypical constructions of the New Zealander which she suggests are usually about 'men, sport and farming'. Alex commented that when asked about culture people could "rattle off" a list such as: "rugby, innovation, no 8 wire and being the underdog". According to Claudia Bell (1996), the kiwi bloke has been well portrayed in comedy *Fred Dagg* aka John Clarke; comic strips such as Murray Ball's *Footrot Flats* and Burton Silver's *Bogor*; or the humorist renditions of tall tales associated with hunting, shooting and fishing such as *A Good Keen Man* and others by Barry Crump (1960) or the more familiar 'Crumpy'. Constructions of the 'kiwi bloke' are treated as iconic in status, and were helped by the likes of Sir Edmond Hillary who, following his historic climb to the summit of Mt Everest in 1953, has been portrayed as the epitome of the rugged outdoor adventurer, the practical good hearted man, who is accessible and does not give himself airs, and he puts himself out to help others less fortunate. In other words he is a good all round bloke. These constructions call on a form of nostalgia and myth about the life of the 'kiwi bloke' (C. Bell, 1996).

The limitations the 'kiwi bloke' constructions were described by Alex as "shallow constructions" of identity, which are presented as "all encompassing". Perhaps the most enduring and all encompassing stereotype of the 'kiwi bloke' is characterised through the game of rugby. There are hundreds of books about rugby past and present along with almost daily media coverage of rugby players and games at every level. There is a circular relationship between the frequency with which rugby is cited as the national game and the acceptance of this status by many New Zealanders.

At a personal level rugby is so much part of the New Zealand and my own psyche that I am finding it hard to stand back and analyse the dialogue about it. I find it challenging to hear Bridget say “And the use of the word WE when there is a national bloke’s team playing something somewhere and people say oh isn’t it great that we won. Pardon you know, that WE doesn’t represent me, I don’t feel any part of that at all”. I like watching rugby, I like the feeling I get when WE win and laugh at how I can get so caught up in what is after all only a game. At the same time when I read Bridget’s quote and apply a gender analysis, I do agree with Bridget that men’s rugby when played as the ‘national game’ does not represent me or women in society or even the World Cup winning Black Ferns, New Zealand women’s rugby team.

When I say rugby is just a game it is of course both that and much more than that. It is what gets “rattled off” (Alex) the tip of the tongue when asked about representations of New Zealand; it is in our newspapers and on our radios and televisions almost daily. As DavidT noted – you can feel a bit disloyal if you do not know who is in your national team – and he included cricket – men’s cricket in his list.

There are inside the nation and outside or international aspects to rugby. Suze focused on how rugby functions within New Zealand by expressing how she was pained by the way that rugby was the only “thing that seems to be able to bring us together as people... its become a real tribal thing which I can’t bear and umm it’s the only time that people feel like they can be together and be one and be happy about who they are”. The notion of rugby as a means of bringing people together has a long history in New Zealand. By 1901 with the introduction of the Ranfurly Shield, a trophy for regional games, rugby in effect became sanctioned as the state sport as there was “no state religion” (Belich, 2001, p. 386).

That rugby plays a crucial function in the life of New Zealanders whether people support it or not was evidenced during the 1981 Springbok tour. The Springbok team in 1981 was a ‘whites’ only team selected under the regime of apartheid in South Africa. The nation, communities and families were divided about the tour. There were two obvious points of view being expressed. First, the proponents of the tour argued that rugby was ‘just a game’ – that New Zealand desperately wanted to win - and had nothing to do with politics even although Rob Muldoon, the then Prime Minister of New Zealand, sanctioned the tour and made sure the police force was funded so the tour went ahead as planned. Second, people in the anti-tour groups argued that apartheid, the division of peoples along race

lines, was an unjust and morally corrupt way of ensuring privilege and power for the white minorities to the extreme deprivation of all other peoples in South Africa. Sport was political and for New Zealand to sanction an all white rugby team was tantamount to supporting the apartheid regime in South Africa.

DavidT recognised that "... part of national identity, part of being a citizen in a country is to join the barracking, supporting and knowledge of those who represent the country outside". Rugby has its origins in England as a somewhat genteel version of the more chaotic game of folk ball, although Belich suggests that the attraction to rugby in New Zealand was that it was "... relatively unrestrained, collectivist and violent" (2001, p. 382). Rugby was also another vehicle for the New Zealanders to prove themselves as Better Britons.

'Bloke' culture and in particular rugby are constructions that operate as banal and everyday representations of our national identity. The gendered and rural nature of these stereotypes was highlighted by Victoria. "I think for xxx-sake I'm a woman who has spent my whole life in a city". Victoria is pointing out the exclusionary effect that an overemphasis on a limited range of cultural resources has for people who do not fit the stereotype. These exclusions operate at every level of society. Alex suggested that "we don't often take that step back" to think about what our identity as New Zealanders means. One of the ways in which Pākehā New Zealanders are often prompted to think about who they are is through travel, whether it be travel overseas or to other regions of New Zealand.

#### Travel to 'the centre': London/Britain/England/Scotland/Europe/Canada

*"You cannot stop short at borders in the hunt for Pākehā culture" (Belich, 2001, p. 325).*

International travel is a big event from New Zealand as the 'centre of the universe' (DavidJ's earlier description of London), is so far away. Since the introduction of air travel, travelling overseas is far more accessible. It is now customary for many younger, particularly middle class, New Zealanders to go on an overseas experience, commonly referred to as going on your "OE". Many do a 'gap year' or more between school and University, or travel before settling down and starting a family (Inkson & Myers, 2003).

Many participants talked about their experiences of travelling overseas and what the impact of those experiences had on their sense of New Zealandness. This travel would have occurred post World War Two when air travel became more accessible and Britain's borders were still open to citizens of the British Commonwealth. Most participants would have embarked on their travel

adventures from the 1970s onward, except for JoanM who may have gone to Britain earlier than that.

I have decided to focus on the bulk of overseas travel experiences which revolve around going to Britain or Europe, 'the centre', in the series of data extracts for analysis. Some participants talked about their travels to Asia, the Pacific and South America, and some reflections on travel in general which are filed for analysis at a later date. In my reading of the data extracts I have recognised some before travel stories; mostly there are the stories of being in a different place and the insights those experiences produced; and lastly there are reflections on how I see myself being back in New Zealand.

*Before travel: 'I was just a New Zealander like everyone else'*

The ordinariness and an element of being contained in a distant place are expressed by participants.

- Suze I'd never really thought of myself being a Pākehā in New Zealand – I was just a New Zealander like everyone else and of course that wasn't a political statement in the 50's and 60's it was just stating a reality – everyone was just a New Zealander. It wasn't until HART stuff of 1960s and then through 70s that we started talking about racism.
- Jo ... Jackson was talking earlier about being here and not knowing any other place to be and neither do I because my family have been here for five or six generations. So I don't have the sense of belonging elsewhere.
- Suzanne ... with a working class background ... certainly none of my family had been overseas apart from my Dad going to war but trips overseas weren't part of what you did when you were 15 and a half, sixteen.
- Suzanne ... And like my parents didn't travel overseas – they were just totally here – so what was, was and there was not that great an opportunity to look back.

Two quite powerful notions are expressed in these data extracts; that of the ordinariness, the commonplace, of 'just a New Zealander' or perhaps I am 'only' a New Zealander. The second is that closely aligned assertion of a sense of belonging to New Zealand which implies a sense of containment that maybe associated with living on relatively small islands. All three participants are of the middle generation age group so are looking back to pre1970s New Zealand when travel by air was relatively expensive and travel by sea time consuming.

The 'as just totally here' phrase that Suzanne uses to describe her working class parents suggests that for many people who settled in New Zealand, that was where they made their lives for better or for worse. Travel might offer an

opportunity to look back but there were few choices available to the working classes and going to war seemingly did not count in the same way as overseas travel by choice. The travel to war and back may have reinforced the notion of wanting to be totally here. War was a harrowing experience for most and returning to the distant shores of a settled colony could have been perceived as a very safe option. Everyday life in a prosperous post World War Two New Zealand reflected a sense of settled ordinariness, a time to get on with life in the colony.

### *At the 'centre': Heritage and home?*

Three participants, JoanM, Moyra, and Jen spoke of their heritage claims to Britain in relation to their travel overseas.

- Moyra I mean I might have Irish and Scots and Lincolnshire and Yorkshire and Oxfordshire ancestry but I'm not British.
- JoanM ... [I] went to England where my half of my family came from and then I really felt like a New Zealander I didn't really feel very much like my English relatives.
- Jen So when I first left New Zealand and spent time in England when I was 19 ... until that time, [I] hadn't really thought in terms of seeing my identity as being different from British. I'd thought we had a lot of commonalities with British identity and British culture and things like culturally that's who we are closest too, until actually living it and seeing what was distinct between British culture, which is where my roots are from Cornish and British plus Danish and German, and seeing those differences and thinking well that's actually Pākehā culture as opposed to being British or a New Zealander.

Both JoanM and Jen noticed differences between themselves and British people in their travel to Britain. Jen spoke of expecting a "...lot of commonalities with British identity and British culture". She found a lot of differences when living there. Both JoanM and Jen would have been influenced by the view of Britain as the cultural 'home' for New Zealanders, particularly for those who had heritage connections (C. Bell, 1996). The view of Britain as home was widely supported in families, through the education system, trade and politically in New Zealand up until the 1970s when a schism occurred that was heightened by Britain joining the European Economic Community (EEC) (Belich, 2001; Sinclair, 2000).

Notions of 'home' as the safe, familiar place where one is accepted may have been in the imaginations of these travellers. The lack of commonality they felt with British people and culture, where they perhaps did not feel completely accepted, or just 'fit in', may have prompted them to imagine New Zealand as home. Their talk indicated a personal shift away from New Zealanders having

such close ties with Britain, ties that were changing at political and economic levels in both societies.

Moea     So really I think I only became a New Zealander when I went to London. You know I was a New Zealander and that was the point of difference and I just remember just slagging off Poms. I used to drink a lot in those days, get drunk and abusive and obnoxious, you know – stupid Poms you know we'd never sell off our family silver you know, <laughter> Mag, Mag, Maggie and Greenham and all that. But I always thought no I will never stay here, these people are just so drab and you know just everything about it you know it was neat you know, it was London and everything, but it was also alien, it was very alien to me. And how the people were and there was no spark to them, they were kind of, even the unionists, the unionists were great and feminists were great, but generally there was a sort of a uuuhhh you know there, that I just knew that I couldn't ever bring children up there. And so when I did become pregnant I had to come home.

The changing times and views of Britain were exemplified by Moea, who said "... it was neat you know, it was London and everything, but it was also alien, it was very alien to me". This is a heartfelt invocation of the feeling of being a stranger in the motherland. To be 'alien' does not imply a sense of coming home but rather of being somewhere quite different from home.

The distinctions between being British and being a New Zealander were noted by Jane, who was a first generation New Zealander of British immigrant parents, when she went and lived in Britain for 11 years.

Jane     so I was the 'other' there, when I was living there. I tended to say I was a New Zealander because that was what I was called there you know – you're a New Zealander, apart from with the police or when the police thought I was South African and I was quite happy to leave it like that.

Jane adopts a somewhat tentative tone to being a New Zealander, perhaps not surprisingly given her close family links to Britain. I imagine she might have thought that she would pass much more readily as British, but instead, she was marked out as a colonial, either as New Zealander or South African. Perhaps being a colonial of indeterminate origin, particularly in relation to authorities such as the Police, had its advantages, it would have made her much more difficult to track down. The police, as representatives 'the centre', do in Jane's report convey a sense of dismissal of the 'white' colonials as all being the same.

There were ways in which the participants spoke about the British which drew heavily on the 'Better Briton' discourse (Belich, 2001). Moea calling the British 'Poms'<sup>16</sup> appeared, to me, to serve two functions. The first was to create a sense

---

<sup>16</sup> Australian and New Zealand slang term for British person (immigrant) (Orsman, 1997, p. 621)

of distance between the New Zealander and the British and to indicate a lack of connection. The second I interpret as a form of put down and name calling when Moea said “I remember just slagging off Poms ... stupid Poms” along with comments such about British people such as ‘so drab’ and ‘no spark’ implied a better than thou, as well as a different from thou position, perhaps associated with the sense of alienation she experienced.

That a ‘kiwi’ is less bound by authority than the British and thus more able to make their own assessment of a situation is clear in Moyra’s ‘red light’ example.

Moyra     And attitudes to authority too, my husband is actually British which is very good for me as it reminds me of what I might have been, <laughter> but you know, he’s changed, he’s changed. It is a bit like, he or his relatives would stand at a red light all day, where no self respecting kiwi would, you would know that it was the red light that had broken down.

The phrase “no self respecting kiwi would” not only implies a separation from the British and carries the inference of the ‘Better Briton’, it also implies that the British are not self -respecting. This inference can also be read in to the way Moyra drew on classic elements of ‘kiwi culture’ of the practical, no8 wire, can do, innovative kind to demonstrate not being British. Being a ‘Better Briton’ was reinforced by suggesting that the examples given showed off a good side “... even to that white dominant culture” (Moyra).

Underscored in the juxtaposition of the Kiwi and Briton in these stories is the suggestion of a challenge to the superiority of ‘the centre’ by the ‘colonial’.

Suze       And when I lived there and at work I’d find more connection emotionally with people who had come from the West Indies, Pakistan or India than I would with the Poms. They would get so xxx off with all the colonials who had landed there – and I would say – it’s just your chickens coming home to roost after all the wealth you stole from the world’s peoples. You told them they were British and they are coming back to mother Britain. I really enjoyed that all these people came back to Britain. ... They do not have any responsibility any appreciation – sure it was the British ruling class and most of the people you mix with are just ordinary people who didn’t know what was going on at the time. Margaret Thatcher – put the Great back into Britain - what’s that but empire building and colonisation.

Suze’s talk of feeling more connected to other colonials than to the Poms carries this implication as she pointed out “You told them they were British and they are coming back to mother Britain”. She is also challenging the British to recognise they are now reaping what they sowed and hinting that the colonials are more alert, better informed than the colonisers.



There is a robust assertion of New Zealandness and a realisation that New Zealanders are different from the British in these travel extracts, which in turn backs up the realisation that New Zealand was a different place and, as people from that place, they were now different from their British relatives or partners.

### *New Zealand as home*

The tales of travel overseas and in particular to Britain and Europe appear to show up characteristics of New Zealandness for the participants. Perhaps the biggest shift in identity that I notice in the stories is the notion of New Zealand being home.

JoanM     So that was when it really showed for me that I was a New Zealander and that I had an attachment to this country.

New Zealand as home was made apparent by Moea in her desire to come home to have her children and by Suze saying “nowhere else could ever be home”. The belief in Britain as the ‘home’ country has been displaced in part through the experience of travel. It is rather like the act of travelling to ‘the centre’ had exposed the belief of strong connections or the impression of sameness with Britain as perhaps more imagined than real at least at a personal level. For some like Jane and Suze, involvement with political and indigenous issues and relationships with different ethnic groups in Britain were steps towards recognising a Pākehā identity when they returned to New Zealand.

### Conclusion

One of the defining features of the nation for New Zealanders is the relationship with Britain. Pākehā culture is constantly shaped through and out of this relationship, and remnants of it are apparent in the participants talk about symbols of New Zealand. The Queen is monarch of New Zealand and *God Save the Queen* holds equal status as one of New Zealand’s national anthems. The major sports that are played in New Zealand have their genesis in Britain, although the New Zealanders have proved themselves to be ‘Better Britons’ time and again in sporting contest with the British Britons. Pākehā, who are represented by the Crown as Treaty partners with Māori have the challenge of sorting out ‘race relations’ issues to move beyond the façade that participants spoke of. Most New Zealanders travel to Britain as part of their “OE”. Britain is no longer regarded as home for most New Zealanders. The British people who come to New Zealand are not coming from our imaginary British home but rather are coming to our home in New Zealand as signalled in the travel talk by participants.

Many participants report that they recognised New Zealand as home and themselves as New Zealanders, and maybe Pākehā, through their travel experiences. In the next chapter I focus on the ways participants have talked about recognising themselves as cultural.



# Chapter Seven

## Treaty People Recognise Being Cultural

*"I am because we are and since we are, therefore I am" (Robinson, 2005, p. 130)*

Treaty people recognising themselves as cultural, is the second of four findings chapters. In the last chapter I examined the ways in which participants talked about symbols of New Zealand. These symbols of nationhood that have their genesis in the colonial connections with Britain are central to constructions of Pākehā culture.

In the first section in this chapter, I consider the way that Treaty people, who are conscientized about recognising themselves as cultural, have talked about being normal in a dominant group and some of the privileges they recognise. Along with privilege there is recognition of who is included and who is marked out as culturally different. Two key features of recognising cultural identity for Treaty people are the Pākehā –Māori relationship and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Talk about these relationships is explored in the second section.

### **Being normal and recognising privilege in the dominant group**

Members of a dominant group can go about their daily lives where their way of being in the world is reflected back to them so often they are inclined to think that what they hear, say and view is the normal way things are. In this section I consider how the participants talked about being a normal part of New Zealand society, as members of the dominant group. To be cultural was the ‘other’ position to ‘normal’ as Suzanne captured when she said “everything else is different and that’s culture”.

What is regarded as normal in a culture can change over time and be greatly influenced by major world events such as wars, or as in more recent years the introduction of television and computer technology. Many of the participants recalled childhood experiences that occurred pre 1970s, when policies such as assimilation and integration to the ways of the dominant group for all people in New Zealand were being actively practiced with little critique. JoanM commented that

We [Pākehā] just think that the way we behave is the norm and everyone else has to try and fit in.

I suggest that a growing critical awareness of these policies have influenced participants' talk about what is normal. DavidT perhaps captured this best when he said

I had a strong sense that what I grew up with was normal and right. I had an expectation that this way of being was the way things should be and others needed to fit in.

Simply regarding one's own lived experience as normal is how most people recalled early childhood and growing up experiences no matter what culture/s they were part of. Bridget exemplified this starting point when she said

But I need to go back and start the story about having a cultural identity that was being normal, being normal for me as a child of an Irish Catholic family.

Although participants did not talk much about their growing up experiences, some did mention particular situations which prompted a sense of cultural normality. For example, Jen, Jo and I all mentioned living in largely monocultural communities in provincial areas of the South Island. In these communities there was no need to discuss issues of culture or cultural diversity because most of the cultural norms were not challenged by interactions with people from other cultural groups in any significant way.

It wasn't until their teenage years that some Pākehā participants started to both notice and/or meet people from different cultures. Even then they did not necessarily have any sense of their own cultural identity. Suze described as interesting the sense of

... growing up in the majority culture where you are so unconscious as to what it looks like – but you do notice Lebanese people, Chinese people because they are so weird and you are so normal.

She was reflecting on a memory from secondary school days in the 1960s when people from cultures other than Pākehā really were a minority in most New Zealand communities. Even although the cultural mix in Aotearoa has become much more diverse in more recent years, and there was some recognition of different cultural groups, Suzanne thought that "... people – Pākehā people – actually don't recognise that they are one of those cultural groups".

Some aspects of the normality of being part of the dominant group were also discussed by participants. Being a part of the dominant group carries with it certain expectations as Bridget points out.

... we don't expect to be asked questions as to what we're doing somewhere or why are we here? So because of how I look and basically the colour of my skin and probably now my age as well I wouldn't expect to be stopped by the law or questioned ... I expect

to be respected and treated as a human being where ever I go – and my culture says that is how I should be treated.

The dominant culture has the power to set out the values and rules of behaviour in a society and members of that group tend to experience being in society as normal (Tyler et al., 1991). DavidT described normal as “...something that is a taken and is a given – you just get on with it”.

There is a critical edge in the way these memories are recalled which DavidT described in hindsight as

... cultural arrogance, it was about a culture of control and dominance ... what is normal for us – Pākehā – is right and even superior. We see often the good things we brought Māori – civilisations, advancements, whatever.

Alex also talked about noticing the privileges of invisibility that Pākehā have when they have a

... language, a moral political ideology that is so commonly used and so dominant that it becomes just what is, and what is ‘main stream’.

Speaking only English and the taken for granted attitudes around the English language were discussed by DavidT and Alex as examples of dominance. The way in which Māori place names are pronounced in an Anglicised fashion, because most Pākehā are monolingual, produces according to DavidT a “... disconnection with the history of the people who named that place”. Not only that but it also accentuates the disregard for things Māori that many Pākehā have grown up with.

Another aspect of cultural dominance, commented on by Alex is the ways in which academics and researchers study peoples and cultures which are different from their own. He made the point, in reference to Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), that we are able to

... look out there at what other cultures do and have a privilege to be able to do that but not reflect or think retrospectively about why we are able to do that or how we do that and who benefits from our looking.

Privilege and dominance are maintained through holding the ‘normal’ ground, treating people from different cultures as ‘other’ and measuring their difference from the baseline of the normality of the dominant group. Turning the cultural gaze on to our own cultural ways and seeing them alongside the ways of other peoples certainly disturbs the complacency of holding the so-called normal ground.

### *Who is culturally marked?*

Participants came from different backgrounds and circumstances. Some were clearly white/Pākehā/normal and experienced few childhood situations that

raised questions about who they were culturally or what being normal meant. Some participants had a more ambiguous relationship with the dominant norm, particularly those with Pacific Island, Irish, Catholic and other immigrant heritage. These people were often made aware of their ‘outsider’ or minority status as children attending schools.

Catriona spoke of an incident at school in Scotland when she was nine that prompted an awareness of her cultural identity.

We had come back from the summer holidays and were asked to write a story about our holiday. And I wrote a story about the burn, about the land that I had experienced in my holiday and the teacher scored out the word burn and substituted stream. It was important to write English. And so it was my identity with the land that was being questioned and I still feel angry about that. I think it was very much, an awareness of that story that was part of the beginning of my bicultural journey. And so that identity was of being a Scot and **not** being English. And I still see English in a derogatory term that doesn't cover all English people; it covers English people who don't recognise difference.

For Catriona being marked as ‘other’ by the teacher for her use of a Scots term emphasised the importance of her cultural identity, an identity that she still carried some 60 years on in another land.

Suze at a similar age in a Catholic school in New Zealand had her cultural identity called into question.

I was a New Zealander and I was ethnically, **no culturally**, Irish Catholic. And I came at a time of crisis at about 10 when the other Irish Catholics that I was at school with insisted on naming me as other, and asking me where I was from and what I was. And so I went home to my parents and asked my father, ‘what am I?’ ‘Where do I come from?’ And he said “you're kiwi like everyone else”. So it wasn't till probably three or four years later of wondering why I was being made other that my mother, my mother said to me that my father's grandfather was a Spanish negro which was just another way of obscuring the reality. ... And so I guess my story is one of the shame, pain of my father and the racism of my father who had a black mother who said she was Irish.

In both these stories a child is marked out from the norm, their identity or right to use their language is called into question by members of the dominant group. Suze was made to feel like she did not quite fit in even although her father insisted that she and they did when he used the phrase “... you're a kiwi like everyone else”. I think it was a way of claiming an identity in this place and saying that there was no need to look beyond that. It may also relate to a fear of being marked out as “other” therefore being an “outsider” rather than part of the normal group.

Pal and Angeline both have Pacific heritage and talked about experiences where their cultural differences were brought to notice in the school system. Pal grew up in a State housing area and went to a large primary school in the South Island.

We were quite aware of being different. It was like all our families came from somewhere else. [There were] ... very strong Irish communities, Scottish, Dutch but also Ngapuhi and Ngati Porou and Kahungunu some Tainui but mostly Ngapuhi and Ngati Porou. There were also Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island, Niue families.

That sense of coming from somewhere else or realising that you were different was also experienced by Angeline once she moved out of her “family zone” as a 3 or 4 year old. She said

I was outside of what I knew and what I was comfortable with which was having you know Samoan mother and a Pākehā father and I thought that was quite normal [then] stepped out of that to realise that actually there was different families out there. And that was a young age that I would have discovered that you know going to kindy<sup>17</sup> and meeting different children.

Both Pal and Angeline talk about being aware of culture and difference from a much younger age than their Pākehā counterparts. For example, they spoke of being labelled as “black”, usually followed by an expletive, in derogatory ways. They were not only marked out as culturally different by the Pākehā majority, they were also marked in race terms. They were not white, and therefore not the ‘norm’.

There is a different tone to the stories of people who were not regarded as being part of the dominant group. Kathy arrived in New Zealand from Canada as a child in the 1960s and recalled that “... any outsider was basically ostracised by New Zealanders at the time so I never really felt like a New Zealander”. Membership in the unnamed dominant group was closely guarded and the lack of differentiation of a cultural identity often meant that a sense of national belonging was denied to people who were seen as outside that dominant group. Even although Kathy felt like an ‘outsider’ she, like many other ‘white’ British and European immigrants, could for the most part ‘pass’ as Pākehā or at least generally have access to the same privileges that members of the dominant group enjoyed. It is interesting to note that DavidJ also came to NZ in the 1960s as an adult male from Britain and does not talk about any experiences of feeling or being ostracised.

Being culturally marked as Pākehā was not appreciated by a boy who was around 10 years old and went to a Kura Kaupapa (Māori immersion) school and was

---

<sup>17</sup> Kindy or Kindergarten - State funded preschool education for 3 and 4 year old children



doing kapa haka. Mitzi told the story of this boy who had been called a Pākehā and he came home and said to his father

“I am Māori aren’t I dad?” and his dad said “well umm no not really”. He said “but I’ve got Māori ancestry haven’t I dad?” “Well not really no.” “Don’t I even have a grandmother or a great grandfather or something, just a little bit don’t I dad? And dad said “no you don’t” and he said he suddenly threw the arch wobbly ... because he was so outraged to find that he was Pākehā.

At the age of 10 this boy did not see that being Pākehā was an identity that he wished to acknowledge, he also would not have wanted to be different from his mates but perhaps was being ‘othered’ by them.

In contrast to the stories of being marked out as different Alex, who attended Kura Kaupapa as one of very few Pākehā, spoke of discovering for himself that he didn’t have any Pākehā friends at about aged 12. While this awareness ‘freaked him out’ personally, he was accepted by his school friends. Sarah spoke of attending a large secondary school in Auckland where as a Pākehā she was in a minority. She did not speak of this as a negative experience but rather said that she always knew she was Pākehā.

It would seem that Pākehā, who fit in as members of the dominant group engage in the process of culturally marking themselves at a much later age. For example, Karen said she was in her twenties when she became aware of having a cultural identity and so was I. The experience of Pākehā who fit within the dominant group not recognising themselves as cultural until they were in their late teens or early twenties was echoed by a group of community psychology people who met to reflect on their cultural identities (Huygens et al., 2003). On the other hand the participants who are members of minority cultural groups in Aotearoa were culturally marked at a much younger age. Being marked as cultural from a young age is also the experience of children from immigrant cultures (Gibson Group, 2007; Huygens et al., 2003).

In this section I have considered the ways in which participants expressed some of their experiences of being normal. Notions of normality imply the presence of the abnormal or things that are different from normal. When participants started to see and engage with the cultural ‘other’ they began to view their sense of normality as a position of privilege related to being a member of the dominant group. The critical realisation of a sense of privilege and culture was closely linked to the emergence of Māori voices and Te Tiriti o Waitangi onto the social and political landscape of Aotearoa in the 1970s and beyond. Developing relationships with Māori and the Treaty are explored next.

## **Pākehā in relationships with Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi**

The interactions between Pākehā, Māori, and the Treaty have been important factors in the way in which Treaty people negotiate their understandings of Pākehā culture. In this section I present first an analysis of the way in which participants talk about Pākehā relationships with Māori, which is then followed by Pākehā negotiating Te Tiriti o Waitangi relationships.

### **One people no more: Pākehā engaging in relationships with Māori**

Influences by, and interactions and relationships with, Māori are reflected in a number of different ways. When engaging in intercultural relationships there are often experiences or ways of being that one needs to come to understand and to do that we start from what is normal to us. There are differences in the location and politics that participants were introduced to when growing up that underpin the descriptions and discourses used to elucidate their sense of a growing cultural identity as Pākehā. I noticed that there appeared to be a North Island - South Island regional difference in the way in which Māori were talked about. This was perhaps coloured by my own experience of growing up in the ‘deep south’, where the North Island was a long way away.

For some, especially those in the South Island, there is a sense in which Māori were an exotic other as they were so few in number, although the notion of maintaining a separate life style was expressed. However, living in or taking a trip to the North Island presented a different set of experiences and challenges with respect to Māori people. I am describing some of the early impressions of intercultural contact and the stories of a growing awareness of a cultural identity that is associated with an increasing contact with Māori and also, for most people, a growing awareness of the issues of colonisation and the Treaty of Waitangi which I will explore in the next section.

One of the myths that New Zealanders grew up with, at least until the 1970s, was that as a country we had the best race relations in the world, “the ideology of Māori and Pākehā as one people living in harmony” (Walker, 2004, p. 225). There were many examples where Māori and Pākehā lived side by side in apparent harmony. The best race relations myth was maintained through the political and social dominance of Pākehā who generally had limited cultural interaction with Māori (Spoonley, 1988).

Participants recalled situations where they started to notice Māori. DavidT in the following quote highlights an experience where Pākehā and Māori were not

really living alongside each other; they inhabited different worlds with very little interaction between them.

And it wasn't until I ended up living in Wairoa, Ngati Kahungunu ki Wairoa rohe, where just over fifty percent of the population was tangata whenua. And looking at the church context, we had the parish church in the town and a small church next to the marae across the river - and basically two different communities [which] didn't overlap. We may have had one or two Māori in town that came because they lived in town and that was easiest and maybe they didn't get on so well with the people across the river. But there was only one or two Pākehā that ever crossed the river. The real separation between the communities really struck me. Seeing the lack of relationship really raised questions for me about the ideology that says we are all New Zealanders. So I started crossing the river.

This story reflects the myth of harmonious race relations where two peoples, while members of the same church community, gather and worship separately. Crossing the river may have been regarded as a subversive and unsettling act. The separation between Māori and dominant group communities or worlds was not an accident in many cases, particularly in the South Island, where the following participants lived. Karen recalls

The earliest memory I have about cultural difference, would be when one of my uncles married a Māori woman from Invercargill. The family dynamics shifted and we didn't go and visit them any more. It was quite weird because my mother came from a large family who habitually visited each other a lot. And it wasn't what was said, it was what wasn't said. I thought it was weird and when I asked questions I was 'shushed'.

The family dynamics that Karen described, while rather extreme, were indicative of the separation of Māori and Pākehā families. Studies of intercultural marriages in New Zealand (Archie, 2005; Harré, 1966) both discuss some of the difficulties that arose when Māori and Pākehā came together in this way. This situation stayed with Karen as she was growing up.

I knew there was something wrong about that, I just didn't know what it was. So I started to notice other things as I went through school. I have one clear memory of a story in a School Journal about a Māori girl called Hine. There was a drawing of her - dark skin, thick lips, bare feet, and chewing on a corncob. Now that was way outside my experience!

Both Moyra and Jo also tell school-related stories of noticing Māori where they stood out from the dominant group. I can still name, nearly 40 years on, the only Māori person who went to my secondary school and he was not even in my year.

Jo said she was

.... at boarding school with a young woman who came from one of the local pa and had come there on a Māori Foundation Scholarship. I remember her and was friends with her but when I think back now I don't know that I identified or acknowledged her different identity. I knew she was different and I think there was a sense of becoming aware of difference at that point but not enough to make any sense of it.

These stories suggest that, while there is some recognition of difference, there is no encouragement to explore what that difference might mean. Although there is a sense in which Māori are remembered for receiving scholarships or, in Moyra's case, being named as 'truant'. Moyra was influenced by the following story which reflects the way in which the education system often operated with a lack of cultural understanding.

A young Māori kid had gone home with his family, I presume for a tangi, I'm not sure, and had got into trouble with the truant officer. And a friend of dad's had stuck up for him and said it wasn't truancy it was you know, going home to the family and what was wrong with that. So sort of Māori people came into that mix quite early.

The experience of growing up in the South Island in relation to Māori was perhaps best captured by Jen when she said

I grew up out of Christchurch on the Canterbury Plains in Ellesmere and in a very white environment. ... I went on a road trip when I was 16 to the East Coast [North Island], and I remember being in this small town up there and it was the first time ever of feeling that I was in a racial minority and I didn't know that there were parts of Aotearoa, or New Zealand, as we called it at that time, that there were that many Māori people. So that was kind of like - right **the whole world was not quite like Leeston.**

The North Island was this distant and rather strange place that seemed to be very different from the places where those of us in the South Island were growing up. Even though there were many Māori place names, for example, the pronunciation of them was so anglicised that they were almost unrecognisable as Māori words. I did not realise until about 5 years ago that what we called the 'Quwara' Gorge was actually the Kawarau Gorge. There seemed to be fewer opportunities in the South to actually engage with Māori, as Catriona noted, when she arrived in New Zealand from Scotland.

When we arrived in New Zealand we lived in Christchurch and I had a, my closest friend kept telling me that I was missing out because I didn't meet any Māori people. That what was a piece of information in my head, it didn't mean very much.

Suze recalled that southern attitudes to Māori were not all bad and occasions where socialising together occurred were enjoyed.

And certainly in the South Island we didn't think we were racist. We thought the North Islanders were racist because we'd heard about the colour bar in some pubs in the North Island. We had brothers and friends who would go on trips to the North Island and drink in public bars with the Māoris and the Māoris would love it and say you must come from the South Island cause you come and drink with us and all the North Islanders would be in the lounge bar. So we knew we weren't racist because we were really happy to go and drink anywhere in the pub, and we were really happy to have Māoris at our parties, and we would have a hangi in the back yard.

These are all views where the participants are noticing Māori as different from themselves and noticing that people have different attitudes to Māori. Karen's parents appear to reject any involvement with Māori whereas Suze's brothers and friends enjoyed the contact they had, which may also reflect a generational change in the way people regard Māori. In these discourses there is an element of surprise and, perhaps, wonder that there is this other people called Māori in great numbers, as Jen discovered, and sometimes excluded from social activities, as Suze told us. Almost all of these stories relate to living in New Zealand pre 1980s, when myths such as "New Zealand has the best race relations in the world" were still prevalent in the dominant group or mainstream as it is now called.

Growing up in rural North Island settings where Māori were present was a normal experience for Joan and Moea, unlike many of the South Island experiences above. Joan, when thinking about being aware of other cultures in this country, recalled when she was growing up in the North in the late 1930s or early 1940s.

[I] first went to school at Ruawai where I guess half the children would have been Māori and I don't actually remember us even thinking about it somehow - that was just what it was like. So although there wasn't a lot of social mixing that's what it was like in those schools in the North where half the children were Māori. And certainly my family would never ever make any differences between one culture and another that I was aware of, so I think I was very fortunate in that respect.

There are some underlying discourses that can be read into two of Joan's statements. Firstly "although there wasn't a lot of social mixing" and secondly "certainly my family would never ever make any differences between one culture and another that I was aware of". They let us know that the belief of racial harmony was current; that "we are all one people" living harmoniously side by side but in our separate worlds (R. Nairn & McCreanor, 1991). There is also the assertion of equality in the phrase about making no differences, which suggests that Joan was not aware of her family having any attitudes about cultural superiority. It does, however, alert us to the fact that there were discourses of cultural or racial superiority that were inherent in and hidden by the philosophy and practice of colonisation.

Another way of being called into the cultural identity challenge is the way in which we are named. M-O-E-A, spells out her name as she introduced herself and then explains that that was where her story started.

And I think that's probably where my story starts with being, you know, being very Pākehā but with a Māori name. ... And I suppose I always, I just remember hating my name as a kid, just hated it,

people would mispronounce it and I was MOA and it was always just you know a hassle and I remember hating it.

I guess if I was Māori and reading this fragment I would be saying “welcome to our world”. This reflects a whole set of attitudes in the 1950s and 60s where Māori language was not recognised or valued in Pākehā institutions and there would have still been the lingering belief that Māori were a dying race so that it was perfectly acceptable to anglicise Māori names and language and to bastardise pronunciations.

While having a Māori name was to some extent problematic for Moea, growing up in a community with a mix of Māori and Pākehā did not seem to be.

And I think growing up I wasn't really sure about white and black it wasn't - because we lived in south Taranaki was really 50/50 so it was kind of a mix at school so my mates were Māori and Pākehā and it didn't kind of arise as an issue for ages about you know whether you were one or the other.

The myths of harmonious race relations and one people, long held by dominant group members, were starting to be disrupted in the 1960s. DavidT, in an earlier story, talked about choosing to cross the river to attend the Māori church rather than stay in the Pākehā one in town. Even at school all was not quite as it seemed; some ripples of change were appearing as Moea was to find when she challenged her history teacher about using the term Māori wars.

The history teacher at high school you know they were talking about the “Māori Wars” and I said ‘they're the Land Wars aren't they'? And I got told to go home and I was being supercilious and I had to look up supercilious. ... So I, when I found out, I was really pissed off went back and said “hey you know this is how it was”. But he was actually very sympathetic, the history teacher, was kind of okay you know, he was pretty okay.

Moea's parents were doctors and socialists and involved in the 1960 ‘No Māoris No Tour’ marches, and also helped Dick Scott (1975) with some of his research about Parihaka for the book *Ask that Mountain*. Moea was introduced to early versions of ‘revisited history’ which took far greater account of the impact of colonisation on Māori and sought to tell more than the previous ‘Pākehā as victor’ versions by uncovering much that had been covered or unexamined.

In one of her first memorable encounters with Māori, Molly tells us about going by train to a church camp as a teenager.

I came up here to Tuakau and went to a camp [with] the youth of various Māori churches. And yeah, I was quite a novelty for these people because it was all people from around Auckland who maybe knew each other quite well from church and were sort of related and had lots to do with each other. ... Maybe that was the first situation, experience of being a minority. Because I remember at one stage overhearing someone saying ‘oh that blonde girl’, oh my god they are talking about me, like I had never been blonde amongst Pākehās, I

had brown, I thought I had brown hair. And then sort of yeah just that kind of ooh I'm quite pale compared to all these people ... So there was sort of moments of realising I was physically different and other maybe incidences of being culturally different.

I tell a similar story of having 'one of those moments' of cultural awareness when living in the Bay of Islands in 1979.

We were living in a small settlement where there weren't that many Pākehā and I really became aware of - that in the relationships I had with the people around me who were predominantly Māori - that I really wasn't Māori and that I would never be Māori. No matter how hard I tried and I did try, I was Pākehā. I was this other that was Pākehā.

In both these stories the participants are in situations where they are being marked as different. It was quite a surprise, and certainly a new and challenging experience, which prompted a quest to make some sense of their cultural identity. There are more stories of being marked as different in the classic markers section but I have included these here as they specifically relate to Māori and are a positive spin off of engaging in relationships with Māori.

Unlike Catriona, who arrived in Christchurch from Scotland and did not initially meet any Māori people, DavidJ had almost immediate contact and was taken on a trip of introduction soon after he arrived off a boat from England in the 1960s. He knew nothing about New Zealand and was going to work for Auckland University with responsibility for adult education in Northland. He was introduced to Northland by the Māori Tutor who was responsible for Māori adult education in the area.

Mat said "Well if you are going to work in Northland I'd better introduce you to it". So we went up for a week and we toured Northland. We stayed in family homes, we visited various pubs and he took his golf clubs, I didn't play golf but there is a nice course at Waitangi. And we spoke to three Pākehā in that whole week. So for me there was never any question about being Pākehā for instance. Clearly that's what I was because that's how everybody referred to me, it was just a natural part of the way things were, no problem. But I think I was still very much an observer, I wasn't involved at that stage because I was so new to it at all. Certainly I was aware of that Māori world and its reality and I liked what I was encountering in it.

It was through the unemployed workers movement in 1982/83, where Catriona started having contact with Māori, that she recognised Pākehā as an identity, albeit a Pākehā of Scots descent.

### *Having a Māori partner and Māori/Pākehā children*

Intermarriage has been a feature of Māori Pākehā relationships since European arrival in Aotearoa. By the 1960s according to Walker (2004) over 50 per cent

of Māori marriages were cross-cultural and while all of these would not have been between Māori and Pākehā a substantial number were.

Both Moea and Karen talked briefly about their relationships with Māori partners and having Māori/ Pākehā children. This is an important area where Pākehā are really challenged about their identity and also the mixed identities of their children. They live with identity issues on a daily basis and as Karen who is an only child said it changed the cultural heritage of her family forever.

I do not want to downplay the significance of Māori/Pākehā intermarriage and partner relationships as they are in themselves a very rich source of exploration of identity issues for both Māori and Pākehā and the future of Aotearoa. While these relationships are not the focus of this thesis, they have been written about in other studies such as John Harré's (1966) book *Māori and Pākehā: A Study of mixed marriages in New Zealand*; Carol Archie's (2005) *Skin to Skin*. Both Harré (1966) and some of Archie's (2005) stories reflect a stronger prejudice from Pākehā about intermarriage and a greater acceptance from Māori.

Discussion of the complexity of Māori-Pākehā identities is beyond the scope of this thesis although forms an increasingly significant field of research. Some examples that I am familiar with are: Tess Moeke-Maxwell (2003) *Bringing home the body: Bi/multi racial Māori women's hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand*; Melinda Webber (2008) *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*, Bronwyn Campbell (2005) *Negotiating biculturalism: deconstructing Pākehā subjectivity*; and Joy Te Wiata (2006) *A local Aotearoa New Zealand investigation of the contribution of Māori cultural knowledges to Pākehā identity and counselling practices*.

#### *"We know we are not the whole" DavidJ*

The sentiment expressed by DavidJ in this phrase was echoed many times in different ways by participants as a way of positioning themselves as Pākehā. There was, in claiming a Pākehā identity, recognition of Māori as tangata whenua and of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the official blueprint of the sovereignty and governance relationships for Aotearoa. DavidJ felt that there was also a sense that

as an emerging culture, if you like partly as a self-identified group, we are a very unusual culture ... Pākehā as we're defining it does not intend to be taken for granted, it's constantly examining itself in relation to the other part of the deal.



Having a sense of Pākehā identity was based on “being in this land” and being aware of the responsibilities and history of Pākehā and “acknowledging relationships with tangata whenua”, according to Jen. Kathy too emphasised that her belonging here was about being aware of “my relationship to tangata whenua”. Moyra expressed her sense of Pākehā identity as standing “alongside the story of justice and that a treaty worker stands alongside the story of justice in this country”. And in doing that treaty work using “tangata tiriti is a helpful starting point [for] moving into a framework which is based in this country”.

Moyra has thought that

... the excitement that people are finding from examining that identification from the point of view of relationships with tangata whenua is on the one level confused because we get all this language around how I am indigenous too, and on the other level it's a way of clarifying that people have two feet firmly planted in this place and that the Treaty gives them a place to stand and be.

“I am a product of some of that work” said Alex who has grown up with a strong sense of relationship with tangata whenua as he went to kohanga reo and kura kaupapa schools (also see Barnes, (2006) for a fuller account of this experience).

His father had been involved in Network Waitangi in Tauranga and

... during the early 80s he was working on a marae in Tauranga in Welcome Bay and he was training young Māori who had just come out of prison doing education courses and he had formed a relationship with some of the local community and Iwi hapu there. And they said why don't you send your kids to this new initiative and of course that fitted in with his politics so that's where me and my bro went so those are some of the circumstances that had an impact on my awareness.

Alex described Pākehā culture in contrast to a nationalistic identity as “...more humbling and engaged in trying to be just and sustainable so that's really important for me. Pākehā culture yeah, it's that sense of belonging”.

Relationships between Māori and Pākehā are intertwined and to a large extent each recognises their cultural ‘other’ through the everyday social and political interactions that take place. Ranginui Walker (1989) has suggested that it is through the relationships with each other that Māori and Pākehā identities are constituted. In the data extracts I have drawn on, participants have told stories of differences between Pākehā and Māori. Putting these stories into language where differences are discussed contribute to the ongoing negotiation of our identities with each other and with Māori. A second key aspect of Pākehā identity is to learn about the social and political history of Aotearoa and for this group of participants Te Tiriti o Waitangi is a vital component of that learning.

## Te Tiriti o Waitangi: Pākehā and the Treaty

We have a right to be here – we were invited – the Treaty was signed  
– the only problem is we didn't honour it (Suze).

Learning about the Treaty and doing Treaty workshops have sparked for both facilitators and participants questions about their own cultural identity. This came as a great revelation to us members of the Tauranga antiracism group in the mid 80's. When reflecting on our facilitation of Treaty workshops it became apparent that a major point of contention arose when we attempted to discuss culture. We all knew that Māori had a culture but did we? We had been told so often that we were a nation of 'one people', with equal opportunity for all, but that wasn't borne out in the health, education or justice statistics. We gradually realised that we did not have practiced ways of talking about what our culture was.

Our experiences in Tauranga are echoed by some in this research where Treaty work has stimulated thought about their cultural identity and the way they name themselves. Even if earlier in their lives they had interacted with Māori or people of other cultures, it was being involved with antiracism and Treaty issues that not only opened up identity issues, such as the ways in which they could name themselves but also reinforced a sense of cultural identity. JoanM told us that her awareness of being Pākehā "... started with being involved in antiracism work" and Catriona said "... the Pākehā identity has been reinforced by learning and becoming involved in Treaty work". For Jo her

... sense of having a cultural identity and being able to name it came, as others have said, probably with my journey beginning to do Treaty work and antiracism and experiences when I moved to Waikato as an adult.

Learning about the Treaty and doing Treaty education work became according to Suzanne "... a point of awareness for people" about their cultural identity and "... doing that work increased my own awareness". By the time Jen was at University the Treaty was discussed although she said

... it wasn't until I was in my fourth year at university that I learned about Te Tiriti and came to that awareness on an academic level. And beginning to realise that we need to understand where you come from and your identity.

Many dominant group people start to see themselves differently when they move outside of their familiar communities, usually by travelling overseas or to different parts of Aotearoa. Travel, in most cases, was a relatively benign introduction to marking oneself as cultural. On the other hand being introduced to the notion of culture through Treaty of Waitangi workshops was challenging for both facilitators and attendees. Having your eyes opened to the events of

colonisation in Aotearoa does seem to induce a shift in both head and heart and very often means coming to terms with emotions and feelings of guilt, fear and a sense of belonging, particularly if you are a member of the colonising group. How much responsibility one takes for the actions of earlier settlers is a common concern, along with working out the rights one has to be here.

Sometimes there has been a specific event that impacts on a person in such a way that it becomes life changing. When she returned from overseas, where she had identified as a New Zealander, Moea helped to organise the 1990 Home Birth Conference which turned out to be “mesmerising - the disorientating event” which challenged her to think about her cultural identity. She said at the conference there were

... these circling Pākehā women you know accusing us of not organising a bicultural conference, some of whom are my best friends now (laughter) but at the time it was WHAT! And luckily we had Joan Cook who we did a workshop with immediately after that conference because it was a sort of a traumatising thing for our organised group of home birth people. I mean it turned into a bicultural conference because Māori would have made it that anyway, but not because of us. And so when Joan did the workshop, we did a three-day one at my house with about ten kids running around as well. And so that's when I became Pākehā, from a New Zealander to a Pākehā.

While some people experience a big event where they are really challenged about what they are doing, for many like DavidT the realisation of needing to change happens over time in relationships and with exposure to different cultural settings.

Through my work I began building a number of relationships because I went often to the far north, to Hokianga, Ngawha and Moerewa. I sat on the marae and listened at the feet of many kaumatua and kuia. It was an exposure experience and I suppose it was an experience that created what Jack Mezirow would name as a disorientating dilemma. I began to realise over time that my worldview had to change and my way of naming who I was also had to change.

For Sarah attending a high school in Auckland where she “... felt quite ‘other’ because there were fewer white than there were Pacific Island” students was what led her into exploring Treaty issues. And with a loud sigh she talked about her struggle with guilt.

I have felt a sense of guilt for being Pākehā for a very long time and I've moved through that fortunately but it took a lot. ... And I only came back to this sort of group much later on. ... And so my sense of coming to a group like this was more a sort of relief - that there were other people who were sort of aware the significance of the cultural boundaries that there are.

Sarah thought guilt was a “phase we go through and run out of”. Whereas Averil felt that guilt was

... bigger than that - its also in the culture and I think its stomped down and that's why we're always going on about we're all one people, put the K back in iwi all that sort of stuff, I think it's there. And we all know that there were wrong things done in this country whether we want to talk about them or not.

Victoria, too, spoke of some of the confusion she felt around issues of cultural identity and sense of place when she spoke just before having to leave the 2003 focus group before it had finished.

Thinking through this stuff is so huge and you're in and out of it all the time and things hit you at some stages and knock you around. Part of the thing for me, the core of this for me is about belonging. Where do we belong, where do I belong? Like these things really knock me around with that. Like I really want to be here and when I am here, I don't want to be here. Then I come and I leave and I get pissed off, I go out and I come back and it's like this whole big thing, this whole us being I mean what are we culturally?

I think Victoria is expressing some frustration with the uncertainties that arise about culture and belonging in Treaty work, and in being part of a Treaty group. Working with issues of colonisation and the way the Treaty, since it was signed in 1840, has been dismissed and ignored by successive Pākehā governments to the detriment of Māori, is unsettling for dominant group members. Re-learning about colonial history raises uncomfortable questions and emotions about identity in and belonging to Aotearoa.

In the early days of Treaty education emphasis was placed on education about the political and social impact of the Treaty with not much attention being paid to the underlying emotional elements which came with the challenging of a person's cultural identity. Moyra spoke of a “depth of fear” being “alive and well” in workshops

... where people who are not of Māori descent think 'oh those Māoris they've got all the culture and we've got none of it and I am not English and I am not Irish'.

They were unaware of their own culture and as Victoria said

... there's that complete cultural blindness unless you're confronted. But then we were all confronted so perhaps there isn't a cultural blindness – perhaps we're all woken up at some stage.

For many people, attending a Treaty workshop was their first opportunity to discuss their own culture. While there was a strong sense of belonging as New Zealanders the notion of belonging to a cultural group and calling that group Pākehā remains highly contested. The sense of being woken up to culture and exploring and debating who we are as Pākehā New Zealanders has been incorporated into Treaty workshops over the last 25 years. Suze talked about

how they have changed the focus of their workshops to take into account the emotional challenges of doing Treaty work.

In the 80s people went to great lengths discussing all the [Treaty] clauses, and got caught up in the semantics and the legal arguments, ... what people are trying to do is come to terms with who they are and that's an emotional challenge; its not an intellectual one. So that's how we focus our workshops to try and move them emotionally so they can cope with being called a Pākehā. And they can cope with umm not being tangata whenua. And they can understand why Māori are saying the things they are saying and how long its taken for Māori to be heard by the rest of us. They mightn't understand everything but they start to understand there is lots they don't know. And they've got things to learn and there is ways that they can learn it.

After a recent workshop Karen was once again reminded about the "... deep seated fear Pākehā have of Māori Sovereignty – whatever they think that might be" when a young man thanked them for the way in which they conducted a workshop. I assume that whatever fears the young man had, were effectively dealt with in the workshop. In the past issues in Treaty workshops were sometimes handled with confrontation and argument which may have added to people's fears. Karen felt that fear "... keeps people from opening up to new information – so they keep picking out all the bad stuff – putting spins on things. I think that's the biggest hurdle that we all face really". When I asked about what people's fears might be based on Karen replied:

Some of it – we did it to them so they might do it to us. We can't deny that wrongs were done – land was stolen and tricked. If we're going to move on we have to acknowledge it. We don't all have to become poor and Māori become rich – it's about equality and honour – equity.

Events, particularly those related to the Treaty, and issues to do with Māori in Aotearoa have been described by some participants as disorientating or unsettling their sense of cultural identity. They have needed to attend to emotional challenges, very often related to fear and guilt, as they have learned about having an identity that is different from being a New Zealander. One of the avenues that people in this research have sought to deal with their cultural identity questions has been to join what is loosely termed the Treaty movement.

Treaty educators now are finding that the workshops they facilitate tend to be shorter than in the 1980s and 90s when they were often held over 2-3 days.

There is now less time to explore cultural issues as Karen explains.

In early days of Project Waitangi we did the Pākehā Culture workshops first. Now you are lucky if you get 5 hours for a workshop – so have to incorporate that into the very beginning of the workshop – but it still sets the scene and relaxes people.

To some degree the use of the term Pākehā in Treaty workshops became a shorthand reference for the Māori-Pākehā bicultural relationship that was advanced in the 1970s. While the position of Pākehā, as the dominant group in the settler population in Aotearoa, was important to examine in learning about the Treaty, there has been a growing awareness of cultural diversity within this non-Māori population. Diverse ways to name oneself in the growing understanding of Treaty relationships were adopted, such as Tauīwi<sup>18</sup>, a Māori term for non-Māori New Zealanders (McCreanor & Nairn, 2002a) and tangata Tiriti, meaning people of the Treaty, to distinguish from tangata whenua (Māori people of the land). These names have become more inclusive of all non-Māori peoples in the Treaty relationship and signal a move towards Pākehā being the name for the dominant cultural group while recognising that there were other cultural groups involved.

From 1983 Catriona was involved in the working party to change the structures of the Methodist Church “to acknowledge Māori as having a real place in it”. She described some of the processes that occurred in the Tauīwi group.

And the Methodist church was also the place that helped me to understand what the difference between being Pākehā and being Tauīwi is. Because that church sort of divided itself, thinking they were doing the right thing, into Taha Māori and Tauīwi. But they didn't, in the beginning, acknowledge that when they said Tauīwi they kind of meant Pākehā with little <hesitate> unimportant bits of Samoan, Tongan and Fijian. And how over the years they had to learn that those were not unimportant little bits they were important little bits. And they eventually came, not all that long ago, to the realisation that in order to give the Pacific Island church its due place, Pākehā's had to make their bit much smaller and that's that.

DavidT as he became involved in Treaty work in the late 1990s reflects on these different ways of naming himself.

Getting involved with the treaty movement here and particularly the treaty conferences and Tamaki treaty workers, I came to name myself as Tauīwi and also as tangata Tiriti. I started to feel I could own those ways of describing myself, as much because they came out of my desire and my need to relate to the whenua and to tangata whenua.

As the understandings of Treaty relationships grow and develop so too have the ways in which people can describe themselves become more layered as we see with DavidT above and with Kathy who preferred to name herself as tangata Tiriti.

So that's become an important term for me as separate from Pākehā because there is a lot of people who call themselves Pākehā that would have no idea about learning to be a Treaty partner so I suppose I am just sort of feeling my way, like Ingrid was under the water and trying to find the shape of how people have started to

---

<sup>18</sup> Tauīwi is used in some academic and Treaty networks, but is not a term that is in everyday use

identify with being a Pākehā. I mean I still use it loosely to refer to myself but I keep going back to this tangata Tiriti.

The increasing acceptance of the Treaty in the daily lives of people as signalled by Kathy in calling herself tangata Tiriti adds to the layers of identity whether they be Pākehā or Tauīwi-Pākehā as a cultural identity and the national identity position of New Zealander. There is a freshness about the tangata Tiriti position that in some respects signals a way forward in the bicultural – multicultural debate which leaves room to acknowledge Pākehā dominance and history and opens up negotiations for an inclusive place in Aotearoa.

One of the commonly held beliefs about the Treaty of Waitangi is that it is a unique feature of New Zealand colonial history; no other country had a Treaty like this. The uniqueness of the Treaty has been used as a justification in the ‘the best race relations in the world’ discourses. In the following extract, however, Kathy is using the notion of uniqueness to disrupt rather than support that belief. Kathy said

I keep thinking that while the idea of race has developed differently in each country I keep thinking that our Treaty is pretty unique. And the process of colonisation happened a bit differently too here from what I can gather. You know to have this Treaty of ours and the resistance that Māori had and the respect they earned umm.

Kathy by claiming the Treaty as “ours” and aligning it with Māori resistance is reframing the ‘best race relations’ discourse into the present day context rather than persisting in repeating old beliefs. This reframing of an earlier discourse clearly places all of us in the Treaty relationship and relates to the way in which people identify themselves.

## Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed some of the key factors that I think stimulated participants recognition of being cultural. Treaty people have applied critical social analysis skills, perhaps gained and certainly honed through the processes of being involved in Treaty education, to the way they have come to recognise themselves as cultural.

Most of the participants in this study grew up with a sense that they were just normal, other people might be different and have a culture but they did not view themselves as being cultural. The most common prompt that stimulated recognition of Pākehā culture was in reference to Māori. This supports the theorising in earlier chapters that Māori and Pākehā are constituted in relations to each other. While Māori and Pākehā each exist in their own right it is only because the other is present that the cultural identity becomes salient.

Learning about the Treaty of Waitangi alongside relationships with Māori was the second significant prompt for the Pākehā in this research. For most participants it has been through both attending and facilitating Treaty workshops that they have had the opportunity to talk about Pākehā identity and culture. Through the talk about culture and the challenge to act responsibly in Treaty relationships they now recognise themselves as cultural. In the next chapter I explore further the ways in which participants talk about what it is to be Pākehā and the sense of belonging in Aotearoa.





# Chapter Eight

## Treaty People Recognise Being Pākehā

Having established the British heritage links to Pākehā as the cultural identity in chapter six and explored the ways in which members of the dominant group in Aotearoa have come to recognise themselves as cultural in chapter seven, I now attend to how participants give meaning to Pākehā as their cultural identity.

The recognition of culture and how to name your identity within that culture are usually so entwined that they are difficult to undo without some overlap. I have separated the two constructs of being cultural and being Pākehā. In my reading of the data I identified that there were, at times, two different levels of processing involved in the way participants recognised a) what it might mean to be cultural as opposed to just being a normal New Zealander, and b) how they then talked about what it might mean to be Pākehā. In this chapter I focus on the latter, the positive recognition of being Pākehā and the associated assertions of belonging to Aotearoa.

### **Yes, I'm Pākehā**

Yes I'm Pākehā, I have a Māori name but I'm Pākehā. I'm proud to be Pākehā because it's about the new identity, not the old ... we're all New Zealanders ... it's a different identity (Moea).

Pākehā is the Māori name for the 'white' settlers who came to Aotearoa (Walker, 1989). There is considerable debate within the dominant settler group about what the word Pākehā means; about who is Pākehā; and even more basically about the notion of whether members of the dominant settler group have a cultural identity. These points canvassed in chapter 2 and touched on in many of the discussions throughout this research. In this chapter I am focusing on the way participants have talked about what they think it means to be Pākehā and to belong in Aotearoa.

It would seem that some underlying identity questions are raised as participants discuss the issues around naming themselves Pākehā. Questions such as:

- how is a cultural name assigned?
- who has the power to name?
- can I claim a name for myself?

- how does that name apply in a collective sense?
- do I accept a name that is given; can I define who is part of the cultural group that I see myself belonging to?
- how many layers of meaning can a single name have and still be useful?

It is these questions that I will bear in mind as I read, analyse and write this section.

### Debating who is Pākehā?

The question remains whether Pākehā culture is the dominant culture, or as Jen suggested, Pākehā culture is possibly the culture of people who call themselves Pākehā (Jane).

Pākehā is a highly contested term within the dominant settler population of Aotearoa with many layers of meaning (Black, 1997; M. Nairn, 2002; Spoonley, 1986, 1988). Pākehā as a name for the dominant cultural group has not had widespread acceptance although it is becoming more commonplace as a cultural name. In some quarters of the dominant group there is strident resistance to the use of that name. The resistance is sometimes related to people not wishing to take on a cultural name from another language that has been loaded with a number of derogatory meanings over the last 200 years or so. This lack of broad acceptance leaves open for debate the question of who is Pākehā and it is certainly a point that is discussed openly by the participants in this research.

It has become clear to me that there are many layers to the ways in which cultural groups are viewed and come to be understood. We are not all the same and it is the mix of all the parts that add up to the bigger picture of how a cultural group might be described. How a person is positioned and lives within a cultural group and wider society would seem to influence the way in which a given cultural name is accepted or rejected. Further to that is the question of what and who might be included within a given cultural group. Which parts do I accept and what do I reject and yet remain part of the bigger cultural picture?

Being a member of a cultural group and trying to describe what that group looks like is a challenging process. In doing this research I was quite intentional about not defining, culture and, in particular, Pākehā culture. I was interested in seeing how participants came to their own understandings what being Pākehā meant for them. However, a few of the participants in this research had also been interviewed in my earlier research about Pākehā Culture (Black, 1997) and copies of that research have been circulated through Treaty networks.

Victoria summed up how difficult it can be when trying to describe a cultural group such as Pākehā.

Why I found it so hard to think about it was there are so many commonalities and many diversities. So one culture that we might have in our group is totally different from the rugby head culture. So if it's a broad Pākehā culture there are all those stereotypical things and if its people who have consciously thought about it there would be a whole lot of different things. It's really hard to say well this is it.

Victoria in this extract is puzzling with how to approach and understand questions of culture. Culture is often used to refer to the way people behave in different groups in society. For example, Victoria's reference to a "rugby head culture" has become a shorthand label that allows the listener/reader to draw on the stereotypes that have been formed about people who play and follow rugby, which is often described as the national game of Aotearoa.

Participants tended to distinguish between Pākehā culture as a more generalised description of the dominant group in Aotearoa and the way in which they applied an understanding of what it meant to be Pākehā for themselves and their commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Jen raised this issue in the first focus group session when she talked about Pākehā culture maybe not being about

... that bigger picture because the people who call themselves Pākehā and take pride in that term have gone through some of that journey about what being Pākehā is (*lots of background murmurs*). And so we, so people who take that term and have looked and worked on that journey of our history and our understandings and our responsibilities, so it's a different thing than white New Zealand culture. And if that's how we look at it, I feel a bit more positive about it (*Laughter*)

In some ways Jen is setting up an argument for the name Pākehā being used as an exclusive term to be both claimed by and applied to those who have come onboard the Treaty and identity journey. Jen is perhaps signalling a move from describing Pākehā as a cultural group to using Pākehā as a rather more fine-grained identity description. And her comments were picked up and discussed by a number of participants such as Moyra who reinforced this view when she spoke of knowing herself as

... Pākehā-Tauīwi now. And I think I do that for the reasons that Jen was identifying. I feel it's a minority group so it's within that, that Jen's already described as tangata Tiriti in relationship to tangata whenua.

Suzanne differentiated Pākehā culture from what she thought of as the

... predominant culture versus the things that I see as part of my culture that include those things around justice and values that I see as not being part of the dominant culture so that there is a distinction there for me. ... If Pākehā culture means embracing a lot of the things we have talked about then that's okay. But if Pākehā culture means all those other things that in fact we are challenging then I am not part of that so you know how you define those becomes important in terms of whether or not you identify for me.

Bridget also took up this thread of conversation

... when I am describing Pākehā identity or a Pākehā community, I am actually talking about people who are, I could say in the main white New Zealanders. They don't claim the name Pākehā for themselves so therefore I am not going to use that to describe them. Because I think that Pākehā for me is something that I have claimed and I think that people do need to claim it for themselves. And so that has really confirmed that for me that I can't label someone else as Pākehā, that's for them to do themselves.

Suzanne and Bridget are beginning to tease out what a Pākehā identity might mean for them by making it distinctive from what Suzanne called the “predominant culture” or mainstream culture. The notion of a predominant culture is somewhat slippery and is probably more closely related to debates about dominance and a national identity, although debates about cultural identities occur with national frameworks. Jo then extended the debate into the political domain when she made the distinction between a national identity and being Pākehā. Jo said

I think that being Pākehā is about a political stance because I think that it is about that moving really differently. For me to name myself as Pākehā where lots around me name themselves as Kiwi/New Zealander or other things, is for me to take a political stance around that and the position of that. But I am also conscious that the term Pākehā is used often to name those of us who are either white skinned or who in some way have English heritage, in a much broader sense than I use it.

All of these participants are touching on aspects of cultural naming that make the very concept of a cohesive cultural group both tricky and intricate to describe. In these extracts participants were in the main referencing the ways in which they had come to name themselves as Pākehā.

For example, Moyra talked about addressing issues of Pākehā cultural identity in two ways. She spoke about naming ourselves as Pākehā in a tangata Tiriti framework as being “... a very important thing for those of us who are committed to a Treaty based future to try to do”. Moyra suggested that a second more general way of differentiating Pākehā culture was to look at “...discerning the hallmarks of culture here which might distinguish culture here from culture say in the United Kingdom”. This second idea calls on the notion that Pākehā culture is now different from the culture it was originally derived from and that it has largely become a cultural label used to describe people of British/European descent who have settled in Aotearoa.

My experience in doing this research is that the two ways Moyra outlined above operate alongside each other and sometimes in tension with each other as probably the most common discourses in relation to Pākehā identity. These

layers of meaning came up for discussion again in the second focus group when I asked about *how being in a group of self-identified Pākehā might stimulate, strengthen, and/or reinforce a sense of collective identity as Pākehā in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners and to other tangata Taiwi groups*. This proved to be an interesting and rather challenging question as some of the discussion centred around clarifying the notion of ‘self-identified Pākehā’ which I had thought was an obvious title for a group who had in the previous research session mostly identified as Pākehā. Tim raised the question of there being “...very few Pākehā in New Zealand” who were “self-identified Pākehā”. He thought that it was

... an essential dynamic for minority groups to engage with each other on the basis of articulating commonality. Its not to say that we don't also along side our relations exercise the power in the dominant way, we do. But there are some differences.

I am not sure that Tim was suggesting that to be Pākehā you had to be a member of a sub-group, but rather that being with a group of people with a common interest gave an opportunity to talk about identity issues such as being Pākehā.

Bridget said “I don't feel any sense of collective identity with other Pākehā unless it is in a situation like this”. And that point was echoed by a number of participants and extended by DavidJ when he talked about Pākehā in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners as being really important “... because when I'm thinking about myself as Pākehā I'm rejoicing because I'm seeing myself as one part of the whole deal”. He went on to say that when compared with indigenous peoples in other colonies Māori “... are a very noticeable and un-ignorable part of the deal and that gives Pākehā a shape too”. Ingrid raised the notion of being “... honourably Pākehā” when she said.

I'm really clear that if there wasn't a movement of people who were trying to work out how they were Pākehā in relation to Māori, and I've never thought about this before, I'd be trying to vacate the identity Pākehā as fast as I could too.

The point that Bridget, DavidJ and Ingrid are making is that being part of a group of people who are intentional about being Pākehā reinforces the notion that Pākehā is not only a collective identity position but also carries the implication of honouring Māori as the significant other cultural group in Aotearoa. Mitzi added to the discussion when she said

I would also like to have a shot at the kind of Pākehā that we would like to become, and I've been trying to [do] this for sometime. I guess I want to become the kind of Pākehā that Māori had in mind when they signed the Treaty. (lots of murmurs)

And what might that sort of Pākehā look like? Mitzi recounted a story she had heard from one of the elders at the Manukau tribunal hearing, who said

... “you are implying that my ancestors were wrong or mistaken in inviting the Pākehā to come and live with us. But if my ancestor was

mistaken the only mistakes they made were that they did not realise that the Pākehā do not know how to share". [Mitzi noted] Now that has stayed, and stayed, and stayed with me as ... it sort of opens up a little peephole to what was supposed to happen if you like, or what was hoped would happen.

Kevin also made a very salient observation about the kind of Pākehā he would like to be more often when he talked about being with a group of people giving a submission which challenged the Government about the proposed Foreshore and Seabed legislation.

At the conclusion of the submissions the response of the Māori there was so warm and accepting that I/we – the group I was with, and other people who had made submissions had shared the betrayal, the sense of betrayal that they felt and had identified ourselves with that betrayal against the government and the enemy. So that was certainly one experience of mine where I would like to be that kind of Pākehā a lot more often.

Key values for this group could be summed up as being honourably Pākehā in relation to Māori and Te Tiriti and to examine our cultural practices in such a way as to become conscious of what they are and how they both help and hinder intercultural relationships. The commonality of being a group of 'self identified Pākehā' is not so much that people are part of a sub-group but rather that there is a shared commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and to learning new behaviours and establishing just relationships with Māori. Mitzi also reminded us that being Pākehā is not a 'set piece' which may mean that the question could be better explored with the focus on the kind of Pākehā we are trying to become rather than who is Pākehā.

In identifying some of the discourses that centre on the question 'who is Pākehā' I have found that there are layers of meanings discussed in this research that echo those which were present in my earlier research (Black, 1997). Pākehā people are those whose ancestry is most likely to be British or European and in race terms they are sometimes described as Caucasian or 'white'; in Te Tiriti o Waitangi Pākehā were the people of the Crown (tangata Tiriti) and Māori as tangata whenua were the other partners. Pākehā is a name given by Māori to the new settlers who first came here and is a name still commonly used by Māori. For many who use the term Pākehā it also implies a relationship with Māori.

Being Pākehā includes all of these elements but the process of working out and making an identity claim of being Pākehā is much more complex than understanding a series of meanings as is clear from the way that the participants discussed what being Pākehā both meant for them and the kind of Pākehā they aspire to become. Pākehā is an identity that is being constantly negotiated

between the position of being in the dominant cultural group in Aotearoa and being part of a group such as Treaty people which is striving to be consciously Pākehā. As Treaty partners we are attempting to engage in relationships with Māori and members of other cultural groups that are decolonising and equitable a process which in turn constitutes our identity as Pākehā and also changes that identity. In the next section I will look at how participants draw on these layers of meaning when naming themselves as cultural.

### Calling myself Pākehā – Naming myself culturally or ethnically

Members of a dominant group have been described as the culture defining group (Tyler, 1992) in a society and usually they have no need to name themselves as cultural. If they do adopt a cultural label for themselves they are likely to regard it as a choice and may express surprise at hearing themselves labelled in this way. At the same time they show little hesitation in recognising and labelling as cultural people who they perceive as different from themselves (Tyler, 1992). It would appear to be a radical shift in social positioning for dominant group members not only to claim a cultural identity, but also to use the language of another culture as the name for that identity. Treaty people discussed some of the ways that Pākehā as a cultural name is both resisted and accepted.

#### *To be or not to be Pākehā*

While the participants in this research have, in the main, come to use Pākehā as a cultural and sometimes ethnic description for themselves, they nonetheless recognise that the use of this term as a cultural label is at best contested and at times resisted outright by other members of the dominant group. Susan recalled a story about a woman's reaction to being called Pākehā in a workshop.

... a woman who I was working with was very fixed on the fact that Pākehā was a rude word you know that derogatory use of it. And after I had explained my thing she said "I feel better about it now but I still want to define myself I don't want to be called a Māori name, and its fine for them but I'm not Māori and I don't want to be called by a Māori name". And I said "oh yeah how do you define yourself?" And she said "I'm a Kiwi" (laughter) and this ripple went round the room and she looked around and said "Oh yes I suppose it was a Māori word but it's not now" (more laughter).

Susan is relaying a story of resistance. The woman was clearly stating her preference for the term "Kiwi" which implies a preference for a national identity position and supports the "one people" discourse. She is also directly rejecting the term Pākehā as she did not want to be "called a Māori name", particularly, as it may have dubious or downright insulting meanings attached to it. Suzanne also noticed with people in workshops that "there is that lack of recognition – lack of connection about Pākehā cultural identity". Further to that when looking at the meaning of the word Pākehā



there is still quite a strong feeling against – even when they know that it doesn't mean things like white pig. ... People just want to be New Zealanders. So there is still that – why can't we all be New Zealanders – and it is quite strongly held.

I suggest that the act of resistance has further meaning. To be called a name by Māori has the effect of being regarded as the cultural 'other' to Māori and dominant group members are more used to naming cultural 'others' than to be named as a cultural 'other' themselves.

Suze commented that it was "... easier overseas to say you are Pākehā maybe – it is still so politically charged here" and people resist being called Pākehā because it is a Māori word. Some of the common alternatives to using Pākehā were spelled out by Suze when she said

... otherwise you call yourself a Kiwi or a New Zealander or a European. For me Kiwi is a sad reflection of NZ people of European ancestry who want to pretend that they're indigenous – that they come from the earth. New Zealander means nothing because it's about Abel Tasman and Holland. And European is like some misplaced person who has been planted and they don't know where the hell they belong.

Suze in this extract is offering an alternative form of resistance, in this case to the national identity labels that are commonly used in New Zealand.

Participants have raised two of the most common ways in which dominant group people reject a cultural identity. These are discourses of resistance that frequently come up in discussions about Pākehā and culture in New Zealand. The debate about what is or isn't a Māori word is not the work of this thesis, although it is a factor in the wider community acceptance of the name Pākehā. In discussions about Pākehā as an identity most people acknowledge the national identity position of New Zealander or Kiwi, even if they resist being called that. The challenge lies in encouraging people to recognise that they also have a cultural identity as Pākehā, which means that they are New Zealanders with a cultural identity.

### *Accepting Pākehā as the name given to us by Māori*

It is more or less a given for the participants in this research that to accept the name Pākehā is to acknowledge a relationship with Māori. Many participants in naming themselves as Pākehā did this by calling up their sense of being cultural alongside Māori and sometimes other cultural groups.

There was the fundamental acknowledgment of the origins of the name Pākehā as Molly pointed out.

It was a name that was given to us. And the first time that I remember being called a Pākehā was by Māori and that was

probably the first time I heard that word and related it to myself, as a teenager I suppose.

JoanM reinforced this view by saying

When you listen to Te Karare or any Māori thing we are always called Pākehā and actually to use it is accepting the gift that they have given us – the name.

And Bridget took it a step further with the implication that the acceptance of the name Pākehā is also “an acknowledgement of the tangata whenua right to name us”. In accepting the notion of a Māori right to name, participants are reinforcing the Māori position as the indigenous people – the tangata whenua or people of this land - and the authority that gave them to name the later settlers. In some ways acknowledging the Māori authority to name a settler people is an act of defiance. It is a direct challenge to the belief of superiority the British and European colonists held during the expansionist period of 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> centuries as they moved out of their homelands to conquer the world (Banton, 1998; Belich, 1996; Miles, 1989).

A generational shift in the way in which Pākehā is used as a cultural label was raised by some of the younger generation research participants. Jackson, while acknowledging that some people definitely didn't accept the word Pākehā, felt that for others

... Pākehā is as comfortable a Māori word as haka. It's like we're with Māori because look what we do before the rugby. I'm Pākehā I use a Māori word to describe myself. It's that whole feeling of being not the dominant group feeling like this all we are. Yeah I think that's why a lot of Pākehā would be very proud using it without any context to the Treaty.

Jackson is alerting us to a change in the use of Pākehā as an identity term that is occurring in younger generations. Louise, as mother of five teenagers, supported this shift when she said

I agree with you that Pākehā is used as a way of making that statement that I'm not racist and identifying with Māori – that young people are using it in that way as a way of defining themselves as being in support of Te Tiriti. ... I see them using it in that way to distinguish themselves from their racist peers.

Sarah too reflected on her experience of attending an Auckland secondary school “where there was predominant numbers of Pacific Islanders”. She talked about identifying as Pākehā through having a “sense of otherness” because of this experience and it was from this sense that her interest in Māori and Treaty issues has developed.

In these extracts at least some members of younger generations appear to be able to take for granted Pākehā as cultural name. Jackson emphasised this when he said “I was naturally Pākehā when growing up”. He had been told he was Pākehā and that he “never thought of being New Zealander or Kiwi”. He

thought that now there would be families that “never thought of a choice other than being Pākehā”.

While Jackson grew up being Pākehā for most of the participants in this study it has become a claimed identity position. It may not be their only cultural identity position and sometimes it sits in tension with other identities.

Particularly for those in the middle and older generations Pākehā has been, to a large extent, a cultural name that has been claimed, or perhaps reclaimed, after years of disuse by the dominant group but continuous use by Māori. As Suze said

I was just a New Zealander like everyone else and of course that wasn't a [consciously] political statement in the 50's and 60's it was just stating a reality – everyone was just a New Zealander.

Suze reminded us that it wasn't until “we started talking about racism” in the 1960s and through the 1970s that an awareness of structural issues of power and cultural organisation developed. People involved in Antiracism and Treaty movements have been at the forefront of community activities and debates about challenging the foundations of racism, along with the promotion of Pākehā as an acceptable cultural identity label. There has, over the last 25 years, also been a steadily growing body of literature that has examined, discussed and debated the various uses and meanings of Pākehā as I have discussed in chapter two. As an activist in treaty issues for at least 25 years, Suze said that for her some of the things underpinning calling yourself Pākehā are about

... being part of a movement to bring all our peoples to a common place in this land as far as what we want – what our values are – how we move together and how we work together.

One of the clues which support the notion of Pākehā being a claimed identity is the way in which some participants prefixed their answer with the word “now”.

It implies that Pākehā hasn't always been a named identity. For example:

- Catriona ... but I now identify myself as a Pākehā of Scots descent because being Pākehā is important;
- Bridget I name myself both culturally and ethnically as Pākehā and that's what I do now. I haven't always thought about it very much;
- Marisa so I guess now I would name myself as Pākehā;
- Jo I name myself Pākehā now”.
- Karen Now, being Pākehā means being a descendant of British settlers and this gives me an identity as a Treaty partner. I resist being called European because as far as I know none of my recent ancestors came from Europe.

For many participants there were significant events or decisions made in their lives that alerted them to a Pākehā cultural identity. Jo talked about this process

as conscientization, a process described by Freire (1970) as both becoming conscious of and acting on that sense of consciousness in a new way. Twenty odd years ago it was quite a radicalising experience to use the name Pākehā and very often that identity was questioned and sometimes dismissed as being too “politically correct”. There was a real cringe factor in claiming that identity so it is probably not a surprise to hear people frame their Pākehā identity in the “now”. As Mitzi reminded us

... we act as if being Pākehā ... was a sort of set piece that you were born into and that's it, when in fact it's a cluster of learned relationships and learned behaviours and it's hard work to actually learn replacement behaviours for those things. And then you look bloody funny when you're doing it and everyone says “you're politically correct aren't you”. But political correctness is often about trying to get our new scripts that we intend to say out there instead of the things that are there at the beginning on our lips if we just blurt.

Some of the experiences that have either led to or reinforced describing themselves as Pākehā were shared by participants. Karen said that through researching her Celtic heritage she found what she described as “her heart links to Māori, the whanau, hapu, iwi concepts and the links to land”. There is sometimes an expression of tentativeness about family heritage which is reflected in the way Alex described his cultural identity.

I have done a bit of learning here so how I would name myself culturally, I am Pākehā and ethnically Pākehā, English, French from what I know at the moment but I am still learning my heritage. At present I think I am the third generation Pākehā, so that's what I know at the moment.

Like Karen, Jo presents a much more definitive sense of being here which she links to her knowledge about her own heritage and to the Treaty.

In fact I name myself as Pākehā but with English and Irish descent. ... I think that having a sense of being Pākehā is about becoming aware that my ancestors came to this land, four and five generations ago. And that I have an identity here that I link to here but I only do that through the Treaty. That any right I have to be here comes through the Treaty.

Finding a name that acknowledges both cultural heritage and presence in Aotearoa was raised by DavidJ when talked about having

... discovered a new term over this period, Anglo-Pākehā. <collective ummm> Because yes, for a long time I have seen myself simply as Pākehā but more recently I have seen the definition of Pākehā that says this is something that comes from growing up in the dominant majority culture of this country. Now I didn't have that experience because I actually grew up in England and I bring that English background with me so I think Anglo-Pākehā is probably a better way to put it.

The notion of rediscovering heritage has become an important aspect of solidifying a Pākehā identity now, just as leaving the past behind was for many new settler peoples particularly in the earlier periods of colonisation. This point underlies the claim to a national identity and supports the notion of ‘short

families', where there is little knowledge of family history beyond current generations or before arrival in New Zealand.

There are political components to claiming a Pākehā identity that relate to an awareness of Māori as tangata whenua, racism and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. We see Jo above relating her sense of Pākehā identity to the Treaty and Karen drawing on links with Māori. For DavidJ “the precipitating thing I think, that made me aware of being Pākehā in a political sense, was as Bridget said the [1981] Springbok tour”. A challenge about social and cultural structures that only reflect dominant group ways of doing things turned out to be a learning experience for Moea and was the point at which “... I became Pākehā, from a New Zealander to a Pākehā”. Kitty in tangata Tiriti contexts talked about introducing herself as Ngāti Pākehā (from the tribe of Pākehā). She went on to say that being Pākehā was

... not so much about being different as being conscious of being here and who you are. It's a positive identity – an invitation to an identity.

Tim also differentiated between belonging to the natural community and to that of an intentional Pākehā community.

But to belong actually to Pākehā in the limited or specific sense that we're using it seems to require an intention a choice of something and it's not the natural identity or the natural community that we may otherwise belong to. It does actually require a step to the side; it does require some sort of engagement.

To be in the Treaty movement could well mean, as Tim has described, being a member of an intentional community with an agenda that includes coming to an understanding about being Pākehā. The “natural” identity according to Tim was “... calling ourselves whether Kiwi or New Zealander rather than Pākehā, which normalises our way of doing things”. But it is also clear that the sense of belonging, of being Pākehā that has developed through being in the Treaty movement is not exclusive to that particular group. It was Mitzi who said:

I think I do belong ... and to me Pākehā are my people. I hold a sort of dual citizenship in Pākehā/New Pākehā or something. I think it's dangerous to what we are trying to do in Treaty terms if I begin to set myself apart from other Pākehā. If I ever forget what it was like not to know the things I know now. If I can't, if I don't respect those people how the hell do I think I can be any help to them in their learning or growth or development or anything.

It is important to acknowledge the new learning that comes from being part of a so-called intentional community, whether it is the Treaty movement; a church, sport or political group; or as Jane pointed out through her study of anthropology “... it involved some conscious thought about where I was in my own culture”. Along with being part of an intentional Pākehā community there is also a need to be mindful of the bigger picture of belonging to society and nation. However, for most participants Pākehā has become an intentional cultural identity that

reflects their commitment to just relationships with Māori in a Te Tiriti o Waitangi framework.

### Being Pākehā when not British

When considering the question of who is Pākehā there are aspects of both acceptance of and resistance that are related to the fact that Pākehā has to a large extent become a cultural label associated with those of primarily British descent. For many of the European and Asian settler groups there has been a lack of acceptance of their maintenance of a cultural heritage that is different from the dominant group. They have been a constant challenge to the ideologies of assimilation and discourse of ‘one people’ and have to a great extent been kept on the edges of the dominant British group. The lack of official and historical acknowledgement of their presence in Aotearoa has in fact rendered them largely invisible to the dominant British majority (Belich, 2001; King, 2003). There are also aspects of acceptance to being Pākehā almost in defiance to the reception they received from the dominant group as new immigrants.

Claiming a Pākehā identity to distinguish oneself from being British when overseas was a useful strategy for both Kathryn and Moyra. Kathryn, as a child in Singapore, said she was Pākehā as a way of differentiating herself from the colonising English. She found it somewhat ironic to discover as an adult that Pākehā were the colonisers of Aotearoa. Moyra, when living in Denmark for a period, explained the “stroppiness” and practical problem solving abilities as markers of “kiwi culture” which notably set her apart from being British.

Some of the complex issues that can arise with cultural naming become apparent in the stories both Suze and Angeline bring to our attention with their heritage that wasn’t entirely “white”. Angeline said

I’ve got both Pākehā and Samoan and so I guess I would in terms of this forum I would probably look at that as more a Taiwi issue and I would probably say oh well I am Samoan and Pākehā and I’m not half one. ... So yeah, I do stress and that’s something I’ve come to recently is to say that I am both and I am not either/or so that’s been quite important for me to identify as both.

Suze talked about the struggle she had for many years because

Pākehā also just meant white so it was like saying I’m not black and all that denial of that other side of my family that had been enslaved by white people. So that for me was a challenge. It was not so much [about] not wanting to be named a Māori name – it was trying to clarify for myself what the parameters of that word were.

Now Suze describes her identity as

... ethnically I’m British and African, culturally I’m Pākehā of African and British descent, and politically I’m a black woman. And that’s all cool ... because I’m happy about all my ancestry and because

Pākehā only come from Aotearoa. There's no other place, there's no other people that can say we're Pākehā.

These somewhat more complex and layered identity descriptions are often heard as a challenge to the “one people” assimilation agenda that has been politically dominant in New Zealand. The presence and voices of cultural minority groups have until recently, been left out of mainstream media and literature sources (Gibson Group, 2007). Many of the European immigrant people (e.g. Dutch, Yugoslav, Italian, Greek, and German) did not receive a warm welcome from the British settlers in Aotearoa. In fact life was made difficult as Ingrid, a member of a Dutch family pointed out “the Bay of Plenty Kiwi farmers treated us revoltingly”. Kathy said

when we first came from Canada it was in the 60's and any outsider was basically ostracised by New Zealanders at the time so I never really felt like a New Zealander in that way and I didn't identify with the colonialist British culture that was here. We did a lot of things differently actually.

Many people in these settler groups see the name Pākehā as representing the British majority and have been quite resistant to accepting that name as a cultural representation of living in Aotearoa. I found this resistance to be a real puzzle when a few years ago a “white” student refused to use the name Pākehā but insisted that she was a fourth generation New Zealander. I thought that it was an issue of cultural safety that she could not name herself culturally. It was not until doing this research and discussing the issue with Suze that it dawned on me that for some people using the name Pākehā was akin to accepting British sovereignty. Bridget, who has strong Irish heritage, also talked about being surprised by the realisation that she was now part of a dominant group, a group of British origin that her ancestors had fought with.

While for many immigrant people being Pākehā as part of the British majority was not an option, but some were called into that identity by Māori. Ingrid told us about her family experience.

[M]y father was a green keeper on the golf course and the pa was just there on the beach. And Māori used to go across the golf course a lot to get to the ...fishing grounds and my father had a whole relationship with them about them coming across. And his delight in coming home one day and saying to the rest of the family “*we're Pākehā, but tangata whenua here have just told us we're Pākehā*”. We were so clear that we were not New Zealanders or Kiwis we had not been let into that. But I [had] forgotten [we] were admitted into, you know welcomed into being Pākehā before we were welcomed into being New Zealanders.

That Pākehā identity is not simple and straight-forward is highlighted in these stories. It can mean different things both in the way it is accepted and the way it

is rejected. For the people in this study having a relationship with Māori people displays the strongest link to accepting the name Pākehā, as Ingrid's story above illustrates. The name is clearly associated with those of British descent, born in and/or who live in Aotearoa. Most Treaty people used Pākehā as a way of saying "I come from Aotearoa" and usually gave a fuller account of their ethnic and cultural heritage with phrases such as "I am culturally Pākehā with Irish and Scots heritage" (Rose). For many participants the exercise of naming themselves culturally is a conscious act that they are not asked to do very often. Although some people constantly have to explain themselves as Angeline said.

... because people think that I am Māori, well kia ora, talofa, you know trying to let them know that I wasn't who they thought I was because that's difficult as well, I think people assume that you are something that you are not. And I found that travelling as well, like in Italy people coming and talking to me in Italian, I was like oh no – "no speaka Italiano".

The discourses related to Pākehā identity have cultural, ethnic and political layers of meaning for people living in Aotearoa. There are both discourses of resistance and of acceptance of Pākehā as a cultural identity. Many of the participants claim Pākehā as their cultural identity and are intentional about working towards just relationships with Māori. In the next section I will explore how participants relate their Pākehā identity to a 'sense of belonging' in Aotearoa.

### **Assertions of belonging**

A sense of belonging to place is an important part of establishing a cultural identity. For a coloniser people, as Pākehā are, the sense of belonging is moderated by history and is multi-layered. In chapter three I gave an account based on the literature for how settlement occurred in the case of Aotearoa through processes of colonisation that overrode the way of life of Māori tangata whenua. Often Pākehā assertions of belonging are based on rights that are assumed from generations of families being born in Aotearoa. The discourses based on rights are best noted when examining talk about a national identity. Events such as international sports fixtures where New Zealand teams are participating can evoke a sense of belonging that is clearly related to a national identity as Billig (1995) theorises in *Banal Nationalism*.

Treaty people, in their assertions of belonging, for some through generations, convey a sense of belonging that is tempered with the knowledge of colonisation. Their belonging includes recognition of a Pākehā cultural identity that is based in responsible relationships with Māori and an understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.



DavidT talked about settler peoples being dislocated from “deep historical roots” and he thought that there was a sense of “disorientation” because of it. “It takes a long time many generations to have that sense of deep belonging”. Jo’s Pākehā family has now lived in Aotearoa for many generations which for Jo created a sense of “Being here and not knowing any other place to be”. She said “my family have been here for five or six generations, so I don’t have the sense of belonging elsewhere”. Bridget, who’s family have not been here quite that long, noted that there has been a change in the way settler people think about where home is when she said

... from my generation back there has always been the sense that somewhere else is called home – be it Ireland, England or where ever or people have grown up with the idea that there was a home somewhere. But now as the generations move on – that memory while still there will be much more distant. There will be a sort of thinking oh yes well I had ancestors who came from somewhere but they are not necessarily people who were in my life personally.

Jackson, while not wishing to speak for “the youthful contingent” felt that over the last 20 years or so the connections with countries of origin or immigrant cultures have diminished. Jackson said

I don’t think I was brought up in [an] English sense of ways or Norwegian or whatever, it was behind me. And the sense of belonging as labelling yourself Pākehā might be because ... a lot of Pākehā do not relate to immigrant cultures.”

For these participants the sense of belonging has been engendered through families living in Aotearoa through generations and finding that the connections with countries of origin have become more distant over time.

For many people it is not until they travel overseas that a sense of belonging to place, along with a realisation of cultural identity emerges. Suze expressed her sense of belonging to Aotearoa after being overseas. “I love it here and there’s nowhere else but here could ever be home”. Even although she experienced strong emotional connections when in Scotland and Antigua, Suze asserted that “... this is where I want to be”. Jo talked about feeling different when living in Canada and noted that there were significant differences in the way in which her “... English and Irish heritage had been translated and lived out here over the generations to how it was inside ... English based Ontario”. Kitty having lived in Australia for many years came back to New Zealand with her mother.

I just know that my relationship with culture in terms of place began when we went back to Taranaki where she is from and where my ancestors came to when they first came to New Zealand.

Living in and looking back from another place does heighten an awareness of ‘home’ and some thinking about where one belongs in the world. Travel to Britain and the shift from thinking about home as somewhere else such as

Britain, as Bridget suggested, to home being in Aotearoa were also discussed in chapter six.

DavidJ spoke of “... the passionate belief in belonging in this country” being a “... very strong value” in the Pākehā world.

... now I know that that’s partly in contradistinction to the Māori sense of belonging, it’s an assertion we belong here too, but it is a value, it’s an important value.

In comparison, he said that in England “... people don’t have to bother with that, they can take it for granted that they belong”.

I recalled in talking to DavidJ about the time when a prominent Māori activist in the late 1970s uttered the phrase “Pākehā go home”. There was then a huge beat up in the media about it and I did find it prompted me to think that as a fourth generation New Zealander I knew no other place as home and had not travelled out of this country. DavidJ responded that “... Pākehā did tend to react very sensitively to any such suggestion and to make the countervailing assertion we belong here too”. JoanM also recognised the sensitivity coloniser peoples had about belonging when she spoke of “... a sort of alienation” in her culture.

... of people not actually belonging anywhere although actually feeling this close bond to the whenua here, but not actually being tangata whenua anywhere, which is something that I think colonisers all need to deal with.

In running Treaty workshops Suze is aware of the challenge to a somewhat fragile sense of belonging that Pākehā have, particularly those in older age groups, with the information they receive. She talked about the importance of reinforcing the sense of belonging and the Pākehā right to be here, “... we were invited ... Māori people wanted us here ... the Treaty was signed. The only problem is we didn’t honour it”. And again the call to go away is addressed in this workshop context by Suze when she says

It’s not about getting on a boat and going away – there’s plenty of angry Māori who will say that but its not an option. And most Māori, even radical Māori know that is not an option and they’ve been bloody patient. They’ve put up with us for 160 years so let’s work with that rather than starting to freak out.

Suze is expressing the need to be explicit about the nature of the relationships that were established with the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the processes of colonisation that operated mostly in defiance of the Treaty.

A central theme in discussions about belonging in Aotearoa for all of the participants in this study is based in their understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It is the rallying point of the movement and acts as a touchstone to building relationships. Along with an understanding of the Pākehā position under the Treaty is the sense of consciously being here. That is moving from the taken for

granted position of being here as part of the dominant group (i.e. as a New Zealander) to recognising the cultural position that is synonymous with a conscious sense of belonging. This sense of being here under the Treaty was perhaps best captured by Kathy who had come here as a child from Canada and had not been readily accepted by Pākehā.

I call myself tangata tiriti now because I have read the background to the Treaty and I feel that being a Treaty partner as other people have alluded to and talked about is my way that I stand on this land ... aware of my relationship to Tangata Whenua which is something that I believe is a reality for me now in terms of my belonging here.

Debates about being indigenous and the position of Māori in Aotearoa both raise and unsettle a sense of belonging. DavidT felt that the desire to claim indigeneity by some Pākehā was an expression of “a yearning to belong a yearning to be rooted in this place and recognising that we are different from the English now”. JoanM said “Its like [Don] Brash saying when he comes back to this country he gets a lump in his throat”. I also felt that underpinning the indigenous debate was some sort of justification for the power Pākehā held in New Zealand society that was propped up by the ‘we are one people’ egalitarian discourses.

While there is an acknowledged sense of unease about belonging in Aotearoa Karen felt that identification with the land was a “... strong theme that comes through with us ... who are happy to be here and be sharing or acknowledging the past”. For Wendy having a sense of Pākehā identity started with

... the spirits of this land I think mana atua, mana whenua and mana tangata - so it's about the people, the land and the ancestors that are standing right here.

Both Bridget and Moyra spoke of their attachments to Canterbury. Moyra reported that

... my heart actually starts beating faster when I get towards Canterbury ... and in particular the mountains ... so I really feel I belong to this place.

Being in Aotearoa and the importance of her Pākehā identity was emphasised for Catriona when she went back to Scotland and tried to get a job that would allow her to stay there for a year and “... was very disappointed when they said I was too old”. Then a friend suggested that she stay “... you could come back and be Scots again”. Catriona responded “... no I couldn't, I'm not that just – I mean I was gob stopped it was such a ridiculous idea”. Scotland had become a place to visit it was no longer regarded as home for Catriona as she had clearly shifted her allegiance to Aotearoa.

For many participants an important aspect of belonging was earned through their intentional relationships with Māori and working with the Treaty. Moea

reminded us of the widely different attitudes and values to land that Māori and Pākehā hold that often sit in tension with each other. Belonging incorporated a process of negotiation rather than being taken for granted as a right.

### *Place in the Pacific*

Some participants are starting to situate their Pākehā identity beyond Aotearoa shores into the Pacific and to look at strengthening relationships with neighbouring Pacific peoples rather than focusing on trying to keep up with the “... big boys of the West” suggested Bridget. She thought that while we were “... becoming imbued by being a Pacific place ... [with] more appreciation of being a Pacific based culture that loves everything to do with living in this part of the world” there was still a tension with being Western focussed. A mind shift is required, according to Karen, away from the

...mother England thing planted in our brain – that cultural way of acting. ... So maybe we need to become Tangata Pasifica as well as Tangata Tiriti.

But once again issues of colonisation arise such as the “overstayer” issues in the 1970s when Pacific people were brought to New Zealand to work and were subjected to police raids if they were thought to have overstayed their work permits (De Bres, 1974). Karen thought that these issues had never been laid to rest satisfactorily. The current tightly controlled seasonal workforce that is brought in from the Pacific for fruit picking etc. may reignite old issues and be just as problematic to establishing equitable relationships that do not act to further colonise Pacific peoples. With issues of past and present in mind Suze summed up a positive sense of being part of the Pacific when she said.

Pākehā also is about taking my place in the Pacific because I feel like Pākehā people are Pacific people – they are not Polynesian people but they are Pacific people – they’re not transplanted Europeans. ... It’s not to forget all the colonial baggage that you bring because you are a Pākehā – it clearly says that you are not indigenous to the Pacific or Aotearoa but I think it says that you are moving on. You are not stuck.

Taking a place as Pākehā in the Pacific does signal a significant change from the discourses related to New Zealand being a “little England” or an outreach of Britain. For some participants being Pākehā with an understanding of the Treaty and an analysis of colonisation has opened up new discourses of being a Pacific people.

The assertion of belonging not just to Aotearoa but also in the Pacific are strongly held values for many Pākehā. JoanC told a story about some of the different ways of belonging she has experienced in the close to 60 years she has been living in Aotearoa.

What I've learnt in my journey all those years, you cannot, **well I thought I could**, but I could not do it alone. I think in 1953 I made up my mind to become a Pākehā. I thought I could become a Pākehā by reading books, by learning the history of this country so I could be a good mother to my children who were going to be Pākehā.

And it wasn't until I got to Auckland in the 70's and met up with Mitzi who drew me into a group that I realised that I needed somehow a real collective to be able to do that. And I mean a lot of things have happened to me along the way but that's what cemented it in the end being alongside other Pākehā struggling with what the issues were. And what finally capped it off for me has got nothing at all to do with the Treaty or anything else. One of the dreams of my childhood was to go to Uluru, it wasn't called Uluru in those days, but if you could get there as a young Australian you had made it to the heart of your country. And I got there in about 1985, I think, or 1984, and I got up at dawn to go to the place and I could not believe I stood among about 2000 Japanese. And I thought here's my childhood ambition, I cannot believe this is what I've dreamed of doing all my life and I stood there and watched the sun come over that rock and all of a sudden, you're going to think I'm crazy, but all of a sudden I was there on my own. And that rock said to me you are released go back.

And I came back to this country, into Whangarei. And ten days later they were carving out the road down near our batch at Whangarei Heads. And I rushed round to our batch and I said to Russ, "I need a knife and I need some buckets, they're wrecking our bank and all those ferns are going to be destroyed and I've got to go and save all those ferns". And I rushed round with my knife and bucket and I stuck the knife into the soil and I don't know what happened to me but I was paralysed. I was totally paralysed and I realised that I had to say a karakia [prayer] to the soil to release the fern. And that's what released it. And was completion of the act of Uluru.

And that for me was a part of belonging. So that there are all sorts of ways that you can learn or realise that you belong in a place. But I will never be a New Zealander until I can put my hand on the Treaty and swear to the Treaty while I become a New Zealander because I have no intention of giving my loyalty to the Queen of England. So I'm quite content to have an Australian passport but I'm a Pākehā<sup>19</sup>.

Belonging can be a completely natural and taken for granted sense of being in a place or part of a group, culture, community, society or nation. But that natural, taken for granted sense of belonging can be challenged and disturbed by many things such as learning new information, or by events that impact on one's person or community that bring to consciousness thoughts about where one is in the world as was particularly evident in JoanC's story above.

## Conclusion

For many of the participants Pākehā has become an intentional identity, one that indicates their aspirations towards more just intercultural relationships with Māori and other cultural groups in Aotearoa. Being Pākehā also signals a

---

<sup>19</sup> As I come to the end of this thesis writing I pay respects to JoanC who died on 2 December 2009. Joan has been a stalwart, a great story teller and stitcher, and wonderful role model to many in the Treaty movement. We will miss her dearly.

commitment to recognising and working with a Te Tiriti o Waitangi framework. Participants in the middle and older generation groups did not generally grow up with a sense of Pākehā identity whereas some of the younger participants talked about being Pākehā as a normal identity which they did not have to question. They felt perfectly comfortable and entitled to call themselves Pākehā. The older participants have lived through huge changes in the way that culture is noticed and addressed in New Zealand society.

Members of the dominant group no longer live a largely mono-cultural existence in suburbs, educational institutions, and work places, as was more usual up until the 1970s and possibly later in some South Island towns and communities. Māori and Pākehā lived quite separate lives up until 1950-60s when Māori started moving into urban areas, and even when they worked together did not usually socialise in each others company (Harré, 1966).

The sense of belonging to Aotearoa was an important aspect of Pākehā cultural identity, even although it was tinged with the sense of alienation that comes with being the coloniser rather than indigenous or first people of the land. Some participants expressed their belonging through their attachment to particular locations and familiarity with the local environment. Hearing challenges from Māori and learning about Te Tiriti o Waitangi have encouraged participants to think about how to belong in Aotearoa and what that means in terms of relationships to place and people.



# Chapter Nine

## Treaty People Talk About Pākehā Cultural Values

In this final data analysis chapter I shift the emphasis from the participants discussing New Zealand symbols and recognising themselves as cultural and Pākehā, to marking some of the values of Pākehā culture that were brought to notice in the focus groups and recorded conversations. The values discussed are concepts that I consider to be foundational in the way many of the cultural values of Pākehā have developed. I have grouped these values under four headings: Egalitarianism; Assimilation; Superiority; and in the final section Individuality and Independence.

Values maybe interpreted in many ways and they have variable psychological and material effects. The same value may have both beneficial and harmful effects depending on how it is applied and who it is applied to. This factor becomes evident as participants discuss and critique some of the beliefs and values they recognise as cultural.

Participants discussed Pākehā values, having developed a critique of colonisation that is associated with their experiences as Treaty educators. Discourses that are expressed about these values indicate that they are factors in some of the beliefs Pākehā have about the way New Zealand society works. These values, rather than being taken for granted, are in this study recognised, discussed and critiqued by participants.

### **Egalitarianism**

*By 1900 New Zealand was seen as a progressive humanitarian society – giving people a 'fair go'. These features would be claimed as part of our national identity (Bowen, 2004, p. 25).*

Egalitarianism has its foundation in the European colonisation project. It encompasses the concepts of equality and fairness where class differences and wealth gaps are evened out, and notions of the collective good are expressed. Egalitarian values are prevalent and at times contradictory in their effects through the colonisation of Aotearoa (Belich, 2001; C. Bell, 1996; B. Consedine, 1989). By way of introduction in the data extract below Mitzi gives an historical perspective to values that coalesce with egalitarianism.



Mitzi I think that some of that egalitarian kind of ideas and ideals flourished in a very strong part of the modernist era and that's where some of the rigorous child rearing patterns and having your washing on the line at a certain hour on a certain day comes from. The modernist idea that equality and uniformity are sort of muddled together and that if everybody is all one, they have all got to be identical and alike and the more you can prescribe it the more you can do it right. The more you can do it, be correct and be part of it.

And I think the timing - the historical timing is part of all this mix. I don't quite know how but it seems to me that what was called the generation gap when I got to the really irritating age, sort of that people born before World War two thought differently from those people born after. It's actually true, it really is true and that the actual watershed is postmodernism in fact, although the postmodernism term wasn't developed for another, what, fifty years. But that was a point of generational and philosophical and everything distance - difference and that's when modernism began to come unglued, so many of us were reared in that period.

In this data extract Mitzi is alerting us to a significant philosophical shift that has occurred in Western thinking. According to Billig (1995, p. 128) the thesis of postmodernism "... proposes that a matrix of economic, cultural and psychological changes is occurring in the world". He posits that views about nations and identity have changed with Postmodernism. Notions of equality and uniformity, while as Mitzi suggests, are modernist in their genesis, are nevertheless core features of the ways in which values based on egalitarianism are practiced. The forms of practice may have changed over time but many of the values that originate in notions of egalitarianism are still prevalent.

Egalitarian values are often referred to using phrases such as 'a fair go', 'giving it a go' or the notion of a 'level playing field'. Participants talked about how egalitarianism came about and some of the ways it has become such a notable aspect of Pākehā culture. They also question and critique some of the underlying assumptions of egalitarianism and who has benefited from this value.

When Moyra stated that "everybody matters" she was drawing on the egalitarian notion of universality that is sometimes expressed in phrases such as the level playing field.

Moyra I think there was always a sense of universality about New Zealand culture which meant the government was able, for example, to subsidise petrol prices in rural areas and milk in rural areas and so on, because people, and schooling was accessible, all of that and so I don't know whether that's changing but I suspect it is. That worries me, because I would like to feel that we were able to pass that on.

A past governmental response to ensure universality was the equalising of petrol prices through out New Zealand, which was in effect a subsidy to rural people. The Government had good reason for this as most of the country's exports came from the rural sector (Belich, 2001; King, 2003).

That “there was a sense of universality about New Zealand” is a highly debatable point. The myth of universality particularly as it relates to egalitarianism is strong but the reality of universal opportunity, access to resources such as schooling that would meet the needs of all people has simply not occurred (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). There were up until 1970s marked gender differences in educational expectations and opportunities, in wages for the same work such as teaching (C. Bell, 1996). There were even more marked differences between Māori and Pākehā – it could be said that there were universal privileges for Pākehā and universal exclusion from privilege or even basic opportunities and access to resources for Māori (B. Consedine, 1989).

Another aspect of egalitarianism is the shift away from British class hierarchies being a significant factor in organising structures in New Zealand. Victoria pointed out that an aspect of settlement was “getting away from the class structure”, a notion that was discussed in the following conversation.

- DavidT And a lot of that coming out of industrialisation experience – the fencing in of the commons and the losing of the commons and there fore going into the cities and living in quite slum situations – this is in England – with the factories and wanting to get away from that sort of stuff. And wanting to get away from the hierarchy of class and in Ireland particularly – the Irish that came want to forget the divisions and pain of what was there. So there was a strong sense of wanting to have an egalitarian society.
- Rose And a sense of wanting to create a new way of living in community or in a country that wasn't so determined by the old class structure.
- JoanM Unfortunately in the process of doing that they created another huge injustice for the people of the countries they came to.
- Rose And they also in wanting so desperately to forget what they had they have almost forgotten – the country has restructured in a class way. The class structures still worked for people in the ways that they had worked for people in the old country didn't they – but they were invisibilised under the myth of striving for egalitarianism.
- DavidT Amongst Pākehā even into the 60's early 70's the wealth gap between Pākehā wasn't all that great. Where as into the 80's the gap got to be considerable – so there was a sense of more egalitarianism than what was in the home countries but we have since lost that.

Many of the new settlers who came to New Zealand were people who, with industrialisation, found that their skills as crafts people were no longer valued and there was little other work available in an overcrowded Britain (Belich, 2001). That most of the settlers were not from the ruling classes was a key factor in the desire to set up a more egalitarian society as DavidT suggested. There were many Scots and Irish as well as English people who came to New Zealand and wanted to get away from the old hierarchical structures and to establish a more cooperative style of living. That is not to say that some of the class structures were not recreated in New Zealand as I suggest, but they did not happen with the same rigid hereditary patterns of the old country. DavidT points out that there was not a great wealth gap between Pākehā so any differentiation between classes was flattened to some extent.

The quest for an egalitarian state did not however include the people who were already resident in the lands the colonisers took over. JoanM reminded us that colonisation has created ‘huge injustice’ for indigenous peoples. Māori were not included in the coloniser’s egalitarian dreams and have suffered extensive damage in every facet of their lives through colonisation as I have discussed in chapter three.

Associated with egalitarianism are phrases such as ‘give it a go’, an approach to life in New Zealand which was raised by participants when they discussed Pākehā attitudes to authority. This is not the only interpretation of ‘give it a go’. It also conveys a willingness to get stuck in and do something often as a matter of necessity. People in positions of authority such as academics are not accepted just for their academic ability as Moyra points out.

Moyra     How it manifests itself in New Zealand is that people do give it a go they have a certain lack of respect for experts, which isn’t necessarily good but it does have its good side to, so they won’t, as for example in Germany, bow down to people with academic status or anything like that necessarily, you have to prove yourself on other fronts. There is that sort of attitude to authority and the expertise which I think is different here.

There is a roll up your sleeves and get on with it attitude (C. Bell, 1996) that is promoted as an aspect of the New Zealand psyche. Moyra suggests that even with academic status you “have to prove yourself on other fronts”. I propose that the common ‘give it a go’ story goes something like this.

You get things done by giving it a go yourself or with your mates and you do not have to rely on experts, especially those ivory tower academics, to tell you what to do, after all what would they know they do not get their hands dirty.

In the following extracts questioning authority and a degree of scepticism are recognised as features of Pākehā culture.

- Rose      So what you could say then is that a part of Pākehā culture is that people question authority so that they are actually not willing to always go along with whatever the government says.
- Jane      ... That is a feature I would say here. ... I don't think it's a unique feature here but there certainly seem to be some societies where there are more questioning than less and I would say people here are more questioning. But that probably comes from that frontier.
- Victoria    Distrust of government
- DavidT    ... The whole sense of the egalitarian – your opinion is as good as mine and mine is as good as yours. And some of that is a dislike or not very good with authority. And often there is a sceptical nature to opinions if they are different from yours.

The 'distrust of government' and questioning of authority are factors in the 'give it a go' attitude in that they suggest that people in New Zealand think for themselves and just do not go along with the majority for the sake of it. I think that it is part of what we like to believe about ourselves as Pākehā, although Jane reminded us that these values are not unique to New Zealanders but perhaps the degree with which they have become part of Pākehā cultural psyche is what is noticed.

### Community and social justice

Egalitarian beliefs and notions of equality have meant that some Pākehā, when situations of social injustice are brought to their attention, will challenge injustice through political actions and protests. At times there have been significant protests about proposed changes to policies or support that a Government might be giving to a particular body. Involvement in large scale protests is evident in the stories participants have shared. Memories of involvement in the following were recalled and discussed: The '1951 Waterfront lockout'; 1960 'No Māoris no tour' to South Africa; the 1960s Anti- Vietnam War involvement; injustices related to the Treaty of Waitangi; prior to and during the 1981 Springbok Tour; the anti-nuclear and peace rallies; many of the protests about changes to social security and welfare policies; and more recently with regard to issues about the 2004 Foreshore and Seabed Act.

Underlying the stories of protest activities is the value of wanting a more just and equitable society for all people to live in. Often the values of people in protest and social change movements go against the grain of dominance and normality. Thinking and being active about changing the way things are in a society opens

up the opportunity to examine what is taken for granted as 'normal' in everyday life.

Moyra and Moea tell stories that highlight the activities of families where there is open participation in community issues. Their parents were active in support of issues that, particularly in Moyra's case may have put the family at risk of arrest. However, providing food to people involved in the 1951 waterfront lockout was more important to them.

Moyra One of my very early memories in terms of what it means to be living in our country was of the 1951, well it was called a waterfront lockout in my family you see, everybody else called it a strike. Excuse me but it's a lockout, what's the difference? ... Dad at that time was involved with the Lyttleton Council of Civil Liberties, which organised to take soup down to the Lyttleton Main School and hand it out because it was illegal to feed the children of the people who were locked out. And I suppose this was just too much for Mum and Dad so they made a big preserving pan of soup. My job ... was to take the bread roll put the cheese in the middle put the bread roll on the top and pass it on. These legs came up and I just went bread roll, cheese, bread roll and it was a policeman. And he'd actually come to arrest the people I was with – they always argued that that was probably why they got away because he got a bread roll instead.

Moea's parents were actively involved in the late 1950s protests about apartheid in South Africa and who the South Africans would allow into their country to play rugby.

Moea ... my parents were like the early ones in HART and ... so probably at the age of four in 1960 would have been going on those marches from Lower Hutt to Wellington on the 'No Māoris No Tour' marches. I'd be taken by my parents; I've got photographs of all of us little kids you know on the march. And we did the posters and that sort of thing because there were only two Socialist families in Hawera and the other one was a screen printer (laughter). So we did the posters and sent them to Rhona Bailey in Wellington. And I told was you know the smell of the ink and the exciting things, we'd lock the door and (laughter) would be covered with all, every square inch of drying posters and in the morning we'd bundle them up and send them off.

Children were valued and included in the activities as part of the family commitment to social change. But it could also be difficult growing up with a socially active parent.

Kathy You know in those days [1960s] family was secondary to the cause and we were treated as props or back ups or you know get the fliers out. In an egalitarian sense my father believed that everybody was crushingly equal there was no different needs for different members at any time.

Kathy's story indicates that sometimes children could feel like they were casualties to the cause rather than participants in the cause.

Many of the participants in the older and middle generations were part of the protest movement against the 1981 Springbok rugby tour to New Zealand. It was a time when issues of racism were brought to the attention of the whole country.

Bridget [It was] that sharp point of conscientisation. And suddenly I realised there was something special about being in this country as a descendant of settlers be they whoever but being white that no other country actually was experiencing. That there was something here about living in this place that made us quite unique in the world. And I guess that, that's where my awareness of wanting to claim something other than Kiwi or a New Zealander began. And awareness that I had a culture that excluded or was not in touch with the people in this land. And even though the Springbok tour thing was about apartheid I very, I very easily made the connections with what was happening here and Māori voices were very strong at that stage. But I took no convincing on that issue I am grateful to say - because there were a lot of people with whom I had relationships at that stage and because I marched on tours those relationships inevitably ended.

The Springbok Tour was a time, as Pal described, for Māori and Pasifika people to come together and build relationships with each other and critique issues of separation and racism which affected their lives as minority peoples in New Zealand.

Pal By the time I was at high school we had already started our first "antiracism" group. ... We started to understand and realise things about justice. We were at high school when the 1981 Springbok tour [took place] which separated our school. And we did things like organise like, made sure that we were active in the school council so we could make our whole school stand against the tour and that sort of thing and we played hard. We also got really competitive on the sports field, and stuff like this, it was always do or die. And so I think whether we liked it or not we were made to be aware of who we were, basically we were told we didn't belong. And so you know the journey carried on. The Human Rights Commission at that time also hosted what they called forums on racism around the country and brought a whole lot of young people together to talk about what racism was. And it ended up being another place where we began to develop a conscious awareness of that.

Values of social justice and through involvement in social change movements such as the 1981 Springbok Tour protests, issues such as racism became topics of interest in everyday media debates and conversations. As I have discussed in earlier chapters, the challenge to recognise and take action to change how racism worked in New Zealand was a significant outcome of the anti-tour protest movement. Through these debates some of the beliefs of equality and fairness were challenged and in turn formed a significant part of recognising Pākehā as a

culture. They provided a platform to learn about, debate and discuss wider issues in society and a collective place for individual people who wanted to be actively involved in community and social issues.

Some of the younger participants talked about the impact of social issues and what community meant for them. Kitty talked about growing up in a community in Australia.

Kitty And that was a place at that time in the early 1980s where a lot people of difference had gathered looking for a new way a lot of the times for a lot of people. So it was a community where a lot of social change work was happening and a lot of alternative umm learning in a lot of ways. So I think that umm I was always aware, from the beginning of my life, of difference socially but not necessarily in relation to place because the community that I was part of in the wilderness of the Sunshine coast was people from Australia, New Zealand, Europe, and lots of different places.

Victoria gained support from being part of a group.

Victoria And yeah it's just really neat to be with other people who are all on some journey we don't where we're all going but we're trying anyway you know we keep on trying that's just about as much as anyone can ask I think.

Alex spoke of being involved in social movements as a positive part of Pākehā culture.

Alex I think there have been some real positives about Pākehā culture and Pākehā people who thirst for justice and social change and believe in choice and believe in human rights.

Pākehā have also been allies to Māori in so many ways. Pākehā Treaty movement is obviously one of the allies within the last 40 years. In the past with settlement and colonisation and settlements by Europeans I [have heard] of stories where there have been Pākehā involved in local Māori communities especially in the rural areas and have been really helpful and they just got along and got the work done. And I think that it's really important to acknowledge our stories of peace with Māori and remember those stories and those narratives.

For one thing they give us a sense of place and a sense of connection to the land here and to other Māori people Give us hope and I think those are important stories to have and they need to be balanced with a critique of the current. Taking a more affirmative and position perception of Pākehā Culture is also really helpful in balancing the two.

One of the dilemmas about being involved with social change is that people can get so caught up in being critical of the society around them that it can be difficult to see the positive things that are present in one's culture or social group. Alex is reminding us that while as Pākehā we are part of the colonising process, there have also been instances where Pākehā people and communities

have worked alongside Māori in the best interests of both communities. Being part of a social change movement provides an important forum for culture building as story telling is an essential element in learning about and carrying out social change.

### Fairness and orderliness

Perhaps one of the most enduring aspects of the egalitarian myth is the notion that everybody in New Zealand not only has the right to a fair go, but that a fair go is what they expect to receive in all aspects of their lives.

Moyra ... There is also something about the attitude of Kiwi's to each other, I think there is until recently I have felt quite confident that that sense of fair go which was well documented by the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988), has been alive and well in this country, but now I am actually worried I don't know that that is still.

A fair go calls up the notion of equitable treatment for all in the way that we relate to each other and in how we both treat others and are treated in New Zealand society. There was as Moyra suggests an expectation of fairness, and also that everybody could have a go as I have discussed above. The Television New Zealand programme called *Fair Go*, which focuses on stories where ordinary people have been ripped off or treated unfairly in some way, has been broadcast for at least 25 years, does continue to promote the idea that people are entitled to a fair go in their lives.

The egalitarian notion of fairness also implies a sense that people are fair-minded in the way they think and deal with others. But as Jane suggests this is not always the case.

Jane Linked to this though is the myth that Kiwis are fair minded people – I think there is some truth in that – you find it at an individual level. But I don't actually think it is unique to New Zealand - its one of those Pākehā cultural myths that is misused by the Government – we're all fair and there is no racism here. At an individual level there is some truth to that but I also don't think that it is unique to New Zealanders.

The “Pākehā cultural myth” as Jane calls it, that “we're all fair and there is no racism here” reflects both the egalitarian and the ‘best race relations in the world’ myths that still persist in Pākehā culture even although there is now a clear body of evidence that challenges them both as I have discussed in chapters two and three.

If any of us were under the illusion that being fair-minded included being open and welcoming of all peoples JoanC dispelled that in the second focus group. In describing herself as a “pre-war” person (born prior to WWII), she was very



definite about the fact that there was racism here and that she managed a variety of relationships by “totally compartmentalising” her life.

JoanC You know I can do patchwork [e.g. sewing pieces of fabric together to make a quilt] with this group as long as we only talk about patchwork, I can do something with this group as long as we stick on that, but get on to Treaty issues or these sort of issues umm I drop friends all around the place.

The under belly of racism was also noted by Averil in younger generations.

Averil But it doesn't seem like its only older people. I'm a taxi driver and I work at night – people have usually been out drinking and you wouldn't believe the incredible stuff that young cool 17 year olds in the taxi say. Usually preceded by “I'm not a racist but ...” Because this [Treaty people] is my peer group and friendship group at home I thought society had changed until I got a job as a taxi driver and I'm shocked and horrified and disgusted and embarrassed.

Although Pākehā may be fair-minded in some aspects of the way they live, in others they certainly are not. Pākehā resistance to the recognition of New Zealand as a multicultural society was reported by Jane and James Ritchie (1978, p. 120) in their family studies.

*As a result of rugby tours and such, the nature of racism is becoming widely understood, even if its particular characteristics here hide coyly behind the New Zealand public front of fairness, equality for all, individualism and the devil take the hindmost.*

Racism in its many guises appears to continue on in society, despite a continuing belief that Pākehā are fair-minded.

In the introduction to this chapter Mitzi spoke of the way in which the values of equality and uniformity were related to notions of egalitarianism. She cited patterns of Pākehā behaviour such as rigorous child rearing patterns and washing on the line on a certain day as aspects of uniformity Helen May (1992) in her study of the lives of New Zealand women found that women both pre and post world war two managed their own and their families lives by being highly organised. In this study I have linked the way the participants talk about ordered and organised lives and notions of time with the value of uniformity.

There seemed to be a sense of orderliness in Pākehā society in the post second world war period up until the 1960s or early 1970s (Vocational Training Council, 1975). People's lives appeared to be well organised and followed a regular orderly pattern where, for example, men went to work; work hours were set; pubs closed at 6 pm; banks were only open during the week until 4 or 5pm, as were shops but there was usually a ‘late night’ on Friday; there was a Post Office with a savings bank and manual telephone exchange in cities, towns and most

villages; weekends were for sport and socialising; women once they were married seldom did paid work, rather they stayed home and had babies, ran households and did community work; babies were fed four hourly; washing was done one day a week and baking on an other day; vegetables were largely home grown; and food other than home preserves was only available in season.

The notion that Pākehā tend to live in an orderly fashion was prompted by Pal's observations of the Pākehā family who lived next door to her as she was growing up in the 1960s.

Pal We grew up in between two families who identified as being New Zealanders and as Kiwis. And I always acknowledge the family who grew up alongside us because they represented everything that Kiwi was. They got up at 6 o'clock in the morning, they had very rigid routines about stuff and they had tea at five o'clock and only their family had tea. ... Our [Pasifika] family life living next door was completely different. We had people always living with us, we had different food, and we had different ways of doing lots of different things.

Along with the orderliness or perhaps because of the orderliness there were memories of people being friendly and there was an openness and trust in neighbourhoods.

Jane There was more sense of community when we were growing up. No need to lock doors – people just came in and out. ... My mother had a big vegetable garden and we had hens as well so we kept the neighbourhood supplied and they paid us. And there was swapping of produce.

Suzanne observed that when she talked about being Pākehā with more mature aged groups they would identify things that were familiar to them often from their childhoods.

Suzanne Sunday drives and Sunday lunches – going to church in the morning and coming home and having Sunday dinner then having a snooze or going for a Sunday drive as part of things of the culture. So they certainly identified some of the things they did as children as part of the culture. Probably some of the nostalgic things including going to the batch for a holiday – everybody piling in and a relatively simple kind of holiday – but a holiday as a family in some kind of batch or caravan or tent.

DavidJ reflected on some of the ways in which he noticed differences in the way of life in Aotearoa when he came here from Britain in the 1960s.

DavidJ In some respects I mourn for the Pākehā culture that I met in the 1960s. I think it has been badly undercut by the right-wing revolution since then, particularly of course I came across it in rural Northland and its openness, its welcoming-ness, the hospitality, the fact that you could leave your car out with the key in the ignition lock overnight and that was the normal way then, the doors

were always open, people came and went. That was totally new, that wasn't English.

My kids taught me something about the differences when my first wife and I took the kids back to England at the ages of about 5 and 6 and visited my parents. And people stared, because not only were there the obvious physical differences that my kids would run bare foot over flint paths in the snow. <laughter> But there were also the other things - that they would wander down the street and they would talk to anybody they met, and if people asked them in for a glass of milk or something they would go because they had grown up in a culture of trust which wasn't there in England at that time, and which unfortunately isn't here among us now to the same extent.

One of the ways to capture aspects of culture is to look back and to share stories about the way things were and see what aspects of culture are carried through into the present generations. The routines in the daily lives of Pākehā families tend to be decided within families rather than be prescribed by societal practices such as wash days and baking days as appeared to be the case in earlier generations. For example, nowadays when household tasks are done, and by whom, is decided within families and many women are in the paid workforce even when they have children. I notice that the current generations of children, particularly in urban settings, are living far more organised lives with less free time and space available to roam and play, in. Children's activities tend to be more organised and less self directed than in earlier generations.

There is less common social time available in communities as many businesses particularly retail outlets are now open seven days a week and many for longer hours. Parents are juggling work and family commitments and it can be a real challenge to organise times for families to be together. Bridget talked about there being less space available for gardens. Houses on quarter acre sections are a rarity in the suburbs now with the trend towards bigger houses built on smaller sections. Fruit and vegetables, along with more varieties and brands of food than one could have imagined 30 or 40 years ago are now readily available for purchase in shops and supermarkets.

## Time

There are a number of common phrases that are associated with a Pākehā sense of time and the importance of time in the organising of everyday life. Being on time; knowing what the time is; timing an event; sayings like 'it's only a matter of time'; 'timing is everything'. How often in a day does someone ask "what is the time?" Time is related to what a clock says rather than, for example, where the sun is in the sky. Moea talked about a Pākehā "obsession with time".

Moea      Now in Pākehā culture **time** I just can't get over my thing about time. Got to be on time and if other people aren't on

time, I just get so wound up. I'd really like to lose that but I can't. If people are late or something I just get pissed off maximum, maximum. So I don't know what we'll do about that.

Time is something to be used: one spends time, or perhaps wastes time depending on the value placed on the activity being undertaken.

DavidT Time – our understanding of time and not wasting time and some of that is to do with economic priorities also the importance of punctuality, of efficiency, on focussing on the business on hand, this sounds very common doesn't it – even amongst good aware groups. On being busy sometimes and not often stopping for the time it takes on reflection and critiquing – we're not so good at that and because of the time focus we're not so good at dreaming of alternatives – taking that space just to dream, because it is not a productive use of time.

Rose Well if you see someone just sitting you say 'what are you doing'?

DavidT You're wasting your time just sitting there doing nothing

Rose Notion of wasting time is an active one

DavidT Definition of prayer called wasting time with God – and outside of structured rote learned prayers – sense of wasting time

JoanM with nothing to show for it

DavidT You haven't produced something. So in some ways all the things we've said are all interconnected. We keep coming back to similar connections – some of that is about productivity – to be productive – to have a good work ethic. Those Protestants have got something to answer for (laughs).

Rose Sense in the wasting time is not looking back – like that's a waste of time – you get on with things now – you don't learn from the past because doing is more important than thinking or learning in some respects.

DavidT And there is always a sense of rushing round is a virtue, rushing to do things and the pressure to do this thing and this thing and the pace of life – the rushing to do that.

JoanM But when you rush you don't have to stop and think do you – you don't have time to but it also means you don't have to

DavidT But there is then no possibility to reflect on what you regard as normal – normal is something that is a taken and is a given – you just get on with it.

Rose Yeah getting on with it is taken as normal isn't it.

In this conversation JoanM, DavidT and I are playing around with the idea of time. There are phrases which depict a productive notion of time such as being busy, rushing, doing, getting on with it, pressure and not looking back. On the other hand we tend to regard dreaming, praying, thinking and reflecting as activities that 'waste time' as there is usually nothing tangible to show for the

time spend doing them. Productive time tends to be more valued in Pākehā culture.

Another aspect of the way in which time can rule is the sense of wanting, needing, expecting, something to happen instantly. I think the pressure of living in the moment or in the future, to respond instantly to something has been exacerbated by the introduction of email and internet communications, and perhaps more thoroughly with the now common use of mobile phones and texting.

Bridget the instantaneous – everything has to be – I want it and I want it now and that's very much a marker of Pākehā culture. The time thing is very, very important.

Bridget and I also talked about the time pressures to meet deadlines and the way that time available can be used to dictate a process.

Rose talking to get to a consensus is a waste of time we should be doing.

Bridget That's right the time thing is very, very important and it restricts our thinking often because we are always meeting deadlines particularly in relation to the political environment. If there is a submission or something there is always the last minute you've got to get it in and that's your chance. There's not really a will to consult properly [or] even to negotiate the process, never mind negotiate what the outcome might be.

The pressure to get things done, to meet imposed deadlines and to always be busy can have both negative and positive consequences.

Bridget There is a sense of trying to get some balance and I think that we've lost the opportunity to get balance in lots of areas because there is so much pressure on people. And it starts younger and younger to be achieving to be striving to be busy involved.

Pākehā values attached to time are often noticed in inter-cultural settings. Mitzi described some of the things she needed to know about being Pākehā when she was in different cultural setting.

Mitzi ... how to share better. I need to know how to be more collective and less rush off and stubborn and do my own thing. And I need to be better at consensus and listening to other people and allowing a process to take as long as it needs and not keep on trying to hurry it up or short circuit it. I mean ... I have some very clock watching elements in me but I do try to keep them in check because I think that I have to learn a non-clock time value. Not necessarily to replace my time value but have it sit comfortably in me so I can at least lean one way or the other in my timeframes according to what's going on and what the situation is.

Learning to share better and to not necessarily be in control of processes and time infer that as Pākehā ownership and control are values we aspire to. We tend to run our collective meetings or events to preset timetables rather than stay with a process until a consensus is reached no matter how long it takes. For example, time is a crucial organising tool which is used to keep things moving along. I made a promise to the group at the beginning of the second focus group session that I would finish at the designated time. This was in part a response to the experience in the first focus group session of needing to extend the time by two hours so all the people present had the opportunity to share their stories.

## **Assimilation**

Closely linked to egalitarian notions of fairness and fair mindedness is the idea of assimilating of all cultures into ‘one people’ which I discuss with the counter discourse of diversity in this section. That all New Zealanders be regarded as ‘one people’ has its origins at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (Walker, 2004). It has become a well used catch cry, mostly by Pākehā to establish or perhaps justify their dominance.

Catriona I think the thing I noticed most about Pākehā culture is the tendency to assume that that's it - there isn't any other way of being.

The ‘one people’ notion is, I suspect, also sustained by the on going myth of egalitarianism, the notion that everybody has the same opportunities to make the most of their lives.

DavidJ I notice a very strong emphasis on oneness. That anything different is divisive, and in workshops when people say “But that's divisive”, I talk about it as diversity, but that's very difficult for them. So I am not sure where that strong drive that we have to be all the same comes from, but it is certainly something I notice.

Angeline One of the particular things about Pākehā culture that I have noticed and I have heard as well this afternoon is that there is that focus on oneness and not celebrating diversity. And when I was younger I adopted that as well and I took that on board and I thought I've got to fit in, don't rock the boat, fit in and just go with the dominant Pākehā culture. And just lie low and don't let anything upset that balance, upset that flat kind of okay-ness which I just went along with. And now I just think oh no way you know I wouldn't want to accept that in myself anymore.

Suzanne We often then invite people to think about – when people are saying “why can't we all just be New Zealanders” - What it is that people are actually asking when they ask that question. Why can't we all be one– which one? Are they all saying -why can't we all be Māori? I don't think so. So the thing we often use developing from this then is well if you are making policy – you were making some decisions about health provision for these groups – if you

just said well we'll have one health policy that will apply to everyone will that work. Will the same policy apply to men and women? No of course it won't and nobody expects it to. So then will the same health policy be appropriate for different cultural groups? So it actually helps people understand that we need more than one identity.

In the extracts above all the participants recognise the 'one people' discourse. It was something Angeline had to come to terms with at a personal level as she has a mixed cultural heritage with a Samoan and a Pākehā parent. She had to deal with the embodiment of diversity and being marked as different but she did not want to stand out as different. The phrases "don't rock the boat" and "just lie low and don't let anything upset the balance" indicate a level of tension and vigilance which left her with a feeling of "flat kind of okay-ness".

Angeline is clearly regarded as 'not white' and her Pākehā heritage is in fact dismissed because she looks 'brown'. She is made 'other' by members of the dominant group. 'One people' operates to support Pākehā dominance, by, on the one hand, excluding those who look different, and on the other not wanting them to stand out and make waves. Dual or multiple cultural heritages are generally not recognised or able to be readily named, for example, in the New Zealand census, or on official forms. These structural processes limit the acknowledgement of the diversity of people in Aotearoa.

In their role as workshop facilitators DavidJ and Suzanne, recognise the 'one people' talk and they challenge it with notions of diversity, that we New Zealanders are not all the same and that we do not have to be all the same. Suzanne encourages people to think about diversity in positive ways and disrupts the assumption that the one people is Pākehā when she asks which one they want to be - Are they saying - why can't we all be Māori?"

The interview with Suzanne took place early in 2005 and she made the connection between the 'one person' talk and the notion of special treatment being linked to ethnicity that was highlighted by Don Brash (the then leader of the National Party) in his *Nationhood* speech (Brash, 2004).

Suzanne And also in the current climate to make the link with identities and the link with special treatment and trying to understand that. If you actually treat everybody equally you will be doing some people a disservice, because if you treat all the cultural groups equally you will not be doing some things well.

Rose It's who determines what is equal treatment actually?

Suzanne So we use that way of looking at it to help people to think about difference and acknowledging it, and valuing it and to unpack this idea that we are all one. What is it that

people are saying? In what way are we all one? So we talk about it being this cultural identity.

Special treatment on the basis of ethnicity, race or culture that excludes the Pākehā majority is part of the Māori privilege pattern of talk identified by Nairn and McCreanor (1991) and McCreanor (2005). The one people discourse operates at personal, collective and institutional levels in New Zealand society as a device for dominant group members to maintain their power. Challenging people to think and talk about cultural diversity and the needs of people from a number of different perspectives is one way of breaking through the often unvoiced and taken for granted assumption of oneness.

### **Superiority**

As discussed in chapter three, British and European 19<sup>th</sup> century beliefs in their own superiority were supported by theories about race and scientific attempts to prove firstly that different races existed, and secondly that the white race was superior (Miles, 1989; Montagu, 1972; Rattansi & Westwood, 1994; Said, 1978; Sherwood, 2001; Spoonley, 1988; Young, 1994). British settlers brought with them to New Zealand beliefs in their superiority which tended to be expressed through notions of rightness and the way knowledge, science and rational thinking were valued.

Superiority as a value stands in contrast to egalitarianism as it operates to secure and maintain privilege through controlling sources of knowledge and what is regarded as important knowledge. An egalitarian approach to keeping people in line is the 'tall poppy syndrome'<sup>20</sup>. While Pākehā are encouraged to seek knowledge there are limits to the ways in which knowledge can be displayed as was discussed earlier in the questioning authority elements of egalitarianism. Bearing in mind the tensions between the values of superiority and egalitarianism, I consider the ways in which superiority is expressed by participants.

Engaging in intercultural relationships presents a challenge to Pākehā who are so used to being in their own cultural milieu, with their cultural practices being

---

<sup>20</sup> **Tall Poppy Syndrome (TPS)** is a pejorative term used in the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and New Zealand to describe what is seen as a levelling social attitude. Someone is said to be a target of tall poppy syndrome when his or her assumption of a higher economic, social or political position is criticized as being presumptuous, attention seeking, or without merit. Alternatively, it is seen as a societal phenomenon in which people of genuine merit are criticised or resented because their talents or achievements elevate them above or distinguish them from their peers. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tall\\_Poppy\\_Syndrome](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tall_Poppy_Syndrome), 1/10/08).



dominant that they have not developed the skills to learn how to cope in unfamiliar cultural settings.

Victoria What I notice is that people see Māori stuff as sort of exotic and it's a mixture of a fascination, a fear and being nervous around Māori people. It's a fear of saying the wrong thing, or knowing you should be doing something but you don't know what it is – and we've all been through that. But as a way of being never being able to be really honest - because people are always trying to say the right thing

Being in Māori cultural settings disturbs the sense of comfort, complacency and control that is commonly felt by Pākehā in their everyday experiences.

Living with not knowing everything and at times being uncomfortable is a real challenge to the notions of 'right and wrong' or, as Victoria described the 'black and white' thinking that is part of the needing to know aspect of Pākehā culture. In many of the data extracts participants recognise Pākehā assertions of rightness and needing to know and counter them with the desire to do things differently.

Jen And the other thing I suppose is just looking at that white New Zealand or whatever we call that, that broader picture is some of the stuff around being part of a colonising culture and what that means in terms of needing to know. And so I think that inherent in that culture is stuff about being right, because you have to feel like you're right to be able to go and impose your culture on other people. And that your culture's right and that you know and that you hold power in that knowing.

And so this for me personally the journey around understanding relationships and realising this stuff around culture is about recognising that to do that you have to be able to be open to not knowing and to know that you can never know. So you can never know the experience of someone who is tangata whenua. You can never know the experience of someone who is Pasifica. But to move to that not knowing is a hard journey when the knowing is so built in.

Alex Yes there are lots but I think the overwhelming thing would be our pre-occupation and obsession with science and objectivity and that's a colonial import firstly. But that we continue, again what Jen was saying, continue to really need to know everything that needs to be known and I just that process has really hurt a lot of people throughout this country, this region and the world and I think that, that's who is benefiting from that, obviously there are some problems there so that's what I notice.

Jo In the wider culture are the things that people have talked about: the ethnocentrism and the absolute assumption of 'there is only one right way', and the absolute positioning of that. In terms of my identification of Pākehā I think it is about recognising that and trying to work differently with that notion to change it into another space.

Moyra ... at a personal level it happens when people feel okay about not having to know everything, like I see academics

doing this a lot, they suddenly think well actually there might be something valuable here to which I can contribute so I can be a guest of this process I don't have to control it.

... That's a very different model from the model that many people have been brought up with and I think that's a real marker of change, and an identification with the fact that for example in order for us to identify Pākehā culture we just might have to live in a bit of a muddle while we let go of some of that other stuff, and find out how to relate to one another and to tangata whenua and how that might work out.

... the quality of the marker, ... is around the experience of people relinquishing control and finding relationship, and being excited by that change. So that's the key I think.

The participants in the above extracts are grappling with ways to counter the discourses of superiority in their own lives. Part of their desire to intentionally mark Pākehā culture is to develop different expressions of cultural belonging that do not engage the need to be right and to have and control all the valued knowledge in Society. Jen points to the need to accept the position of never knowing the experiences that, for example, a Pasifica<sup>21</sup> person might have and the knowledge they have learned. That is when Moyra suggested that we accept being “guests in a process” rather than always being in control of it.

### Rational and reductionist thinking

Rational and reductionist ways of thinking fit into the Western paradigm of science (Gergen, 1973). The scientific way of thinking has been a dominant approach to the way knowledge is produced and recognised in Pākehā culture (Belich, 2001). Through the dominance of the scientific paradigm other cultural views of knowledge and ways of thinking have tended to be treated as folklore and myth (L. T. Smith, 1999). The scientific paradigm is an important aspect of Pākehā and Western world views but it is not the only way to produce knowledge and to understand the world. Participants discussed and challenged the dominance of scientific thinking.

Within the paradigm of science emphasis is placed on the need for a logical and rational explanation. But what comprises rationality can be in the eye of the beholder.

Moyra     People used to say to me, you have got to be rational Moyra, and it's taken me ages to get to the stage where I feel like saying now, but I don't like your rationality. I mean my rationality is different from your rationality, so actually I am being rational, but it is not according to your rationalism you know.

---

<sup>21</sup> Pasifica is a collective term for peoples from Pacific Island countries who live in Aotearoa

Moyra appears to be highlighting the societal need to behave in a certain way, usually without any display of emotion, and when one chooses to think or behave in a different way, or to challenge the ‘received wisdom’ of the culture, that is very often perceived as irrational.

Another aspect of the reductionist approach is the Pākehā tendency to think and approach language and learning by narrowing things down to the nub of an issue. Often participants described this way of thinking by comparing it to how they observe Māori ways of approaching things. DavidJ told the following story to illustrate the different thought processes.

DavidJ I’m also struck by what seems to me totally different thought processes that go in opposite directions. In the Pākehā world and in our language we think we get to the truth of something by defining it more and more precisely, and atomising it, so if we want to know the truth about someone for instance we look at things like their genetic inheritance, that bit of them. ... this always comes up when we are discussing with a group the question, such a common one of who is Māori because there is all this intermarriage and so on. So there is that way of looking at it and that leads us into consideration of amounts of blood and all those things.

On the other hand the Māori way which kind of ripples and twists, and says you can only know the truth about someone by seeing that individual in the context of the groups that they are part of their whanau, their hapu, their iwi. I think that the thought processes are actually different, and that that’s true of other words too, key words like mana, for instance, yes you can give it a definition in English, in two or three words, but in fact it seems to me that in its proper context, its meaning ripples [out] until it connects up with another word or concept. ... I was using that example of seeing who a person is but there are lots of the big Māori words, not necessarily about a person which just, it seems to me, expand in their meaning, ripple out. Words have all sorts of meanings that connect up with other meanings, rather than defining them down to one or two words. So there are differences I believe.

In Pākehā culture there is the notion of the whole being bigger than the sum of all its parts but in trying to understand the whole there is a tendency to reduce it down to its smallest parts and explain it from there. Moea talked about it as reductionism.

Moea But that’s the thing about our markers of Pākehā-ness – where Cullen<sup>22</sup> has got in mind a particular part of a Bay or you know where the hangi stones are – its ridiculous that narrowing down that we do – like in medicine – here’s the sore on your arm and we narrow that right down to

---

<sup>22</sup>Hon. Dr Michael Cullen, was the Attorney General, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance in 2005

deal with treating the area but not see the landscape of either the body or the coastline. Archaeological landscapes not just sites – all of it not just a little piece that you can fence off.

So reductionism is a Pākehā trait, ... which is mirrored in the reducing to individual rights – from the collective to the individual so you are getting more and more individualised and smaller. So reductionism versus expansionism – must be the opposite.

The influence of the scientific approach to behaviour, thinking and language for example, while not exclusively Pākehā in that it is certainly a western world influence, does nevertheless permeate the lives of all peoples living in Aotearoa. One approach that is prevalent in science is to reduce or narrow things down, to take things a part to find out how they work or to find a solution to a problem. Sometimes the focus on parts, as Moea indicated, for example, of a body, or place can work to the detriment of seeing the bigger picture or taking into account other realms of knowledge such as the spiritual.

### **Individuality and Independence**

In many respects Pākehā culture reflects wider Western Society influences with its focus on the individual. The family in Pākehā culture is seen as extending from the individual according to Bridget who said

But one of the things for me about Pākehā culture is very much the individualisation of everything that is structured into our systems and although there is an awareness that people do have a family relationship context of some sort, it is generally the nuclear family and/ or small numbers. And is really only seen as a sort of an appendage in a way to the individual rather than the individual being part of that.

Victoria talked about the need for individual time and space alone. She noticed that for Pākehā

... living in isolated individual families and high primacy put on privacy and having time alone – versus being in a more communal setting where people come in and out. I have to go off on my own just to get my head sorted out.

Having individual time and space is promoted in the organisation of Pākehā households. While parents generally share a room, children especially in small families would mostly have a room of their own. Babies have their own bassinets, cots and eventually beds and more often than not would sleep in their own rooms from a very young age. If the house is large enough there are often designated adult spaces that are separate from family or children's spaces.

As with many of the cultural markers, some participants talked about noticing the emphasis on the individual in Pākehā culture in contrast to how they perceived Māori society. DavidJ said

I guess in terms of markers, I am always struck of course by the contrast between still the collective emphasis of Māori society, and the individual emphasis of Pākehā culture and that seems to me that a tremendous amount flows from that.

Alex told a story about attending a tangihanga (funeral process) with a friend that highlighted for him the way in which as a Pākehā he was faced with the tension of wanting to meet his own needs but also wanting to attend to the tikanga (correct processes) of the tangihanga.

It was a big tangi – really big a lot of people came and the welcoming – the powhiri, and the mihi and the whaikorero went for quite a while and me and my friend were getting really, really hungry. And were kind of going we're getting hungry we should just go you know. And we decided after talking about it and after talking to another Māori person there about how hungry we were and we kind of had other things planned for the day – we decided that it wouldn't be good to go. And I guess, one because we had to commit to the full on tikanga which is you need to eat after all those formalities are gone through to settle you into the place and also to take away tapu and we kind of knew that but we also wanted to just leave.

I think that was quite a Pākehā way of looking at it because we were thinking firstly of ourselves as individuals, and what we needed at that time and we didn't really think about the bigger picture and being part of the whole ritual of the tangi and following protocol – we thought of our own needs first. So in relation to Māori I think I notice I'm Pākehā first when my own individual needs spring up from time to time, but actually there is a process that is collective and needs to be followed and it comes up in conflict with my individual needs. So I guess that's a situation where I notice I'm Pākehā.

Alex and I then discussed the concept of choice in relation to a Pākehā funeral where it is acceptable to go to, for example, the church service, but not to the graveside or cremation, or to share in the food after the services. Often the parts of the service happen in different places and sometimes the cremation or burial are attended by invitation only.

Bridget, through her Treaty work had noticed that there was a different sense of accountability as an individual Pākehā.

I suppose my awareness of this is more highly tuned because of my Treaty work. Just listening to any situation where you see Māori people involved in their daily activities – there is always a sense that they are accountable or an awareness of that accountability back to other people, where with Pākehā culture we are not. An individual is entitled to do as they wish within the law, within the legal parameters, within the context of cultural conventions. And I suppose for me that is one of the biggest markers of people when they are looking at an issue and wondering what is it that the issue is about. They tend to think about well 'how does that issue relate to me?' Well there's nothing wrong with that but it doesn't often go wider.

For Pākehā an issue is most likely to be related to a personal situation and responded to at a personal level. That is not to say that Pākehā are unresponsive to issues that are outside their personal experience. The 1981 Springbok tour protests are a good example of a huge mobilisation of people trying to have a voice in changing the apartheid regime in South Africa. What could be noted though is the much slower response of Pākehā in dealing with issues of injustice caused by the colonisation of Aotearoa. Sometimes the far away issues are perceived as easier to deal with than those closer to home. The position of dominance Pākehā maintain could indicate that they are less often personally affected by injustices in society.

Related to the notion of individual accountability that Bridget discussed above are saying such as “*Stand on your own two feet – be your own yardstick*”. In this instance ‘yardstick’ is a measure of comparison (Makins, 1992, p. 1570) and ‘stand on your own two feet’ implies taking a responsibility. DavidT suggested that there was an “expectation of autonomy” that went with the Pākehā focus on individuality and independence. Bridget made the point that Pākehā are expected to “achieve on their own” and that competitiveness was

Bridget ... seen as a very important aspect of Pākehā culture and the idea of working co-operatively somehow looks as if it is suspiciously like slacking or not quite achieving.

Certainly the education system in New Zealand operates very much on individual endeavour as a way of measuring achievement (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Competition was another way in which DavidT felt that Pākehā displayed their individuality and autonomy “whereas Māori are far more cooperative at the other end”. I am not sure that I entirely agree that Pākehā people are more or less competitive than Māori people but perhaps there are different ways in which competitiveness is displayed and whose side one might be on.

The value placed on being independent is another way in which Pākehā maintain their individuality. Molly became aware of the extent to which she had be raised to be independent when, as an adult, she spent time living with a family in South America.

The way I was brought up – was to be independent. I left home at 17 cause that’s when I finished school and that was the understanding that, you know not that my parents were kicking me out, but that was the expectation that I would move on and go to University. You know the whole thing about getting part-time work and supporting myself financially. Basically working since paper runs – I guess from 7 or 8 there was always some form of thing, and I guess that was my parent’s way. I guess the whole money thing as well – trying to get us used to money was that we would do little jobs and we would get pocket money for it – and there was some kind of work relationship

there. And also they expected to earn money and look after it and stuff like that. And not just in terms of money as well. Like another small example, if I had to call someone on the phone, like a business or something, as a kid if I was a bit nervous about calling them – I go “Dad can you call them” – he’d be like “No you’ve got to do it”. There was this expectation that we would be quite independent. And that doesn’t happen to the same extent over there for I think cultural and economic reasons.

Molly’s story would seem to be a fairly typical Pākehā story of being encouraged to be independent. That a child lived at home and was largely supported by parents while still at school but would quite commonly leave home to either go into tertiary education or paid employment. There is also the expectation that money earned belonged to the individual and would be used to support their own living expenses outside of the basic needs that would be met by the family income while still living at home.

The expectation that young adults will leave the family home and be independent is associated with the value of mobility and the way in which being mobile supports independence. Aside from being “great car lovers” Pākehā are, according to DavidT,

also mobile in the sense that we will shift house and/or city for better opportunities however we define those. Though we have a sense, a strong desire to name belonging to NZ most of us don’t have a strong sense of a particular locality, which is different from Māori.

JoanM related this mobility to the fact that

Our ancestors were people who were prepared to move. ... when I think of my relatives in England, for example, well some of them move, but a lot of English people and Welsh and Scottish they have stayed in the same place for generations.

DavidT then discussed some of the implications being so mobile has for many Pākehā.

We don’t have a sense of intimacy or strong sense of belonging to a particular locality. When you are mobile and shift because of work – you leave relationships behind – and you don’t have that long term in depth historical range of relationships. You have them with a few people which are immediate family and maybe with one or two close friends who, where ever you go will keep in contact with you. But there is a sense of loss of that connectedness because you have been in one place for a life time and your forbearers have been there.

While I have the experience of having parents who still live in the same South Island locality that both they and I grew up in, my children have spent their childhood years in a number of different places in the North Island, although all have gone back to the South Island to live for periods on leaving home. JoanM thought that my experience was probably quite unusual “for most New Zealanders”.

My kids don’t seem to care at all about any of this – and I think they would be typical of a lot of New Zealanders of that generation – I don’t know where their loyalties lie really. And I’m sure its to do with

this moving around all the time cause you are prepared to give up the loyalties you have to a community and to move on to the next thing, where you think you are going to be better off or where you have to go to survive or whatever.

Having the individual as the basic unit of family or community supports the notions of independence, autonomy and mobility which also in turn support individuality. Small family units also allow for greater mobility. People moving around a lot, whether for work or out of necessity does, as JoanM suggests, make it more difficult to become established in communities. If too many people are moving through communities then it may become difficult to sustain activities within communities.

### Conclusion

Cultural values that have been marked as Pākehā such as egalitarianism, assimilation, superiority, and the combination of individuality and independence have been discussed in this chapter. I suggest that these are core values that permeate every aspect of Pākehā culture and in effect New Zealand society. There are however different and sometimes contradictory ways that these values operate and impact on all peoples in Aotearoa. Notions of equal opportunity and a 'fair go' for all that represent egalitarianism stand in tension with views of superiority such as being right, doing things my way and being in control of knowledge, and the 'one people' assimilation value. Through the examination of these values in this chapter and through the literature I conclude that even although there are apparent incongruities between these values, together they have the psychological and material effects that highlight the expectation of the dominant Pākehā group that all other peoples will conform to their ways.





# Chapter Ten

## Marking Pākehā Culture as a Decolonisation Strategy

*Members of coloniser groups working on decolonisation come to acknowledge their personal participation in the structural and cultural racism that maintains their group's economic and cultural dominance (2000) and to join others in collective work for change (Glover et al., 2005, pp. 332-333).*

Many Pākehā Treaty people, through their Treaty work which is informed by a decolonisation agenda, make the connection between marking culture and decolonisation. That agenda has three items: to know the culture of the colonisers; to identify how that culture has been naturalised; and to work with people to recognise the oppressive effects of imposing that unmarked culture on all. This is the frame of reference in which Treaty people are 'speaking out' their experiences of Pākehā culture. The Treaty movement has worked to disrupt the ongoing structural and institutional processes of colonisation through education and social action that seeks to establish 'right relationships' with Māori, to affirm Māori authority, and to develop an alternative discourse of 'honouring the Treaty' (Huygens, 2007). Involvement in this decolonising work disturbs the complacency of the culturally invisible taken for granted normality of being in the dominant group as it positions Pākehā as cultural. In Treaty workshops relationship issues between Māori and the Crown are routinely discussed; this invoked a sense of cultural deficit for many dominant group people. Naming and marking Pākehā culture challenges the belief that they do not have a culture.

In this thesis I have described the processes which have stimulated the recognition of Pākehā culture for Treaty people participants. Some key elements in recognising and marking Pākehā culture included engaging in both personal and political relationships with Māori, and being in Treaty groups and networks where talk of Pākehā culture was encouraged. A further element was for Pākehā to take responsibility for supporting Māori calls for justice in their relationships with the Crown since the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840. This has stimulated an examination of the social and political histories of Māori-Pākehā relationships and Treaty engagements from a critical perspective. For Pākehā, learning about their cultural heritage gave a sense of lineage beyond the borders of Aotearoa.

The recognition of being Pākehā had its genesis in the early encounters between the indigenous peoples (Māori) and the settlers/colonisers that was formalised in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The Treaty of Waitangi represented a move on the part of the British Government/Crown to set about colonising Aotearoa while recognising the presence of an indigenous people (Māori) rather than annihilating them as had been attempted when setting up other colonial states (Belich, 2001; Orange, 1987). Learning about British and Pākehā histories is one of the early steps towards decolonisation for dominant group members. The Pākehā Treaty people in this study have marked Pākehā culture with intentional and strategic purpose, within a Treaty of Waitangi relationship context that seeks to disturb and disrupt the commonplace invisibility of their culture to dominant group members. They have taken on the challenge laid down by Hone Kaa (p. 1) to not only know who they are as Pākehā, but also to recognise the power they have as Pākehā. It has been the intentional and strategic marking of Pākehā culture that creates a foundation for decolonisation efforts. However, I did not ask the participants to describe how their experiences of recognising and marking Pākehā culture related to their Treaty work and their own decolonising agendas. This question, along with others related more directly to how cultural marking disrupts and challenges dominance, are the work of future studies.

There are three benefits Treaty people have in mind as they recognise being Pākehā. First, it signals their striving for just relationships with Māori and people from other cultural groups; second, claiming Pākehā identity unsettles their position of dominance as colonisers in Aotearoa; and third, the claim to a cultural identity actively challenges others from the dominant group to recognise themselves as cultural and Pākehā.

The aim of this study was to establish the ways in which some of those who belong to Treaty people networks and are dominant group members in Aotearoa come to recognise and name themselves as Pākehā, acknowledge their Treaty of Waitangi relationships and responsibilities, and mark as cultural their lifestyle, values and practices.

A brief summary of the study is first outlined. I then bring together and discuss some of the central themes that apply to recognising culture as a decolonisation strategy: intentionally recognising Pākehā culture; the constitutive nature of culture; and occupying a cultural space. To conclude I reflect on some limitations and strengths of the study; assess the significance and implications of the study; and the contribution the study makes to psychological theorising about dominant cultures.

## **Summary of study**

In chapter two, *Concepts of culture, marking and Pākehā*, I considered three different approaches to culture: having culture; culture as structure; and doing culture. The essentialist notion of ‘having culture’, while the most familiar to me, was very difficult to apply to marking aspects of culture. The very moment I thought I had marked something, it often disappeared. However, by turning my attention to the way we ‘do’ culture through talk (discourse and language) I was then able to approach the data with questions about how the participants’ talk functioned and what was being produced and reproduced about Pākehā culture through their talk.

The practices and values that are produced and reproduced in any culture have historical, social and location aspects and material effects that impact on the daily lives of the people who are part of the culture. In chapter three, *The socio-political context of culture: Colony, race and nation*, I have considered the ways in which not only the initial but the ongoing colonisation of Aotearoa has been practised by Pākehā, where aspects of superiority and racism have combined to inform myths such as ‘the best race relations in the world’. I canvassed the local and international literature about dominance and how it operates: first, structurally in nations (including for example, the colonies of Australia and America), and through national identities such as the ‘New Zealander’; and second, through the unmarked cultural position that actively maintains dominance and marks minority peoples as cultural or raced and as ‘other’. Challenges to dominance were examined by considering strategies of decolonisation, including research on racism and privilege, to bring the chapter to a close.

The social constructionist approach to the study of language and how it functions has been central to this study of culture and is described in chapter four, *Philosophical and theoretical stakes in the ground*. Community and critical psychology perspectives, a consideration of dominant discourses, and a combination of narrative and thematic methodologies were used to guide data analysis. Chapter five, *People and procedures*, includes descriptions of the real life practicalities and everyday decisions and actions within this study. It is a study with and about people that has included Treaty people as participants in two focus groups and my travelling through the country for further discussions about Pākehā culture.

The most important aspect of this study has been working with the participants and their talk about being Pākehā. Four significant themes, developed through the analysis of the data, were discussed in chapters six, seven, eight and nine.

The theme in chapter six, *Treaty People talk about symbols of New Zealand*, canvassed the ways in which the relationship between Britain and New Zealand has been a defining feature of national identity. Examples of symbols of New Zealand that were found included: Britain as home and role of the Queen, national anthems, not being British, and the New Zealander as a 'Better Briton' particularly exemplified through the national sport of rugby. Race relations myths, the 'kiwi bloke' as a stereotype of national identity and the great 'OE' – the overseas travel experiences, particularly travel back to Britain were ways in which participants recognised their New Zealandness. The chapter ended with talk about New Zealand being "home".

The ways in which *Treaty People recognise being cultural*, was the theme of chapter seven. Through their talk I traced the recognition of the unmarked normal experience of being in a dominant group and the privilege of that position. The move to recognise themselves as cultural was prompted by the calls and actions of Māori seeking justice in their political and social relationships with Pākehā who are in positions of dominance and power. Engagement in relationships with Māori was a major prompt for Treaty people to consider themselves as cultural. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is a significant platform that Pākehā Treaty people use as a means to understand colonisation and to seek socially just relationships with Māori. Through their Treaty work the participants have been challenged to explore their own cultural identities, along with those of the people who attend the Treaty workshops they have facilitated.

Closely associated with the recognition of a cultural identity was the way in which *Treaty People recognise being Pākehā* which I have explored in chapter eight. Treaty people debated who could be regarded as Pākehā and some of the resistances to the name 'Pākehā'. Generational differences were noted in the ways Treaty people discussed what it meant for them to call themselves Pākehā. Younger people spoke of always being Pākehā which had not been the experience of the middle and older generation participants. Calling themselves Pākehā had a number of meanings, one of which was the acknowledgements and acceptance of the name "Pākehā" as given by Māori. A sense of belonging to Aotearoa, the people and the place, proved to be a key feature in discussions of Pākehā culture. Belonging, for Treaty people, as with their recognition of a

cultural identity, was no longer regarded as a taken-for-granted right, but rather, was a position that required ongoing negotiation through Treaty relationships.

In chapter nine, the last of the data analysis chapters, I considered the ways *Treaty People talk about Pākehā cultural values*. The values of egalitarianism, assimilation, superiority and the combination of individuality and independence were selected as they all have an enduring legacy that can be traced to the beginnings of Pākehā settlement. While there appear to be contradictions between egalitarianism which brings to mind notions of fairness and equality, and the being right and needing to know aspects of superiority, all of these values have functioned in Pākehā culture to maintain dominance.

### **Intentionally recognising Pākehā Culture**

The notion of intentionality in theorising social constructionism (Crotty, 1998), that meanings are born through the intentional and active interplay between a subject and an object, was raised at the beginning of chapter four. Both subject and object have no meaning without the other. In this study participants have displayed intentional and active engagement in intercultural relationships and through that engagement their own cultural identity as Pākehā has taken on new meaning.

The study of a cultural group does, of necessity, require the presence of a cultural 'other'. Where there was no cultural other, then how a group lives might be described as simply normal. The first one hundred years of colonial rule in Aotearoa was dominated by Pākehā through acquisition of land (and thus the means of production), and policies such as assimilation and later integration. Māori were believed to be a 'dying race' with weakened numbers through war, land confiscation and disease. They were denied the right to an equitable access to resources, political voice and social justice in all spheres of life. Pākehā during this period of history were the New Zealanders and according to Belich (2001), 'better Britons'. The settler identity was carved out in relation to Britain.

The process of colonisation by settlers in New Zealand was so effective that for many generations, they lived as if there was no cultural other. They had no perception of a cultural other significant enough to disturb their position of dominance. Information about the 140 centennial celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi on the official government website (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Updated 14 Nov 2008) showed that the celebrations were an astoundingly blatant example of settler dominance. Māori were only referenced

in the context of having signed the Treaty, and later as being the “enemy” during the 19<sup>th</sup> century land wars. What is just as astounding is that on the government website there has been no attempt to provide a Māori viewpoint or more modern, revisionist analysis to the 1940 celebrations. I learned more about Māori participation in these celebrations from Patricia Grace (2004) in her novel *Tu*.

By the 1960s Māori had become a visible presence in urban settings, and were establishing a political voice and presence that Pākehā could no longer ignore (Walker, 1990). The Hunn report (1961) was a milestone as it systematically highlighted the disparities between Māori and Pākehā in almost every facet of life in New Zealand. This report acted as an impetus for the start of a political analysis of the issues that more than 100 years of policies and practices of Pākehā colonisation, dominance and assimilation had created. It was one of the flashpoints that prompted Pākehā discussion and action about issues of racism in New Zealand and the formation of groups such as the Auckland Committee on Racial Discrimination (ACORD).

There had been, since the early days of settlement, Pākehā who engaged with and supported Māori both politically and personally. However, it was through Māori actions such as the 1975 Land March that the Treaty of Waitangi was brought to the attention of Pākehā. At that time some Pākehā, including many of the participants in this study, started to get together and engage with Māori and support such issues as protest over land confiscation, along with highlighting and resisting racist practices in education, social welfare, housing and employment and social justice (Huygens, 2007; Margaret, 2002; M. Nairn, 2002; Network Waitangi, 1997). The Treaty of Waitangi, biculturalism, race relations, ‘Māori issues’, were debated in board rooms, staff rooms, sports grounds, pubs, at dinner tables and, as Walker (2004), noted in the bedrooms of the nation. These debates, often prompted by Māori, have largely been led in Pākehā communities by Treaty educators and academics and responded to in various media sources and through government agencies. Since the 1970s a body of literature has accrued that I have been able to draw on through out this study to explore issues of Pākehā culture.

Through discussions over many years I have observed that there is a considerable degree of puzzlement in Pākehā communities about what biculturalism means, particularly as many have claimed they did not have a culture. They did not see anything in their cultural basket to bring to the bicultural debate. Questions about their culture have often been greeted with an uncomfortable silence. Sometimes a sense of cultural deficit was expressed by drawing on the discourse

of Māori being privileged (McCreanor, 1995) because they did have a culture. Talking about culture in this way implied that culture was something that people, usually ‘other’ people, had; it was an essential part of their humanness. The notions of silence and cultural deficit were also noted by McKinney (2005) and Gibson (2006) as they described their participants’ difficulties in explaining what their white identities meant. Slowly, over the years, Pākehā Treaty people have engaged more and more in talking about and debating what their culture might be and mean in relation to other cultural groups.

Pākehā Treaty people have been called to recognise Pākehā culture by Māori and have chosen to accept the challenges of the partnership that has been offered. Through Māori and Pākehā forming co-intentional relationships, and with those Pākehā attending to the asymmetrical nature of those relationships (Bell, 2004), Pākehā is being constituted as an intentional identity. An intentional and conscientized Pākehā identity may develop from McKinney’s (2005) notion of prompted identity.

#### Does saying ‘I’m Pākehā’ really change anything?

The short answer to this question is ‘yes, it does’. However, there are degrees of understanding and acceptance of what it means to be Pākehā. To the younger generation participants in this study Pākehā felt quite a natural and familiar name that usually included a desire to be non-racist. The middle and older generation participants, while usually not familiar with Pākehā as a name until well into adulthood, did embrace it as a way to distinguish themselves culturally in Aotearoa.

Pākehā is a name that locates people in Aotearoa, unlike the label European, which for many people is bereft of content as their heritage beyond Aotearoa is distant in terms of generations and contact. Pākehā in connection with Māori and through Te Tiriti o Waitangi allows for a sense of belonging in Aotearoa.

Pākehā is not always a comfortable identity. In a decolonisation framework being Pākehā is a seismic shift in that one cannot go back to accepting the practices and values of the colonial state as the natural, obviously right way for things to be. All are or may be marked for questioning and negotiation; there is no going back to the comfortable ignorance about that imposition and its effects (R. Nairn, personal communication, 4 April 2008). There is, however, a constant tension for dominant group peoples between the invisible nature of colonisation and what is taken for granted as ‘New Zealand’ and the decolonisation agenda to



make visible and accept that there are multiple authorities that operate in the New Zealand context (Huygens, 2007).

The Treaty has signified both the authority of Māori and the authority of the Crown to negotiate their ways and practices within the nation state of Aotearoa. An important aspect of decolonisation is to mark out the Crown/Government, Pākehā driven policies as cultural rather than the taken for granted norm. Another aspect is to learn about both the Pākehā and Māori genealogy of systems of power and to speak out about them which contributes to the agenda by listening to more than one voice. This in turn disturbs the 'one people' notion that is often drawn on by politicians. Treaty People in this study who call themselves Pākehā are usually trying to define themselves as non-colonial in relation to Māori and according to Te Tiriti o Waitangi by developing values and practices of joint sovereignty rather than the English version of total sovereignty.

Treaty people, engaging in active and intentional relationships with Māori and other people who are culturally different from them, from a position of their own cultural recognition, have gained a new and deeper sense of meaning in their own relationships and in their sense of belonging to Aotearoa by.

### **The Constitutive nature of Culture**

Culture is not a once and for all identity or pattern of behaviours and values. It constantly changes with any number of influences. For example, the introduction of radio, then later television, and more recently the internet have significantly affected the way in which events are communicated around the world, and the way in which people communicate with each other on a global scale. The constantly changing nature of culture has made the task of marking what is cultural difficult. What is marked as cultural is very often changed by the very act of marking. That is the constituted and constituting dilemma, which has meant that the ways in which I have reported and interpreted aspects of Pākehā culture have been a somewhat tentative process. There is no definitive version of a culture. The best version at any given point in time is that which is generally recognised as cultural and can be verified through being produced and reproduced.

Culture is always present and if, as McHoul and Rapley (2001) point out, it is constantly being produced and reproduced and is verified through being reproduced, then Pākehā culture carries with it the history of colonisation as that has been the context in which it has been produced and reproduced. When a

major contextual aspect of culture such as the move towards a decolonisation framework is experienced, then one would expect that a different form of culture will be produced but none-the-less it will still be Pākehā culture. It is rather like the way some of the participants described an event where they were challenged to think about their cultural position and cultural power as Pākehā. They felt disorientated and went through a process of really thinking about their cultural identity and the ways they acted as Pākehā. They then decided to learn some different ways of acting in intercultural relationships that would change their previously colonising ways. They were still Pākehā but they had decided to ‘do’ being Pākehā differently. The embodiment of a named cultural identity has been a significant milestone in the lives of Treaty people as a means of disrupting the taken for granted nature of dominance and producing and reproducing ways of acting with an agenda of cultural justice.

### **Occupying a cultural space**

I argue that there is a need to occupy a cultural space in order to negotiate either bicultural or intercultural spaces or relationships. It is the unmarked cultural position held by the dominant group that hinders the development of an equitable constitutive relationship between Māori and Pākehā, and between Pākehā and people of different cultures.

Exploring Pākehā culture through debates, research and writing, often instigated by Māori, have been attempts to fill the Pākehā cultural space. As Māori have gained more public attention over the last 40 years, Pākehā have been challenged to examine the cultural space that they hold. This research with Treaty people has been a response to that challenge.

My thesis was that members of a dominant group do not in the main regard themselves as having a culture or recognise that they are cultural. Members of dominant groups experience most of the values and activities in their societies as ‘normal’. Their values and practices are, as Billig (1995) suggested, the ‘banal’ taken for granted aspects, of everyday life. When dominant group members meet with people from a different group then the things those people do differently are explained as cultural and not normal. In this way the cultural space for dominant group members remains empty.

The lack of cultural recognition is the taken for granted position of dominance captured by phrases such as this is ‘the way it is’, or ‘how things are done here’ as if there was no other way. For example, some Treaty people talked about how

time was an important factor in their lives, such as being on time, and keeping to time in meetings. They expressed some difficulty with people who were late, or who appeared to regard time in different ways; this was just not normal to them. They did recognise that there were different ways of understanding time but their way was 'normal' and not viewed as cultural until they were prompted to think about it in that way. By marking time as a cultural practice they could then explore other ways of 'doing' and 'using' time.

A cultural identity is one of the salient ways of stating a claim to a collective identity within a nation state. It offers a sense of belonging and a collection of patterns and values that become a familiar way of life which are brought to notice through contact with different cultural groups and peoples. An aspect in the recognition of culture is the process of both marking and being marked as cultural. Marking culture is an intentional way of explaining the values and systems of everyday life, rather than just taking them for granted as normal.

Treaty people in this research, while sometimes hesitant, were none-the-less willing to attend to and explain their experiences of Pākehā cultural identity. They were willing to engage in the act of occupying a cultural space which is both a political and a personal step towards a sense of collective cultural identity. Participants spoke of being able to claim a sense of collective Pākehā identity through their participation in the Treaty movement. They did not always feel that same sense of belonging to or acceptance of every aspect of Pākehā culture.

A marked cultural identity for Pākehā opens up the possibilities for new forms of relationships, new ways of approaching the world, and of exploring one's own values in relation to the values of people from other cultural groups. There was some recognition among Treaty people that in order to hold power, dominant group members are tuned into a sense of rightness about what they do and say.

## **Conclusions**

The power to name is usually vested with the dominant group in a society (Tyler, 1992). In Aotearoa, Māori, who were the dominant, normal and ordinary people of Aotearoa named the new arrivals as Pākehā. Even though the coloniser/settler peoples gained dominance within a few short years of arrival they have always been named as Pākehā by Māori. JoanM spoke of the name Pākehā as "a gift" from Māori. The acceptance of this name, and as Kitty said, the "invitation to an identity" are important steps towards recognising that even although they are

generally in positions of social and political dominance, Pākehā are just one part of the cultural landscape in Aotearoa.

When engaging with colonisation processes with the intent to decolonise one does have to examine the privileges of being in a dominant group and the long term impacts of exploitation and disadvantage that colonisation, capitalism, racism and Eurocentrism have had on indigenous and minority peoples (Glover et al., 2005). Given the coloniser position of dominant group members, the task of isolating evidence “which can disabuse people of a particular way of demarcating or seeing their culture” (Novitz, 1989, p. 285) is a difficult one. As a Pākehā researcher, and a member of the dominant group that I was researching, I have experienced considerable doubt and difficulty in developing a credible voice to disrupt my own coloniser position and look beyond that to the culture I am part of. I suggest that dominant group members can disrupt the colonisation process by repositioning themselves as cultural alongside other cultural groups, and thus opening up the options for multiple cultural expressions in the way that a society functions.

In the age of the world-wide-web, trans-national corporations and global travel the divisions of international and local feel like artificial constructs when considering the contributions and implications of a study. This study has been a local Aotearoa based study. I make no claims about the cultural views of any group beyond my participants. However, I hope that this study will contribute to and have implications for wider debates about how dominant group peoples recognise and do culture and theorise the ways they do culture.

### *Reflections on the study*

In this study I was intentional in my selection of participants and methods of data gathering. I chose to work with Treaty people as I knew that they had previous experiences in talking about Pākehā culture. I used focus groups and recorded conversations as data gathering methods as they were compatible with Treaty movement practices. I wanted to hear the way Treaty people spoke of being cultural with their peers, and later to engage in conversations and a guided discussion about a collective Pākehā culture. Thirty four Treaty people from throughout Aotearoa participated in the study. Their stories and the views they expressed are born out of their own experiences and are valued as such. I make no claim that their views could be generalised beyond that group, although, I do hope that there may be some synchronicity with wider Pākehā experiences of culture.

I have chosen to explore the way in which culture is expressed and recognised through the stories Treaty people have told. I am both a participant and the researcher. I am Pākehā and a member of the Treaty movement. At times it has been difficult to take a less involved view of the process and the data. It has taken a long time and much iteration to get to this version of the study. Being Pākehā and a participant in Treaty people and a researcher has also been one of the strengths of the study.

To carry out a study of culture where people were familiar with each other and willing to share their personal stories in the group was a real strength that would have been very difficult with larger numbers. That Treaty people are experienced in group processes which are respectful to individuals and allow for diversity of opinion added to the depth of sharing and the richness of data I was given to work with.

It has proved more fruitful to have people talk about culture in a group setting. In my earlier research I had interviewed a number of individuals and then gone back to the university to analyse and write up the findings. In this project, working with a group to gather the data was a worthwhile challenge and relationships were strengthened by the road trip to visit as many participants as possible for follow-up conversations. Sharing some initial findings as part of the second focus group gave some context for the discussion that followed, as some of the people there had not been present at the first focus group.

### Contributions of the study

This study contributes to the international body of literature about culture. It is a study where all the participants are members of the dominant group culture in Aotearoa. The research gaze has been turned onto ourselves as cultural in contrast to exploring the cultural 'other'. In particular, it offers an account of a group of people who are members of the dominant coloniser group in a colonial society who critically consider their cultural positioning in relation to Māori, the indigenous people of the land.

In 1840 a treaty, Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed thus forming an enduring connection between Māori, and Pākehā who, at that time, were represented by the British Crown. This Treaty continues to be a significant factor in the ways in which Pākehā and Māori recognise and negotiate their cultural identities and cultural practices. The relationship between Māori and Pākehā has been described by Bell (2004) as asymmetrical in that the Pākehā partner maintains a position of political and social dominance. Through the recognition of Pākehā as

cultural and by marking some of the symbols and values of this culture this study has been an attempt to critique and disrupt some of that asymmetry.

A significant feature of this study has been the focus on the cultural recognition of dominant group members in a colonial society. The recognition and naming of culture by dominant group members, while a challenge, does not in itself necessarily lead to any consideration of social justice in society. On the other hand, to align dominant group cultural recognition with a critical examination of colonisation, an inherently complex process to unravel, is a distinctive course of theorising and action that contributes to decolonisation, liberation and social justice.

This study primarily contributes to the dialogue in New Zealand society about the intercultural relationships between Pākehā and Māori. It seeks to place Pākehā in a cultural frame in their relationships with Māori and other cultural groups rather than continuing the colonising impact of the unnamed and unmarked position of being 'just normal'.

People in the Treaty movement have been negotiating their cultural and political relationships with Māori over the last 30 years using Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the foundation and theories of social justice and liberation to inform and guide their practices (Huygens, 2007). They have developed through Treaty work a considerable degree of expertise in recognising and marking features of their culture which I have been able to draw on for this study. In turn I trust that my interpretations of their cultural talk will further contribute to our own understanding of how we are cultural and to the on going challenges as we continue to negotiate for justice in Treaty relationships.

#### Implications of this study for Psychology...

This study offers an interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary approach to the study of culture, which in turn contributes to a greater understanding not only of the complexity of culture, but also the banal and everyday values and practices that form the foundation of culture. I suggest that studies of culture require multi-dimensional approaches that go beyond the simplistic inter-cultural comparisons so frequently studied in psychology. I further suggest that as psychologists undertake studies of culture they adopt practices such as naming their cultural and social context, so that they do not perpetuate the culturally blind dominance that is current practice.

There is an increasing volume of literature within psychology in the social sciences that offers many different ways in which to approach any study of culture. Those I recommend include: critical social psychology, discourse analysis, representational approaches, cultural studies, and feminist theorising that offers a range of approaches to the study of culture. For example, the development of theory and research in the paradigm of social constructionism, where the study of language, whether it be the way people talk in everyday conversations, what is written in the media, what is broadcast through radio and television and increasingly the internet, provides a rich resource to gain insight into and an understanding of the practices of culture.

Associated with any study of culture are dimensions of power and dominance. Not all cultures are regarded as equal in the societies in which they reside. The dominant group in a society is likely not to regard itself as a cultural group, therefore any study of culture carried out within psychology, because it is a western world discipline, must include the examination of the ways in which dominance and power are factors.

Dominant group members are more likely to consider their practices and values as normal in the society they live in. When researching culture with dominant group people there is often a need to prompt and question to break the silence and encourage dominant group people to talk about how they are cultural and what their culture might look like.

### *Cultural competency and practice considerations*

The notion that all people act out the values and ways of the culture or cultures they are raised in has implications for psychologists in the way they practise. The Code of Ethics (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002, p. 6) requires that psychologists be “responsive to cultural and social diversity and, as a consequence, obtain training, experience and advice to ensure competent and culturally safe service or research”.

To recognise and accept that all people are cultural implies that as psychologists we bring to all our interactions with people, whether they are from our own or a different cultural group, an awareness of the values and practices of our own culture/s. Cultural awareness includes asking questions about the way we talk about the world, and the impact we have on the world. In our interactions with people we need to question whether we are perpetuating the status quo of dominant discourses and practices (Black & Huygens, 2007).

It has become clear to me, through this study of Pākehā culture, that cultural marking has material effects. In a society not being marked as cultural has the effect of maintaining positions of power and dominance for those who are ‘normal’.

It is as imperative that psychologists, because they are most often members of dominant cultural groups and usually in positions of power, adopt the practice of naming their cultural identity in their work and writing as a matter of course.

Further, I recommend that psychologists name as a matter of course both their own cultural identity and, where appropriate, the cultural identities of their participants, in the reporting of any research with people.

The naming of cultural identities gives salient contextual information to the reader of any publication. It allows the reader, for example, to very quickly assess whether the author is writing about their own or the culture of ‘other’ people. This practice would support the recognition that all people are cultural and has implications for cultural competency. Cultural naming may serve to disrupt the ways in which psychologists universalise their own culture as the ‘norm’, assume the privilege of dominance and promote uniformity.

### **Reflexive coda**

This study represents my ‘coming out as Pākehā’ journey. After all, by engaging in this study I was constantly being challenged about my own position of privilege and dominance. I could no longer maintain a stance of cultural invisibility. At times I felt shy and defensive about the topic and resisted discussing anything to do with Pākehā outside my circle of close colleagues, family and friends. My feelings were reflected to some extent in the way Alison Jones (1999), a Pākehā academic, discussed the sense of dismay, resentment and desire (to be part of the whole) that Pākehā students felt when they were taught separately from the Māori and Pacific Island students in their class. The Māori and Pacific Island students relished the experience of being together – they could ‘recentre’ (L. T. Smith, 1999) their knowledges without the dominant group taking up the ‘centre’ (Moreton-Robinson, 1999).

The challenge for dominant group people to ‘decentre’ control of knowledge that Jones alludes to is one that is threaded through this study and through the decolonisation and whiteness literature I have referred to. Some Treaty people recognised the importance of knowledge as they talked about the need to be



right, to engage in ‘black and white’ thinking and of the need to know. Moyra, for example, suggested that to relinquish control of knowledge there was a need for Pākehā to both live in a muddle for a while and to find relationship.

I have at times experienced considerable resistance to the idea that knowledge is culturally based. Alison Jones theorised that Pākehā ‘do’ cultural ignorance to maintain dominance by refusing to or resisting engagement with cultural difference.

*The always-present unconscious resistances and expectations of both the Pākehā teacher and students formed through our enmeshment in colonial history and its western epistemologies, ensure that pedagogies with cultural others will be a practice of struggle to suppress, recognise and to live with our capacities and passions (needs) for ignorance (Jones, 2001, p. 289).*

The notion of ‘doing cultural ignorance’ as a form of active resistance to sources of knowledge that were not predicated on the ‘normal’ became evident to Jones as she sought to understand the reactions of Pākehā students in lectures given by a Māori or Tongan person in a tertiary education setting. The reactions Jones reports are almost identical to those I experienced from some Pākehā students to the instigation of Māori tutorials in the Stage One Social Psychology course I was co-ordinating. The Māori tutorials worked with the exact same material as all the other tutorials and were not advertised as being exclusively for Māori. There were also challenges from students to tutors and lecturers who were not Pākehā or ‘White’ – after all what would they know? The rudeness of students to some tutors was such that on one occasion the tutor asked to withdraw from teaching a particular class. I learned that dominance and intolerance have real material effects for those who are regarded as ‘other’. Even although I understood the politics of racism, I was shocked by the ferocity of the challenges to tutors who were culturally different from the “dominant” group, and I really struggled with what to do about the situation and my own sense of shame about how ‘my’ people were acting.

I expected that it would be difficult to discuss, read and write about issues of colonisation and dominance both personally and with other coloniser people. “Being part of the problem one is seeking to remedy cannot always be denied” (Bonnett, 1994, p. 172). I have found it challenging to accept what has gone before, the blatant and harmful practices of colonisation that my forebears took part in. Through my involvement as a Pākehā psychologist in the National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues (NSCBI) of the New Zealand Psychological Society, for example, I am learning to be vigilant about not perpetuating the habits and practices of colonisation. This has been particularly pertinent of late as the NSCBI are striving to get the Code of Ethics translated

into Māori and for the Māori and English versions to then be accepted as equivalent. I think the challenges are a life time task and the heartening aspect of decolonising work is that I do not have to do it alone.

The journey to 'decentre', to accept that even knowledge is culturally based, while hard to undertake also provides relief as I gradually learn to engage differently with people. I can let go the sense of responsibility for being 'all knowing' and enjoy the possibilities for learning new knowledge.

Through this research process, with the support and engagement of close colleagues, family and friends, I have become more confident about discussing Pākehā culture and been surprised by the interest from and knowledgeable engagements with many people. Culture becomes a very interesting and dynamic topic of conversation once the silence about it is broken. Sometimes, when I talk about researching Pākehā culture, some people immediately start asking about Māori culture and issues. It seems to me that Māori are regarded as having a culture and the dominant group does not, so the research must be about Māori. I wondered about this reaction to culture as being part of the blindness to the notion that we all do live in the cultural world (McHoul & Rapley, 2001).

I now think of this thesis about Pākehā culture as a process of unravelling dominance through making visible the colonising history of my cultural group, and exploring the boundaries of how that cultural group is constituted with the Māori cultural other (Walker, 1989). One of the aspects of the intercultural relationships between Māori and Pākehā was the short number of years it took to shift positions of dominance from Māori to Pākehā. Within 20-30 years of Te Tiriti o Waitangi being signed in 1840, disease, war, and land acquisition by Pākehā had taken a huge toll on Māori numbers and ways of life. At the same time Pākehā people arrived in great numbers and set up a system of government that largely precluded Māori from having a say in the running of what was their land. My forebears mostly arrived to settle in Aotearoa in the mid-1860s. I am fully complicit in enjoying the privileges that my family have accrued through being in the dominant group.

For many years I have struggled to make sense of racism and the systems people put in place to govern and control and my desire to find a different and more just way to learn to live with the diversities between people and in communities. Surely we could find a better way to live together in this land and on this planet? What could I contribute to a better way of living together? Could Pākehā learn to see who they are and change themselves, somewhat belatedly but hopefully

never too late, to become as Mitzi described “the kind of Pākehā that Māori had in mind when they signed the Treaty”?

The question of culture proved to be a vexed one in anti-racism and Treaty work. It was still generally regarded as something other people had. There was a sense of deficit for dominant group members when Treaty relationships with Māori were discussed; after-all, they had a culture but we did not was the general view expressed. However, as we in our Tauranga Treaty group started to talk about culture, and consciously engage in exploring what Pākehā culture might look like, I started to gain a sense of being part of a culture, rather than of not having one. It was during the mid-1980s that talk of Pākehā as a culture began to be actively discussed and debated between Treaty People, in Treaty workshops, public forums, various media, in the academic literature, and, more generally, in New Zealand society.

When I started this research, the question of Pākehā as culture was well and truly out in the open, in the public domain of debate, so it seemed on the surface to be a simple and straightforward study to undertake. Yet I experienced a reluctance at times to discuss Pākehā culture and felt defensive and somewhat protective of the work I was doing. I felt very tender in my identity as Pākehā and did not always want to defend it. I was prompted to recognise the emotional components to marking Pākehā culture when Suze (chapter 7) talked about focusing the workshops they run to try and move people “emotionally so they can cope with being called a Pākehā”. It was moments like these in the research process that encouraged me to keep exploring my feelings and the blocks to writing they presented. I have been able to open up my own sense of actively producing a Pākehā identity and cultural connection.

I find it a challenge to keep examining the structural and political location of Pākehā, to recognise the many aspects of cultural dominance, superiority, privilege, that being on the coloniser side of the Treaty partnership has given me. As with many Pākehā, I have been comfortable with the constructions of dominance and privilege that have served us well. An example is the expectation of assimilation predicated on the adopted practices of the normality of dominant group members for all of those who are different. But assimilation is never quite complete as the biological imperatives associated with race still mark a person out as different. This point was made explicit, for example, by television presenter Paul Henry’s recent conversation with the Prime Minister John Key about the status of the current Governor General of New Zealand as a typical New Zealander (Wichtel, 2010).

Perhaps the best aspect of this journey for me, at a personal level, is the feeling of openness and sense of depth I now experience in my engagements with Māori and with friends and colleagues. I am openly Pākehā and I accept the challenges and the joys of that positioning. However, I have by no means journeyed alone. This study has come to fruition through the support and dedication of the PhD group, my supervisors, colleagues and family and friends.

It has been a privilege to carry out this study of Pākehā culture with people who care about being Pākehā and who are committed to social justice. I am indebted to the Treaty people who contributed to this study and to those in the wider Treaty networks for the work they do. We do have a culture and we have been gifted a name for that culture. I now feel that I do occupy a cultural space. I have resources in my cultural basket, and a greater repertoire of ways to talk about culture. The challenge for me now is to use the cultural knowledge I have gained to work with other Pākehā to seek justice through the Te Tiriti o Waitangi in all relationships with Māori and with people who are from cultures different from mine. The dynamics of Treaty relationships in Aotearoa will, I suggest, take many more twists and turns. There are debates about a Māori flag, which are revealing the complexities of Māori views and politics, as well as raising the ire of the 'one people' lobby. These and many other issues can be embraced as part of our cultural landscape and the ongoing negotiations required in sustaining relationships between people. I recommend the cultural journey. It is full of richness and excitement, and offers endless opportunities to engage more fully, humbly and with a greater degree of openness in intercultural relationships.



# References

- Adams, G., & Markus, H. R. (2001). Culture as Patterns: An alternative approach to the problem of reification. *Culture & Psychology*, 7(3), 283-296.
- Adams, G., & Markus, H. R. (2004). Toward a conception of culture suitable for a social psychology of culture. In M. Schaller & C. S. Crandall (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture* (pp. 283-296). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, B. (1996). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (new ed.). London: Verso.
- Archie, C. (2005). *Skin to Skin: Intimate, true stories of Māori-Pākehā relationships*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin.
- Augoustinos, M., & Reynolds, K. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict*. London: Sage.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1977/1960). *The fern and the tiki: An American view of New Zealand national character, social attitudes, and race relations*. North Quincy, Massachusetts: Christopher Publishing House.
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Māori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet Publications.
- Ballara, A. (1986). *Proud to be white? A survey of Pākehā prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann.
- Banton, M. (1998). *Racial theories* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barclay, K., & Liu, J. (2003). Who gets voice? (Re)presentation of bicultural relations in New Zealand print media. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 32(1), 3-12.
- Barnes, A. L. (2006). *Taku Ara, Taku Mahara: Pākehā family experiences of kaupapa Māori and bilingual education*. Unpublished MA, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Beaglehole, E., & Beaglehole, P. (1946). *Some modern Māoris*. Wellington: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars: and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making Peoples: A history of the New Zealanders. From Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise reformed: A history of the New Zealanders. From the 1880s to the year 2000*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Bell, A. (1996). 'We're just New Zealanders': Pākehā identity politics. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Ngā Pātai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bell, A. (2004). *Relating Māori and Pākehā: the politics of indigenous and settler identities*. Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday myths of Pākehā identity*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Benedict, R. (1935). *Patterns of culture*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Middlesex: Penguin.

- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dansen, P. R. (2002). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bird, L., & Drewery, W. (2000). *Human Development in Aotearoa: A journey through life*. Auckland, NZ: McGraw-Hill.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Black, R. (1997). *Beyond the pale: An exploration of Pākehā cultural awareness*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Black, R., Goodwin, L., & Smith, J. (1995). *The report of an evaluation of the bicultural development of the New Zealand Psychological Society Annual Conference 1994*. Hamilton: National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues. Document Number)
- Black, R., & Huygens, I. (2007). Pākehā culture and psychology. In I. M. Evans, J. J. Rucklidge & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of Psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 49-66). Wellington, NZ: The New Zealand Psychological Society.
- Bonnett, A. (1994). Contours of crisis: Anti-racism and reflexivity. In P. Jackson & J. Penrose (Eds.), *Constructions of race, place and nation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Booth, J. M., & Hunn, J. K. (1962). *Integration of Māori and Pākehā*. Wellington, NZ: R.E. Owen, Government Printer. Document Number)
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowen, G. (2004). *The last and the lovelist: A study of New Zealand identity*. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Brash, D. (2004). Nationhood. Retrieved 27 January 2004, from <http://www.national.org.nz/>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Brislin, R. (1993). *Understanding culture's influence on behavior*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.
- Bulbeck, C. (1992). *Australian women in Papua New Guinea: Colonial passages 1920-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burman, E., & Parker, I. (Eds.). (1993). *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action*. London: Routledge.
- Burns, P. (1989). *Fatal Success: A history of the New Zealand company*. (H. Richardson, Ed.). Auckland, NZ: Heinemann Reed.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2 ed.). London: Routledge.
- Campbell, B. M. (2005). *Negotiating biculturalism: deconstructing Pākehā subjectivity*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Carabine, J. (2001). Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: a*

- guide for analysis* (pp. 267-310). Milton Keynes: The Open University/Sage.
- Carr, S. C. (2003). *Social psychology: Context, communication and culture*. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- Colquhoun, G. (1999). *The art of walking upright*. Wellington: Steele Roberts.
- Consedine, B. (1989). Inequality and the egalitarian myth. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: GP Books.
- Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2001/2005). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Cowlishaw, G. (2004). Racial positioning, privilege and public debate. In A. Moreton-Robinson (Ed.), *Whitening Race: Essays in social and cultural criticism* (pp. 59-74). Canberra ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Cram, F. (1997). Developing partnerships in research: Pākehā researchers and Māori research. *Sites*, 35, 44-63.
- Cram, F., McCreanor, T., Smith, L., Nairn, R., & Johnstone, W. (2006). Kaupapa Māori research and Pākehā social science: Epistemological tensions in a study of Māori health. *Hulili*, 3, 41-68.
- Cream (Writer) (2009). *Border Patrol*. New Zealand.
- Crossley, M. L. (2000). *Introducing narrative psychology: Self, trauma and the construction of meaning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Crossley, N. (2003). From reproduction to transformation: Social movement fields and the radical habitus. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(6), 43-68.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen Unwin.
- Crump, B. (1960). *A good keen man*. Wellington, NZ: AH & AW Reed.
- da Silva, S. F. (2002/1994). Treaty of Waitangi education: A policy issue - No going back: The outcome of Treaty of Waitangi education. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pākehā Treaty work: Unpublished material*. Manukau, NZ: Manukau Institute of Technology.
- Darwin, C. R. (1871). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. London: Murray.
- De Bres, J. (1974). *Migrant labour: the new slave trade: New Zealand style*. Auckland, NZ: CARE.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2005). Emancipatory discourses and the ethics and politics of interpretation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 933-958). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drewery, W., & Bird, L. (2004). *Human Development in Aotearoa: A journey through life* (2 ed.). Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Durie, J. (1999). Naming whiteness in different locations. In B. McKay (Ed.), *Unmasking whiteness: Race relations and reconciliation* (pp. 147-160). Queensland, Australia: Queensland Studies Centre, Griffin University.
- Durrheim, K., Hook, D., & Riggs, D. W. (2009). Race and racism. In D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky & S. Austin (Eds.), *Critical Psychology: An Introduction* (2 ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.



- Edley, N. (2001). Unravelling social constructionism. *Theory & Psychology*, 11(3), 433-441.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Fanon, F. (1986). *Black skin, White masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Feagin, J. R. (1997). Old poison in new bottles: The deep roots of modern nativism. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 348-353). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Feagin, J. R., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race: Power, privilege, and the shaping of cultural consciousness*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Batur, P. (2001). *White racism: The basics* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 57-65). New York: Routledge.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.
- Ford, C. (2005). Race Relations in New Zealand. Retrieved 24 April, 2009, from <http://homepages.ihug.co.nz/~sai/racerenz.html>
- Frankenberg, R. (1992). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. London: Routledge.
- Frankenberg, R. (1997). White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 632-634). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Salisbury Press.
- Freire, P. (1996/1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). London: Penguin.
- Gavey, N. (2005). *Just sex? the cultural scaffolding of rape*: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. J. (1973). Social Psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 309-320.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994/1982). *Toward transformation in social knowledge* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Gibson Group (Writer) (2007). Here to stay: Series one, *Here to stay*. New Zealand: Roadshow Entertainment.
- Gibson, H. M. (2006). *The invisible whiteness of being: The place of whiteness in women's discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand and some implications for antiracist education*. University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Glover, M., Dudgeon, P., & Huygens, I. (2005). Colonization and racism. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being* (pp. 330-347). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grace, P. (2004). *Tu*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Green, M. J., & Sonn, C. C. (2006). Problematizing the discourses of the dominant: Whiteness and reconciliation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 379-395.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.
- Hall, S., & du Gay, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.
- Hamerton, H. (2000). *Growing up or growing down: Pākehā women's memories of Adolescence*. Unpublished PhD, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Hamerton, H., Nikora, L. W., Robertson, N., & Thomas, D. R. (1995). Community psychology in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *The Community Psychologist*, 28(3), 21-23.
- Harré, J. (1966). *Māori and Pākehā: A study of mixed marriages in New Zealand*. Wellington: AH & AW Reed.
- Helms, J. E. (1992). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a white person*: Content Communications.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Methuen.
- Herbert, A. M. L. (2002). Bicultural partnerships in clinical training and practice in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 31(2), 110-116.
- Howarth, C. (2006). Race as stigma: Positioning the stigmatized as agents, not objects. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 442-451.
- Howarth, C. (2009). 'I hope we won't have to understand racism on day': Researching or reproducing 'race' in social psychological research? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 407-426.
- Howitt, D., & Owusu-Bempah, J. (1994). *The racism of psychology: Time for change*: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hunn, J. K. (1961). *Report on Department of Māori Affairs*. Wellington, NZ: R.E. Owen, Government Printer. Document Number)
- Huygens, I. (1999). An accountability model for Pākehā practitioners. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Māori and Psychology: Research and Practice Symposium* (pp. 17-22). University of Waikato: Māori and Psychology Research Unit.
- Huygens, I. (2001, June 2001). *Journeys away from dominance: Dissonance, struggle and right relationships - the journey to accepting indigenous authority*. Paper presented at the 8th Biennial conference of the Society for Community Research and Action, Atlanta, Georgia USA.
- Huygens, I. (2006). Discourses for decolonisation: Affirming Māori authority in New Zealand workplaces *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 363-378.
- Huygens, I. (2007). *Processes of Pākehā change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Unpublished PhD, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Huygens, I. (2009). From colonisation to globalisation: Continuities in Colonial 'commonsense'. In D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky & S. Austin (Eds.), *Critical Psychology: An Introduction* (2 ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Huygens, I., Black, R., & Hamerton, H. (2003). Reflections on Pākehā identity. *The Bulletin of the New Zealand Psychological Society*, 101, 13-16.
- Inkson, K., & Myers, B. A. (2003). "The big OE": self-directed travel and career development. *Career Development International*, 8(4), 170-181.
- Jackson, K., & Harre, J. (1969). *New Zealand*. London: Thames & Hudson.

- Jellie, M. (2001). *The formation of Pākehā Identity in relation to Te Reo Māori and Te Ao Māori*. Unpublished MA, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ.
- Johnston, A. (2008). *Ladies, a plate: Traditional home baking*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books.
- Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire, and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory*, 49(3), 299-316.
- Jones, A. (2001). Cross-cultural Pedagogy and the passion for ignorance. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(3), 279-292.
- Josephides, L. (1995). Replacing cultural markers: Symbolic analysis and political action in Melanesia. In D. de Coppet & A. Iteanu (Eds.), *Cosmos and Society in Oceania*. Oxford: Berg.
- Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politic, and inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 887-907). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kawharu, I. H. (Ed.). (1989). *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Kidd, W. (2002). *Culture and Identity*. New York: Palgrave.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. L. (2003). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 433-488). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- King, M. (1985). *Being Pākehā: An encounter with New Zealand and the Māori renaissance*. Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.
- King, M. (1999). *Being Pākehā now: Reflections and recollections of a white native*. Auckland: Penguin.
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.
- King, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Pākehā: The quest for identity in New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Kirton, J. D. (1997). *Paakeha/Tauīwi - seeing the 'unseen': Critical analysis of links between discourse, identity, 'blindness' and encultured racism*. Kirikiriroa, NZ: WARC (Waikato Antiracism Coalition).
- Lapsley, H., Nikora, L. W., & Black, R. (2002). *"Kia Māuri Tau!" A bicultural study of mental health recovery narratives*. Wellington: Mental Health Commission.
- Larson, V. (2008). Being kiwi now. *North & South*, July, 40-45.
- Lawson, J. (2004). Notes from John Lawson June 2004. Retrieved 10 June, 2009, from [http://www.raglan.co.nz/history\\_notes.htm](http://www.raglan.co.nz/history_notes.htm)
- Levine-Rasky, C. (2000). Framing whiteness: working through the tensions in introducing whiteness to educators. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 3(3), 271-292.
- Liu, J. H., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T., & Teaiwa, T. (Eds.). (2005). *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Love, C., & Waitoki, W. (2007). Multicultural competence in bicultural Aotearoa. In I. M. Evans, J. J. Rucklidge & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of Psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 49-66). Wellington, NZ: The New Zealand Psychological Society.

- Macdonald, C. (1990). *A woman of good character: Single women as immigrant settlers in nineteenth-century New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Allen & Unwin.
- Macfarlane, A. (2005). Inclusion and Māori ecologies: An educultural approach. In D. Fraser, R. Moltzen & K. Ryba (Eds.), *Learners with special needs in Aotearoa New Zealand* (3 ed., pp. 99-116). Palmerston North NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Madriz, E. (2000). Focus groups in feminist research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 835-850). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Makasiale, C. O., Patterson, S., Silipa, N., Tupou, F., Agee, M. N., & Culbertson, P. (2008). Voicing the unspoken: Breaking through the barriers of mainstream institutionalized deafness to Pacific therapeutic practices. In M. Levy, L. W. Nikora, B. Masters-Awatere, M. Rua & W. Waitoki (Eds.), *Claiming spaces: Proceedings of the 2007 National Māori and Pacific psychologies symposium, 23-24 November 2007, Hamilton* (pp. 29-35). Hamilton, NZ: Māori and Psychology Research Unit, University of Waikato.
- Makins, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Collins Concise English dictionary* (3rd ed.). Glasgow: HarperCollins.
- Mansell, R., Tremewan, P., Packman, J., & Thompson, T. (1985). *Pākehā: A pilot kit on taha Pākehā*. Wellington: Project Waitangi.
- Margaret, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Pākehā Treaty work: Unpublished material*. Manukau City, NZ: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.
- May, H. (1992). *Minding children, managing men: Conflict and compromise in the lives of postwar Pākehā women*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- McCreanor, T. (1989). Talking about race. In H. Yensen, K. Hague & T. McCreanor (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pākehā to the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 90-112). Auckland: Penguin.
- McCreanor, T. (1993). Pākehā ideology of Māori performance: A discourse analytic approach to the construction of educational failure in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Folia Linguistica*, 27(3/4), 293-313.
- McCreanor, T. (1995). *Pākehā discourses of Māori/Pākehā relations*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Auckland University, Auckland.
- McCreanor, T. (1997). When racism stepped ashore: Antecedents of anti-Māori discourse. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 26(1), 36-44.
- McCreanor, T. (2005). 'Sticks and stones will break my bones...': Talking Pākehā identities. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities departures and destinations* (pp. 52-68). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- McCreanor, T., & Nairn, R. (2002). Tauīwi general practitioners' explanations of Māori health: Colonial relations in primary healthcare in Aotearoa/New Zealand? *Journal of Health Psychology*, 7(5), 509-518.
- McCreanor, T., & Nairn, R. (2002a). Tauīwi general practitioners' explanations of Māori health: Interpretive repertoires. *The New Zealand Medical Journal* 115(1167).
- McHoul, A., & Rapley, M. (2001). Ghost: Do not forget; this visitation / Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose. *Culture and Psychology*, 7(4), 433-451.
- McIntosh, P. (1997). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In R.

- Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 291-299). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McKay, B. (Ed.). (1999). *Unmasking whiteness: Race relations and reconciliation*. Queensland, Australia: Queensland Studies Centre, Griffith University.
- McKinney, K. D. (2005). *Being White: Stories of race and racism*. New York: Routledge.
- McLauchlan, G. (1976). *The passionless people*. Auckland, NZ: Cassell New Zealand.
- McNab, R. (Ed.). (1914). *Historical Records of New Zealand* (Vol. II). Wellington: John Mackay, Government Printer.
- Mead, M. (Ed.). (1955). *Cultural patterns and technical change*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized* (H. Greenfield, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Metge, J., & Kinloch, P. (1978). *Talking past each other!? Problems of cross cultural communication!* Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Miles, R. (1989). *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Miles, R. (1993). *Racism after 'race relations'*. London: Routledge.
- Miles, R. (1994). Explaining Racism in Contemporary Europe. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity & Identity: On the Western Front* (pp. 189-221). Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage. (Updated 14 Nov 2008). The Centennial Exhibition - New Zealand Centennial, 1940 [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 29 October 2009, from <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/culture/centennial/centennial-exhibition>
- Mitchell, A. (1972). *The half-gallon quarter-acre pavlova paradise*. Christchurch, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Moeke-Maxwell, T. H. (2003). *Bringing home the body: Bi/multi racial Māori Women's hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Unpublished PhD, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Monk, G., Winslade, J., & Sinclair, S. (2008). *New Horizons in multicultural counseling*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Montagu, A. (1972). *Statement on race* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (1999). Unmasking whiteness: A Goori Jondal's look at some Duggai Business. In B. McKay (Ed.), *Unmasking whiteness: Race relations and reconciliation* (pp. 28-36). Queensland, Australia: Queensland Studies Centre, Griffith University.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004a). Unmasking whiteness: A Goori Jondal's look at some Duggai Business. In A. Moreton-Robinson (Ed.), *Whitening Race: Essays in social and cultural criticism* (pp. 28-36). Canberra ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (Ed.). (2004b). *Whitening Race: Essays in social and cultural criticism*. Canberra ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Morgans, B. L. (2004). *Pākehā identity discourses: Beyond 'race' and ethnicity*. University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Mulgan, R. (1989). *Māori, Pākehā and democracy*. Auckland: Oxford.
- Mulvey, A., Terenzio, M., Hill, J., Bond, M. A., Huygens, I., Hamerton, H., et al. (2000). Stories of relative privilege: Power and social change in feminist

- community psychology. *American journal of community psychology*, 28(6), 883-911.
- Murray, M. (2003). Narrative psychology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical guide to research methods*. London: Sage.
- Nairn, M. (2000). Decolonisation for Pākehā. Auckland: Workshop material distributed by CCANZ Programme on Racism.
- Nairn, M. (2002a). Decolonisation or denial: A case study of Pākehā responses to the trauma of colonisation. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pākehā Treaty work: Unpublished material* (pp. 209-213). Manukau City, NZ Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.
- Nairn, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Conference of Churches of Aotearoa New Zealand (CCANZ) Programme on racism collected newsletters 1985 - 2002*. Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.
- Nairn, R. (2003). *Madness, media & mental illness: a social constructionist approach*. Unpublished PhD, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Nairn, R. (2004). *Madness, media & mental illness: a social constructionist approach*. Unpublished PhD, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Nairn, R. (2007). Ethical principles and cultural justice in psychological practice. In I. M. Evans, J. J. Rucklidge & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of Psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 19-34). Wellington, NZ: The New Zealand Psychological Society.
- Nairn, R., & McCreanor, T. (1990). Insensitivity and hypersensitivity: An imbalance in Pākehā accounts of racial conflict. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 293-308.
- Nairn, R., & McCreanor, T. (1991). Race talk and common sense: Patterns in discourse on Māori/Pākehā relations in New Zealand. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 10(4), 245-262.
- Nairn, R., Pega, F., McCreanor, T., Rankine, J., & Barnes, A. (2006). Media, racism and public health psychology. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 11(2), 183-196.
- Nairn, R., & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues. (1997). Cultural justice and ethics in psychological practice. In H. Love & W. Whittaker (Eds.), *Practice issues for clinical and applied psychologists in New Zealand* (pp. 127-135). Wellington: The New Zealand Psychological Society.
- Nash, R. (1990). Society and culture in New Zealand: an outburst for 1990. *New Zealand Sociology*, 5(2), 99-124.
- Nauman, R. (1999). *Culture and heritage*. Auckland: New House.
- Network Waitangi. (1997). The role of tangata tiriti/tauiwi tiriti activists in the struggle for tino rangatiratanga (draft), *Project/Network Waitangi Newsletter* (Vol. June, pp. 13-16). Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.
- New Zealand Psychological Society. (2002). *Code of ethics for psychologists working in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Author.
- Nikora, L. W. (2001). Rangatiratanga and Kawanatanga - resetting our future. *The Bulletin of New Zealand Psychological Society*, 99, 29-32.
- Nikora, L. W. (Ed.). (1993). *Cultural justice and ethics: Proceedings of a symposium held at Annual Conference of New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria, Wellington*. Hamilton, NZ: National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues.



- Novitz, D. (1989). On culture and cultural identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: GP Books.
- Novitz, D., & Willmott, B. (Eds.). (1989). *Culture and identity in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: GP Books.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Orsman, H. W. (Ed.). (1997). *The dictionary of New Zealand English: A dictionary of New Zealandisms on historical principles*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, I., & Shotter, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Deconstructing social psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pearson, D. (1989). Pākehā Ethnicity: Concept or conundrum. *Sites*, 18(Winter), 61-72.
- Pearson, D. (1990). *A dream deferred: The origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Pearson, D., & Sissons, J. (1997). Pākehā and never Pākehā. *Sites*, 35(Spring), 64-80.
- Pellew, J. R. (1995). *Pākehā ethnicity, culture and identity: An examination of ethnic consciousness in Aotearoa-New Zealand*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Personal Narratives Group. (1989). *Interpreting women's lives: feminist theory and personal narratives*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana UP.
- Phillips, J. (updated 4 Mar 09). 'The New Zealanders' [Electronic Version]. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved 10 June 09, from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/the-new-zealanders/11/1>
- Piercy, M., & Freeman, J. (1972). Getting together: How to start a consciousness-raising group. Retrieved 13 September 2009, from <http://userpages.umbc.edu/~korenman/wmst/crguide2.html>
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Ramsden, I. (1990). Cultural safety. *New Zealand Nursing Journal*, December, 18-19.
- Ramsden, I. (2000). Cultural safety/Kawa Whakaruruhau ten years on. *Nursing Praxis in New Zealand*(15), 4-12.
- Ratner, C. (2008). *Cultural psychology, Cross-cultural psychology and Indigenous psychology*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Rattansi, A., & Westwood, S. (Eds.). (1994). *Racism, Modernity and Identity: On the western front*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Reber, A. S., & Reber, E. S. (2001). *The Penguin dictionary of psychology* (3rd ed.). London: Penguin.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ritchie, J. (1964). Contacts and attitudes in the city. In J. E. Ritchie (Ed.), *Race relations : Six New Zealand studies* (pp. 85-99). Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University of Wellington publications in psychology: no. 16.
- Ritchie, J., & Ritchie, J. E. (1978). *Growing up in New Zealand*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Ritchie, J. E. (1963). *The making of a Māori: A case study of a changing community*. Wellington: A.H.&A.W. Reed.

- Ritchie, J. E. (1964a). The evidence for anti-Māori prejudice. In J. E. Ritchie (Ed.), *Race relations : Six New Zealand studies* (pp. 85-99). Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University of Wellington publications in psychology: no. 16.
- Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*. Wellington: Huia/Daphne Brasell Associates.
- Ritchie, J. E. (Ed.). (1964b). *Race Relations: Six New Zealand studies*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University of Wellington publications in psychology: no. 16.
- Robertson, N. (2004). On equality and colourblindness. *The Bulletin of New Zealand Psychological Society*, 102, 26-27.
- Robertson, N., & Masters-Awatere, B. (2007). Community psychology in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Me tiro whakamuri a kia hangai whakamua. In S. M. Reich, M. Riemer, I. Prilleltensky & M. Montero (Eds.), *International community psychology: history and theories* (pp. 140-163). New York: Springer.
- Robinson, T. L. (2005). *The convergence of race, ethnicity, and gender: Multiple identities in counseling* (2nd ed.). Upper slade River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rowling, J. K. (1997). *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *Towards a fair and just society*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Volumes I & II*. (Gail Jefferson, Ed., E.A. Schegloff, Intro.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Kitsuse, J. I. (Eds.). (1994). *Constructing the social*. London: Sage.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1957). Introduction. In A. Memmi (Ed.), *The colonizer and the colonized* (pp. xxi-xxix). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Scott, D. (1975). *Ask that mountain: The story of Parihaka*. Auckland: Heinemann.
- Sherwood, M. (2001). Race, empire and education: Teaching racism. *Race & Class*, 42(1), 1-28.
- Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2004). Attitudes towards biculturalism in New Zealand: Social Dominance orientation and Pākehā attitudes towards the general principles and resource-specific aspects of bicultural policy. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 88-99.
- Sinclair, K. (2000). *A History of New Zealand* (Revised ed.). Auckland: Penguin.
- Smith, A. D. (1986). *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Snedden, P. (2004). The Treaty of Waitangi: Source of disunity or template for cultural inclusion. from <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/pr290204.doc>
- Sonn, C. C., & Green, M. J. (2006). Disrupting the dynamics of oppression in intercultural research and practice. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 337-346.



- Spoonley, P. (1986). Introduction: Being Pākehā - in search of ethnicity. *Sites*, 13(Spring), 1-5.
- Spoonley, P. (1986a). Being Pākehā: An interview with Michael King, May 1986. *Sites*, 13(Spring), 6-13.
- Spoonley, P. (1988). *Racism and ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., & Pearson, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., Pearson, D., & Sedgwick, C. (Eds.). (1984). *Tauīwi: Racism and ethnicity in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2007a). Ethnic groups in New Zealand. *QuickStats about culture and identity*  
Retrieved 31 July, 2008
- Statistics New Zealand. (2007b). *Profile of New Zealand responses, ethnicity question: 2006 census*. Retrieved 12.12.09. from [www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz).
- Steele, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Cultural Identity: a resource for educators: Whakamana tangata* (4 ed.). Wellington: Pacific Education Resources Trust.
- Stone, J., & Stone, D. (1964). A race relations controversy. In J. E. Ritchie (Ed.), *Race relations : Six New Zealand studies* (pp. 51-74). Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University of Wellington publications in psychology: no. 16.
- Taylor, S., & Wetherell, M. (1995). Doing national construction work: Discourses of national identity. *Sites A Journal for South Pacific Cultural Studies*, 30, 69-84.
- Te Awēkotuku, N. (1991). *Mana wahine Māori: Selected writings on Māori Women's art, culture and politics*. Auckland, NZ: New Women's Press.
- Te Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage. New Zealand's National Anthems [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 10 January 2008, from <http://www.mch.govt.nz/anthem/index.html>
- Te Wiata, J. E. (2006). *A local Aotearoa New Zealand investigation of the contribution of Māori cultural knowledges to Pākehā identity and counselling practices*. Unpublished Master of Counselling, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Thomas, D. R. (1986). Culture and ethnicity: Maintaining the distinction. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38(3), 371-380.
- Thomas, D. R., & Nikora, L. W. (1994). *Māori, Pākehā and New Zealander: Ethnic and national identity among New Zealand students*. Unpublished research report, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.
- Thomas, D. R., & Venno, A. (1992). *Psychology and social change*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Tuffin, K. (2005). *Understanding Critical Social Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Tuffin, K. (2008). Racist discourse in New Zealand and Australia: Reviewing the last 20 years. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 591-607.
- Tuffin, K., Praat, A., & Frewin, K. (2004). Analysing a silent discourse: Sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 100-108.
- Tyler, F. B. (1992). Ethnic validity: A model for families on uncharted seas. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 1, 203-222.

- Tyler, F. B. (2001). *Cultures, communities, competence, and change: a transcultural ethnic validity perspective*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Tyler, F. B., Brome, D. R., & Williams, J. E. (1991). *Ethnic validity, ecology, and psychotherapy: a psychosocial competence model*. New York: Plenum.
- Vaughan, G. M., & Hogg, M. A. (2002). *Introduction to social psychology* (3rd ed.). Frenchs Forest NSW: Prentice Hall.
- Vocational Training Council. (1975). *Understanding Pākehās: a pamphlet to help Polynesian migrants understand the European New Zealander's way of life and work*. Wellington: Vocational Training Council.
- Walker, R. (1989). Māori Identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand* (pp. 21-34). Wellington, NZ: GP Books.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (2001). Hostages of History. *Metro*, 236, 82-87.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Penguin.
- Ward, A. (1973). *A show of justice: Racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press/Oxford University Press.
- Ward, A. (1995/1973). *A show of justice: Racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press/Oxford University Press.
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington, NZ: NZCER Press.
- Wepa, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Cultural Safety in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wichtel, D. (2010, October 16-22). Beyond the pale: This time, Paul Henry, you've gone too far. *NZ Listener*, 225, 12-13.
- Wilkinson, S. (2003). Focus groups. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical guide to research methods* (pp. 184-204). London: Sage.
- Williams, D. V. (1999). *'Te Kooti tango whenua': The Native Land Court 1864-1909*. Wellington: Huia.
- Williams, R. M. (2007, 22 June ). 'Hunn, Jack Kent 1906 - 1997'. *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. Retrieved 31 July, 2008, from <http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/>
- Winks, R. W. (1954). *These New Zealanders*. Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Young, R. (1994). Egypt in America: *Black Athena*, racism and colonial discourse. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity and Identity on the western front* (pp. 150-169). Cambridge: Polity Press.



# Glossary of Māori words

Entries are drawn from Walker (2004) unless otherwise shown.

Aotearoa	New Zealand
haka	war dance
hapu	Sub-tribe, descendants, pregnant
Hauhau	common name for Paimarire cult
hikoi	Peaceful walk
iwi	Tribe, bone
ka mate	name of a haka
kapa haka	group of action song performers
manaakitanga	hospitality, help, care for
Māori	normal, natural, hence the name of the tangata whenua
marae	courtyard in front of meeting house
mihimihi	formal speech of welcome
Pākehā	white man, European, related to <i>pakePākehā</i> and <i>Pākehākeha</i> , imaginary beings with fair skins
papakāinga	residence, village settlement
papa-tū-ā-nuku	earth mother
powhiri	formal welcome to a marae
rangatira	chief
Ringātū	a Māori Christian faith founded by Te Kooti
tangata Tauīwi	Non Māori New Zealanders
tangata Tiriti	people of the Treaty
tangata whenua	people of the land
tangi, tangihanga	Weep, cry, funeral, rites for the dead
tapu	Sacred, prohibited, unclean
Tauīwi	strange tribe, foreigner. (Walker, 1990) hence used to denote all non-Māori (Huygens, 2007)
<i>Te Karare</i>	Name of Māori News television programme, TVNZ
te reo Māori	the Māori language
<i>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	The Treaty of Waitangi
whaikorero	speech in reply to formal welcome
whakapapa	Genealogy
whenua	Land, afterbirth, earth, country



# Appendices

## **Appendix 1 Information for Participants 2003**

**Rosanne Black**  
**Psychology Department**  
The University of Waikato  
Private Bag 3105  
HAMILTON, Aotearoa/New Zealand

TELEPHONE: (07) 838 4466 extn 6730  
FACSIMILE: (07) 858 5132  
EMAIL: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)  
MOBILE: 027 4402 796

---



**The  
University  
of Waikato**  
*Te Whare Wānanga  
o Waikato*

*Marking the Unmarked: Reading  
narratives for PāKEHĀ cultural markers*

### **INFORMATION for PARTICIPANTS**

#### **ABOUT THE RESEARCH**

You have been invited to participate in Rose Black's PhD study project to tell the stories of how being involved in Te Tiriti o Waitangi and/or anti-racism groups may have informed your sense of Pākehā identity; and whether being part of a group process may have stimulated and/or reinforced a sense of collective cultural identity.

The invitation to attend a Group interview will be issued through recognised Pākehā Treaty and Antiracism networks. The first group interview will take place on Sunday 5 October 2003, from 12-2pm, at the Wharenuī, Manukau Institute of Technology, Gate 12, Otara Rd, Otara (off East Tamaki Rd).

The group sessions will be both video and audio tape recorded and then examined in a number of ways.

Participant's will be asked to complete a short form with some biographical data on it. This data will be used in a general way to describe the profile of the group when reporting research material. There is no intention to use the biographical data to describe individual participants, unless specific consent to do so is given.

#### **Participation**

Your participation is voluntary. You have the right to completely withdraw from the research at any stage. This right includes an opportunity to change, or have erased any part or the whole of your contribution to the group process.

The first group session as planned is expected to take two hours. Some questions will be asked to initiate the storytelling process. You do not have to answer the questions and you are free to leave the group session at any time.

You are welcome to contact me after the research session if you have any questions or doubts about your involvement in the research. I would like to have the opportunity to contact you after the group session for a follow up if there are any things that I don't understand.

#### **Confidentiality**

After the group session the tape-recordings will be written out in full (transcribed).

Transcripts of research sessions will be returned to participants for reading. At this time each participant will have the opportunity to amend any of their own contributions to the group session.

There are a number of levels of confidentiality that you can agree to which will be repeated on the consent form for you to sign. The options you have are:

1. You can remain anonymous through out the study. Your real name will not be used in any records that will be made available to other members of the group, or in any publicly available research material. You may select a name that you wish to be known by in the research material.
2. You can have your name used in any records stored as original data in the archives of the researcher, or another appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre.
3. You can have your identifying information (e.g. locations, group identities, age, etc.) used in any follow up research sessions, or sessions with other groups.
4. You can have your identifying information used in the PhD study report and other reports and presentations arising from the research.

Your contact name and telephone number, biographical data, interview tapes, and all material relating to the interviews, will be stored in a secure place. The researcher will hold all research material for up to a year following the completion of the PhD report. After that the material maybe lodged in an appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre.

### **Results**

The research will lead to the publication of scholarly articles, a PhD report and possibly a book. Information from the research will be presented at conferences and may be used in some educational materials.

### **Ethical Commitments**

The researcher is bound by and committed to following those standards established by the New Zealand Psychological Society's 2002 Code of Ethics and has a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. The research has been given ethical approval by the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee of the University of Waikato.

**Thank you for participating in the research.**



## **Appendix 2 Consent form for Participants 2003**

University of Waikato

Psychology

Department

### **CONSENT FORM**

#### **PARTICIPANT'S COPY**

Research Project:

#### **Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers**

I have read the information sheet about this research project and the researcher has explained the study to me. My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, or decline to answer any particular questions in the study. I agree to provide information to the researchers under the conditions of confidentiality I have agreed to below:

*(Please initial one or more options)*

1. I would like to remain anonymous through out the study \_\_\_\_\_.
  - My real name will not be used in any records that will be made available to other members of the group, or in any publicly available research material. I wish to be known by the name \_\_\_\_\_ in the research material.
2. I would like to have my name used in any records stored as original data in the archives of the researcher, or another appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I agree to my identifying information (e.g. locations, group identities, age etc) being used in follow up research sessions with this group, or sessions with other groups \_\_\_\_\_.
4. I agree to my identifying information being used in the PhD study report and other reports and presentations arising from the research \_\_\_\_\_.

I agree to participate in this research project.

Participant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact Rose Black (researcher), or the supervisor or the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee.

#### **Researcher information:**

Rose Black,  
Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton  
Ph: 07 838 4466 extn 6730 or 027 4402 796 Email: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)

#### **Supervisor information:**

Professor Jane Ritchie  
Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton  
Ph: 07 838 4466 extn 8402 Email: [j.ritchie@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:j.ritchie@waikato.ac.nz)

**Appendix 3 Participant biographic information form**

Research Project:

**Marking the Unmarked:  
Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers**

**Participant biographic information:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Biographical Data:**

Gender: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: 16-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56+

Ethnic Identity \_\_\_\_\_

Cultural Identity \_\_\_\_\_

Locations that I have lived in or have a sense of belonging to:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Treaty and/or Anti-racism groups I have belonged to or been involved with:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Researcher information:**

Rose Black,

Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton

Ph: 07 838 4466 extn 6730 or 027 4402 796 Email: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)

## **Appendix 4 2003 Focus group questions**

Rose Black

PhD Research Project:

### **Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers**

Questions for 2003 Focus Group research session with:

People who are involved in Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Anti-racism work now.

Would you like to briefly tell the group something about yourself?

- How do you name yourself culturally/ethnically?
- When did you start to become aware of having a cultural identity?
- What were the circumstances of that awareness?
- What does being Pākehā or having a sense of Pākehā identity mean to you?
- Are there particular things about Pākehā culture that you notice?

Would you like to briefly tell the group something about the Te Tiriti and antiracism group you belong to and the work you do?

- How does belonging to that or any group inform your cultural identity?
- How does it stimulate/ strengthen/ reinforce a sense of collective cultural identity?

In analysing the material from this session I will be looking for some of the markers of Pākehā culture that are discussed by participants that might lead to ways of strengthening a sense of Pākehā cultural identity in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners and to other tangata tauwiwi groups.

## **Appendix 5 Letter to 2003 focus group participants**

**Rosanne Black**  
**Psychology Department**  
The University of Waikato  
Private Bag 3105  
HAMILTON, Aotearoa/New Zealand

TELEPHONE: (07) 838 4466 extn 8040  
FACSIMILE: (07) 858 5132  
EMAIL: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)  
MOBILE: 027 4402 796



**The  
University  
of Waikato**  
*Te Whare Wānanga  
o Waikato*

12 March 2005

Dear Participants

Many thanks to all of you for participating so generously in the focus group on Pākehā culture in October 2003. Thanks also to those of you who have given feedback about your own story. For those of you I haven't heard from I have worked on the assumption (in letter, 28 January 2005 and in email, end of February), that I can follow your consent form and include your story.

Please find enclosed a copy of the collected stories shared in the focus group. I am sending these around:

- 1) to provide you with a transcript of the whole session, since some participants needed to depart before all the stories were told
- 2) to give you an opportunity, should you wish to take it, of reflecting on any general themes that you perceive in the stories about Pākehā culture.

I hope you enjoy reading them. In my upcoming visit to you I am interested in discussing your thoughts about any themes relating to the growth and development of Pākehā and Tauīwi identity that you wish to discuss. In effect this is a completion of the five questions posed in the 2003 focus group.

My research focus is to try to articulate "markers" of Pākehā culture. Since we are all tangata Tiriti exploring our cultural identity I would value the opportunity to co-theorise with you about themes of Pākehā culture prior to holding a second focus group at the 2005 conference.

With kind regards

Rose Black

## **Appendix 6 Collected stories notes for 2005 conference**

### **Marking the Unmarked in stories of Pākehā and Taiwi identity**

Notes from initial analysis of *Stories of Pākehā and Taiwi Identity* (October 2003)  
Feedback to MIT Treaty Conference 2005

#### **Coming into a Pākehā Identity**

Family experiences  
Being a New Zealander  
Noticing difference  
Overseas travel  
Relationships with Māori  
Antiracism and Treaty

##### **Karen**

“At times it was like being in a dinghy with no oars on a stormy sea”

#### **What being Pākehā means to me**

##### **Wendy**

It does start with the spirits of this land I think mana atua, mana whenua and mana tangata - so it's about the people, the land and the ancestors that are standing right here. So where do I stand on Māori land? I stand on Māori land, so that question is quite simple to answer.

##### **Edwina**

For me it's what gives me my place here in relation to the land and to the people. I think it's the sense of belonging in Aotearoa. I mean it's the thing that gives us our place here.

##### **Jen**

I suppose what having that sense of Pākehā identity is about is being in this land and the responsibilities and history of that. It's about acknowledging relationships with Tangata whenua. It is a very strong grounding and gives you a base for being here and a place to be. We use the word Pākehā and Pākehā culture in different ways: Generally to describe New Zealand European culture. But lots of people who are of that culture won't use that term. So maybe Pākehā culture is not about that bigger picture because the people who call themselves Pākehā and take pride in that term have gone through some of that journey about what being Pākehā is. For people who take that term and have looked and worked on that journey of our history and our understandings and our responsibilities, it's a different thing than white New Zealand culture. And if that's how we look at it, I feel a bit more positive about it because it represents some positive stuff. Because I think that's one of the things that is difficult ... is finding our own ancestors and our positive stories.

##### **Moyra**

Pākehā-Taiwi as a minority group within tangata tiriti and in relationship with tangata whenua

##### **Moea**

I'm proud to be Pākehā because its about the new identity – not the old 'we're all New Zealanders'. It's a different identity.

##### **Karen**

Being Pākehā means being a descendant of British settlers and this gives me an identity as a Treaty partner

**Jo**

I have an identity that I link to here through the Treaty. Being Pākehā is about a political stance.

### **Things I notice about Pākehā culture**

**Catriona**

... the tendency to assume that that's it - there isn't any other way of being.

**Wendy**

That we live in a racist regime

**Jen**

I think that inherent in that [colonising] culture is stuff about being right, because you have to feel like you're right to be able to go and impose your culture on other people. And that your culture's right and that you hold power in that knowing.

**Jo**

In the wider culture are the things that people have talked about: the ethnocentrism and the absolute assumption of 'there is only one right way', and the absolute positioning of that. In terms of my identification of Pākehā I think it is about recognising that and trying to work differently with that notion to change it into another space.

**PAL**

We grew up in between two families who identified as being New Zealanders and as kiwis. And I always acknowledge the family who grew up alongside us because they represented everything that kiwi was. They got up at 6 o'clock in the morning, they had very rigid routines about stuff and they had tea at five o'clock and only their family had tea. Our family life living next door was completely different. We had people always living with us, we had different food, and we had different ways of doing lots of different things. We could run our clocks by their timetable. I knew that it was Wednesday because the sheets were on the line next door. It was very clear and you know Aunty Margaret baked on Thursdays. She always baked – slices, biscuits, pavlova - it was just amazing. But the other thing was they had grandparents and we didn't ... we missed out on that inter-generational thing.

**Suze**

I think the unconsciousness is what I notice. They're unconscious about who they are yeah. And the thing that saddens me most is still hearing that Pākehā have no culture. And the desperation that I see within New Zealand for Pākehā people to make everyone like them still. "You're just a kiwi, it's alright you're just a kiwi", you know. The other thing that pains me most is that the only thing that seems to be able to bring us together as people is rugby. You know its become a real tribal thing which I can't bear and its only time that people fell like they can be together and be one and be happy about who they are.

**Bridget**

... about rugby and the sort of Kiwi blokish culture that's what I notice very much is promoted through the media. And the use of the word WE when there is a national bloke's team playing something somewhere and people say oh isn't it great that we won. Pardon you know, that WE doesn't represent me, I don't feel any part of that at all.

**Moyra**

being able to fix things – giving it a go

**Moea**

time - 'got to be on time and if other people aren't on time, I just get so wound up'.  
Land – the New Zealand view of land and land use and the overlay of Māori whenua and all the values and stuff around that

**Marisa**

Part of our family culture is that there were a lot of things that never got aired – parents not fighting in front of kids

**Karen**

Some things that I value about Pākehā culture are that we are innovative and inventive; that when we are able to be creative and use our inborn talents we are at our best. We can be generous, and we do have a strong sense of justice when we understand issues. On the negative side, there is still a patriarchal system that tries to keep us constrained for its own purposes. I think that there are a lot of Pākehā people who are ignorant through lack of knowledge, because information has been deliberately withheld from them. I also believe that there is no excuse for ignorance any more. There is a wealth of information available to anyone who cares to look and question.

**David J**

I notice a very strong emphasis on oneness. That anything different is divisive, and in workshops when people say "But that's divisive", I talk about it as diversity, but that's very difficult for them. So I am not sure where that strong drive that we have to be all the same comes from

**Angeline**

... there is that focus on oneness and not celebrating diversity and when I was younger I adopted that as well and I took that on board and I thought I've got to fit in, don't rock the boat, fit in and just go with the dominant Pākehā culture and just lie low and don't let anything upset that balance, upset that flat kind of okay-ness which I just went along with.

And now I just think oh no way you know I wouldn't want to accept that in myself anymore.

**Alex**

Our pre-occupation and obsession with science and objectivity and that's a colonial import firstly. But that we continue ... to really need to know everything that needs to be known and that process has really hurt a lot of people throughout this country, this region and the world and who is benefiting from that? Our pre-occupation with IT and technology and all of that stuff and just being distanced and objective from some things is quite noticeable. That's the dominant culture.

## **Appendix 7 Information for Participants 2005**

**Rosanne Black**  
**Psychology Department**  
The University of Waikato  
Private Bag 3105  
HAMILTON, Aotearoa/New Zealand

TELEPHONE: (07) 838 4466 ext 8040  
FACSIMILE: (07) 858 5132  
EMAIL: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)  
MOBILE: 027 4402 796



The  
University  
of Waikato  
*Te Whare Wānanga  
o Waikato*

### ***Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers***

## **INFORMATION for PARTICIPANTS**

### **ABOUT THE RESEARCH**

You have been invited to participate in Rose Black's PhD study project to tell the stories of how being involved in Te Tiriti o Waitangi and/or anti-racism groups may have informed your sense of Pākehā identity; and whether being part of a group process may have stimulated and/or reinforced a sense of collective cultural identity.

The invitation to attend a Focus Group will be issued through recognised Pākehā Treaty and Antiracism networks. A second focus group, to discuss the notion of **Collective Identity as Pākehā**, will take place at the **Treaty Conference 2005**, at Nga Kete Wananga Marae, Manukau Institute of Technology, Gate 12, Otara Rd, Otara (off East Tamaki Rd), on Saturday 30 April 2005.

The focus group session will be video and audio recorded and then examined by the researcher in a number of ways.

Participants will be asked to complete a short form with some biographical data on it. This data will be used in a general way to describe the profile of the group when reporting research material. There is no intention to use the biographical data to describe individual participants, unless specific consent to do so is given.

### **Participation**

Your participation is voluntary. You have the right to completely withdraw from the research at any stage. This right includes an opportunity to change, or have erased any part or the whole of your contribution to the group process.

The focus group session as planned is expected to take two hours. Some questions will be asked to initiate the group discussion. You do not have to answer the questions and you are free to leave the group session at any time.

You are welcome to contact me after the research session if you have any questions or doubts about your involvement in the research. I would like to have the opportunity to contact you after the group session for a follow up if there are any things that I don't understand.



### **Confidentiality**

After the group session the recordings will be written out in full (transcribed). A transcript of research session will be circulated to participants for reading. At this time each participant will have the opportunity to amend any of their own contributions to the focus group session.

There are a number of levels of confidentiality that you can agree to which will be repeated on the consent form for you to sign. The options you have are:

5. You can have your own name and any potentially identifying information as it appears in the focus group transcript being used in all research material and publications related to this study.
6. You can have your own name and any potentially identifying information being used in material circulated to participants in the study. In all other research material and publications you can use a different name.
7. You can have your own name being made available in any records stored as original data in the archives of the researcher, or later with another appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre.
8. You can remain **anonymous** through out the study. Your own name and any identifying information will not be used in any records that will be made available to other members of the group, or in any publicly available research material or publications. You may select a name that you wish to be known by in the research material.

Your contact name and telephone number, biographical data, interview tapes, and all material relating to the interviews, will be stored in a secure place. The researcher will hold all research material for up to a year following the completion of the PhD report. After that the material maybe lodged in an appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre.

### **Publications**

The research will lead to the publication of scholarly articles, a PhD report and possibly a book. Information from the research will be presented at conferences and may be used in some educational materials.

### **Ethical Commitments**

The researcher is bound by and committed to following those standards established by the New Zealand Psychological Society's 2002 Code of Ethics and has a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. The research has been given ethical approval by the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee of the University of Waikato.

**Thank you for participating in the research.**

## **Appendix 8 Consent form for Participants 2005**

University of Waikato

Psychology Department

### **CONSENT FORM PARTICIPANT'S COPY**

Research Project:

**Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers -  
Collective Identity as Pākehā Focus Group – April 2005**

I have read the information sheet about this research project and the researcher has explained the study to me. My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, or decline to answer any particular questions in the study. I agree to provide information to the researchers under the conditions of confidentiality I have agreed to below:

*(Please initial one or more options)*

1. I agree to my own name and any potentially identifying information as it appears in the focus group transcript being used in all research material and publications related to this study  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. I agree to my own name and any potentially identifying information being used in material circulated to participants in the study. In all other research material and publications I wish to be known as  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. I agree to my own name being made available in any records stored as original data in the archives of the researcher, or later with another appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. I agree to remaining **anonymous** through out the study  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - My own name or any identifying information will not be used in any records that will be made available to other members of the group, or in any publicly available research material.
  - In all research material I wish to be known by the name  
\_\_\_\_\_

**I agree to participate in the Collective Identity as Pākehā Focus Group**

Participant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact Rose Black (researcher), or Professor Jane Ritchie (supervisor) or the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee.

**Researcher information:**

Rose Black, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton

**Ph:** 07 838 4466 X 8040 **Email:** [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)

**Supervisor information:**

Professor Jane Ritchie, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton **Ph:** 07 838 4466 X 8402 **Email:** [j.ritchie@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:j.ritchie@waikato.ac.nz)

## **Appendix 9 2005 Focus group questions**

### ***Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers***

**BACKGROUND:** At the last MIT Treaty Conference in October 2003, I facilitated a focus group session where participants considered the following questions:

Would you like to briefly tell the group something about yourself?

- How do you name yourself culturally/ethnically?
- When did you start to become aware of having a cultural identity?
- What were the circumstances of that awareness?
- What does being Pākehā or having a sense of Pākehā identity mean to you?
- Are there particular things about Pākehā culture that you notice?

Since that conference I have transcribed the stories that were told and circulated to them to the participants and done some preliminary analysis. During March and April of this year I arranged to visit as many participants as possible in their own town to discuss the last question above, which due to time constraints was not covered very fully in the initial stories.

To finish off the data gathering process for my PhD I intend to facilitate a focus group discussion on the notion of Collective Identity as Pākehā at the MIT Treaty Conference 2005. The focus group will take place on Saturday 30 April.

When analysing the all the material from participants I will be looking for some of the markers of Pākehā culture that might lead to ways of strengthening a sense of Pākehā cultural identity in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners and to other tangata tauwi groups.

Focus Group Questions on Collective Identity as Pākehā, for a discussion with Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Anti-Racism Educators.

- How does being in a group of self-identified Pākehā stimulate, strengthen, and/or reinforce a sense of collective identity as Pākehā in relation to Māori as Te Tiriti partners and to other tangata tauwi groups?
- How do these identified cultural markers relate to
  - A sense of collective identity;
  - The kind of Pākehā we are seeking to become?

## **Appendix 10 Letter to 2005 focus group participants**

**Rosanne Black**  
**Psychology Department**  
The University of Waikato  
Private Bag 3105  
HAMILTON, Aotearoa/New Zealand

TELEPHONE: (07) 838 4466 extn 8040  
FACSIMILE: (07) 858 5132  
EMAIL: [rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)  
MOBILE: 027 4402 796

---



### *Marking the Unmarked: Reading narratives for Pākehā cultural markers*

Greetings to research participants

Thank you again for being part of the focus group discussion at Treaty Conference 2005 about collective Pākehā identity. I am now attaching the transcript of that focus group discussion, held at Nga Kete Wananga Marae, Manukau Institute of Technology on 30 April 2005.

Please check through your own contribution for accuracy and sense, bearing in mind the context in which the stories were told and return any changes to me ([rblack@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rblack@waikato.ac.nz)) by **Monday 12 September 2005**.

Keep in mind when you are reading the transcript of the discussion that it is a written version of spoken talk and is not necessarily how one would write. As we don't tend to speak in sentences I have added punctuation as I thought appropriate.

You are free to withdraw from this research at any time.

If I haven't heard from you by Monday 12 September 2005 I will assume that you are happy with your contribution/s as they read now to be included in my PhD research project on Pākehā Cultural Markers.