Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

Kei hopu tōu ringa ki te aka taepa, engari kia mau ki te aka matua.
(Do not grasp the vine that hangs loose, but hold tight to the parent vine, anchored firmly below to Papa the earth and above to Rangi the sky.) (H M Mead, 1996; 54)

Introduction

The article involves a search for what might be useful, relevant and appropriate research framework for Māori for the study of Māori development and learning. It is also an attempt to articulate psychological approaches that will validate indigenous cultural epistemologies that support indigenous movements towards self-determination and that also provide useful tools for examining development and learning.

In seeking to articulate research as well as theoretical approaches that can be validly used in the study of Māori development and learning, the advice above given to Tāwhaki by his kuia, Whaitiri, to guide his ascent to the heavens in search of particular forms of knowledge is pertinent. There are many theoretical approaches, methodologies and methods that might be used in studying development and learning. How does one know when one is climbing the safe, viable, appropriate vines, those rooted firmly in Papatūānuku and secured above to Ranginui? When buffeted by alternative theoretical winds, how does one identify those that will support the development of theory and research that will be of positive use to Māori and that will sit comfortably within a Kaupapa Māori framework?

A Kaupapa Māori framework being proposed for the study of Māori development and learning takes cognisance of movements towards the 'indigenisation' of psychology, and incorporates critical psychological and sociocultural theorising. It enables a multi-levelled focus spanning sociocultural, political, historical and social contexts. I have a leaning towards sociocultural theory because it has been greatly responsible for revealing 'culture' and 'development' as inextricably entwined. Sociocultural or co-constructivist approaches to development and learning are in congruence with a Kaupapa Māori framework, to the extent that they seek to understand, affirm and validate social practices in all their shapes and hues, across cultures. As a component of this 'comprehensive' framework, critical psychology provides a lens through which to understand, critique and search for ways of overcoming the role 'Psychology' has in maintaining inequitable and unjust conditions as the status quo (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997). Discussions around indigenous psychology also help to shape ideas around how relationships between Māori and non-Māori approaches to development and learning might be conceived, and enacted.

Taku Tūranga Ake

I have a history of study and research that has Developmental Psychology as a base. In somewhat of a paradox (given the discussion below!) at one level I am quite comfortable with this. Our development, behaviour and learning are what interest me. Much of my formalised 'study' of humans has occurred from within the so-called ivory towers of academia. While I had initially chosen to study 'pure' Psychology I soon focused on the developmental area that at the time was, and generally still is, primarily concerned with children. I think that if one wants to find out about our psychological development one should at least concentrate on humans, which probably explains why as an undergraduate I had found it hard to understand the relevance of studying the behaviour of rats and pigeons, not to mention the physiology of a sheep's brain. I also believe that we develop, learn and behave in relationships with others. Understandings of development and learning are located in understandings of relationships of humans with humans, not in the sensations individuals get from skin pricking instruments.

As a researcher I have found myself travelling up many and varied aka, psychological or otherwise. Critiques of so-called western academic and intellectual fields by historically disempowered groups - indigenous, colonised, women - beg the question, is it possible to use and to develop knowledge in empowering ways in fields that themselves have played fundamental roles in disempowerment? In particular, can psychological approaches to development provide ways and means of studying and understanding development of an indigenous, colonised people?

In its relatively brief existence as a field of study and research, western 'Developmental Psychology' has been premised around notions of the 'natural order' of development, and optimal conditions for ensuring this natural order. This natural order, located in the norms, values, beliefs and practices of the 'powerful' in western society, has been broadcast world-wide in the form of developmental templates. The cultural underpinnings of developmental descriptions coming out of the 'west' have been largely unrecognised or ignored. Such globalisation of developmental psychology has had significant side-effects for non-(dominant) western cultures, including Māori (Burman, 1994).

In Māori Education at the University of Auckland we have often joked about my position, which for many years appeared that of a somewhat lone psychological voice in a more sociological chorus of history, feminism, difference, policy, and so on.

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

Across institutions in Aotearoa-New Zealand however, Māori academics are pursuing Māori ways of understanding, interpreting (and creating) Māori psychological development as an area of study in which they have chosen to work.

Enriquez, (1989; 69) writing about the development of indigenous psychology notes that;

[t]he development and utilization of indigenous viewpoints can no doubt be approached in a number of ways. More importantly, it occurs at many levels and cuts across many disciplines. What appears to be an isolated development in a particular discipline in a particular country usually proves to be part of an over-all pattern.

For indigenous people working in arguably western academic arenas, who are 'employed' (fiscally or otherwise) in making space for our views, our cultural knowledge and ourselves, there is much work to do.

To place this article within its historical context, it was written about the time I, along with two other Māori women, was conferred a Doctorate of Philosophy. It was written at a time that might be described as a golden period in terms of Māori completing PhDs, particularly within Education. Hopefully this time becomes representative of a new 'status quo', that of Māori aspiring to and achieving in higher echelons of academic study. An almost cultural characteristic of many theses completed by Māori during the time is that writers identify where they have come from and to whom they belong. By this I do not mean identifying themselves in terms of Māori whakapapa (although this almost invariably does occur), but in terms of how their personal histories relate to the academic and research enterprises represented in their thesis.

'Insider', 'Participant,' 'Researcher', 'Kura kaupapa Māori parent', Māori woman with Ngā Puhi and Pākehā genealogical connections (to name but a few) are not hats that I put on and take off. They are not different coloured spectacles, one of which I may choose to look through at any given time. I do not see these as multiple positionings. Rather, these are some of the facets or dimensions that make me who I am. One or another dimension might come to the foreground or go into the background, depending on the circumstance. But they are also facets of me as 'researcher'.

I openly declare that I am part of and am totally committed to particular Māori educational, political and cultural movements. This does not represent a problem or a research-related dilemma, it just is. I believe recognising and openly acknowledging where one belongs, what one belongs to as part of your research whakapapa so to speak is fundamental to a Kaupapa Māori approach, irrespective of the discipline area or field one wishes to align oneself with.

Sociocultural Approaches to Research

To date, much of my research work has drawn heavily on what are variously described as sociocultural or co-constructivist perspectives of development. A key axiom of such theoretical perspectives is that development and learning need to be understood in relation to the social contexts in which they occur. By contexts I include the political, historical and societal, as well as the social and cultural, that influence (and arguably, are influenced by) development and learning. Greenfield & Cocking describe researchers who have written from similar positions as having "managed to combine data from historical, sociological, cultural, and psychological sources to explore multiple levels of causality of developmental phenomena" (1994; xv).

I have a leaning towards sociocultural theory because it has been greatly responsible for revealing 'culture' and 'development' as inextricably entwined. Sociocultural method, in particular its facility in variously fore-grounding and backgrounding features of 'the big picture' on which one is focused, is also greatly appreciated (eg. Rogoff, 1995). The comprehensive (as opposed to eclectic) nature of such 'theory' being incorporated in the framework may be conceived of as providing a set of lenses that can be attached to a 'research camera' in various combinations. As a sociocultural approach enables one to keep the 'big picture' in view at all times, whilst focusing on selected smaller parts of it. Much like using modern cameras that allow you to decide what kind and which part of a view you want fore-grounded in the lens while ensuring that the rest does not end up all out of focus, or left out of the shot entirely (Rogoff, 1995). For example, the context as 'historical' as well as the context as 'social and cultural' can be kept in the research frame.

However, in general sociocultural perspectives do not explicitly recognise the political context. That is, ways that dimensions of power intersect with the psychology of 'development and learning' are not commonly acknowledged. As well as acknowledging that whatever developmental phenomena is focused on is inseparable from a greater sociocultural whole, including issues of power, I want a methodological and theoretical framework that appreciates I am present in 'the big picture'. In a sense rather than being behind the camera, I am in the camera-shot itself.

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

I have also endeavoured to locate Kaupapa Māori at the base of research. It is argued that what such an approach requires is more than a 'taking for granted' of the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge, language and worldviews. It involves recognition of bias and subjectivity as inherent to this as much as to any other approach. However, unlike many conventional theoretical and research approaches, it treats such bias and subjectivity not simply as an obstacle to be minimised or overcome but rather as what needs to be openly acknowledged and demonstrated. By openly acknowledging the values and experiences that affect our work as researchers and writers, "we expose our work to a kind of scrutiny that more mainstream work avoids" (Fox & Pilleltensky, 1997; 15).

In order to develop Kaupapa Māori research and theory in relation to the study of development that are Māori-useful and safe, a critical sense of how social sciences such as Psychology have impacted on our history and our culture is called for. We need to identify aspects that have potential to act as dangerous and dis-empowering frameworks. Conversely we also need to identify whether there are theory and research approaches contained within such a field that may be used as tools in positive and empowering ways.

Critical Psychological Perspectives

'Critical psychology' as a generic label for developments occurring across a range of psychological fields, has emerged out of internal disenchantment and external criticism of psychology, some of which has been outlined above. Many contemporary theoretical movements, such as anti-colonialism, feminism and post-modernism have influenced the development of critical psychology. Critical psychology approaches in the field conventionally known as developmental psychology, as well as critical approaches being used in other disciplines to address issues of colonisation and de-colonisation, are uncovering theoretical and conceptual ways of working which are potentially very useful in studying and understanding Māori development and learning.

A fundamental concern shared by 'critical psychologists' working across the range of psychological areas is the evaluation of "theories and practices of psychology in terms of how they maintain an unjust and unsatisfying status quo." (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997;3). Critical psychology generally draws on 'critical theory' that has its roots in the Frankfurt school and shares common elements underlying 'critical theory' approaches. These elements reflect emancipatory agendas, commitment to change and desire to address injustices and inequalities (Gibson, 1986). Critical theory approaches have also

contributed significantly to articulation of Kaupapa Māori theory.

Prilleltensky and Fox (1997) describe values that critical psychologists generally identify as of key importance. These include; social justice, self-determination and participation, human wellbeing and diversity. They also outline a number of central concerns that critical psychology aims to address, including;

1) Conventional psychology's pre-occupation with individualism;
2) Psychology's role in the identification and privileging of values and norms of the 'powerful', and 'dominant' groups;
3) Power disparities and our own roles as 'psychologists' in oppression.

A requisite for critical psychological research or applied practice is an explicit recognition of 'subjectivity'. That is, the practice of critical psychology involves identification of the subjective nature of one's efforts. Working as a critical psychologist requires acknowledging the degree to which moral values, political allegiances, and personal and professional experience affect choices made and positions taken. This extends to ensuring work one engages in should be morally defensible (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997).

From a critical psychological view, 'subjectivity' and 'intersubjectivity' have significance as psychological terms that extend way beyond notions around the perceiving self and around psychological interaction. Black England-based academic Amina Mama (1995; 1) describes her use of the concept of subjectivity "instead of the psychological terms 'identity' and 'self'" to indicate her rejection "of the dualistic notion of psychological and social spheres as essentially separate territories: one internal and one external to the person.".

'Subjectivity' has been used to look at how relative positions of power and powerlessness that a group may hold within society affects the way individuals perceive their personal societal positions. In this sense, there is overlap with more sociological approaches in 'critical theory' (Gibson, 1986; Giroux, 1983). This is unsurprising, given the previously mentioned over-lapping genealogy of German critical psychology and critical theory - their shared geographical, intellectual and cultural origins. I think the relevance of subjectivity as conceptualised in terms of power is in its potential usefulness for trying to understand the wide variations in responses of indigenous, colonised peoples to the positioning of their cultures in contemporary societies.

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

This is illustrated for example in varied reactions to indigenous-driven interventions, including the range of Māori responses to the emergence of Kura Kaupapa Māori.

The notion of metasubjectivity in critical psychological methodology (e.g. Mama, 1995) overlaps with discussions and approaches to Kaupapa Māori research in the field of Māori education (e.g. Bishop, 1996; L. Mead, 1996; L. Smith, 1991). In summary, these relate to questions about relationships between the 'researcher', the 'researched' and the research itself. These relate to issues about who defines, designs and controls research. In criticalpsychological research, shared metasubjectivity between the 'researcher' and 'researched' is a necessary element.

Metasubjectivity has implications for generalisation of research findings or outcomes. Rather than generalisation being seen as a closed system of concrete-abstract, generalisation is located within knowledge sharing between research participants. It is premised on the assumption that results will not be simply developing knowledge about the researched for general(ised) dissemination and discussion, but will develop knowledge for the researched. Generalisation occurs when communication between 'researchers' and 'researched' is made possible through the researched appropriating necessary theoretical structures. This also entails that any 'problem' being investigated needs to be a problem for the researched, not about the researched. This doesn't necessarily mean that the researched initially or explicitly identify the research problem, but that they too understand it as a problem, and that in understanding the problem, working to identify solutions is in their interests.

From this position, any form of deception is not considered an appropriate characteristic of research that involves 'subjects' as co-investigators, although of course there is still the possibility of co-investigators deceiving the primary researchers! However in this kind of research, 'subjects' have a vital and personal interest in learning about problems or issues of interest. Part of the research task involves working to increase knowledge and understandings of 'subjects' about a particular issue or problem. It also involves working to increase the likelihood of productive actions and change, thus incentives for deception are minimised.

It has been observed that in conventional or mainstream psychology attempts to intervene in social inequities and injustices, energy tends to be focused on trying to 'fix' individual problems, rather than on tackling structural, institutional and societal ones (e.g. Fox & Prilleltensky,

1997). Psychological endeavour aimed at making change often involves supporting minor reforms, rather than radical change. As an alternative across the range of psychological fields, 'critical psychology' approaches are not easy approaches, given the fundamental mission to facilitate change; not only in the field of psychology but also in society.

According to Tolman (1994; 144) psychology needs to be about producing;

the kind of knowledge that individual human beings need in order to expand their real possibilities for meaningful participation in the collective regulation of the conditions covering their own lives. Only in this way can psychology become genuinely critical.

In Search for a Psychology that Reflects Māori Realities and Answers the Needs of Māori Society
(modified from Enriquez, 1989; 105)

To continue addressing the challenge described initially, to what extent can psychological theory and method be Māori-useful in the study of Māori development and learning? To misquote Tolman (1994), how do we ensure that developmental psychology in Aotearoa-New Zealand does not remain yet another discipline about us, but rather operates as a discipline for us?

Across a range of disciplines, growing numbers of Māori researchers are engaged in a process of developing 'Māori centred' as opposed to 'Māori friendly' theory and praxis. In a discussion around schooling and notions of difference, Patricia Johnston defines 'Māori friendly' as that which focuses predominantly upon "sensitising environments to the cultural needs of Māori students" and aims at improving "the life chances of Māori students through the sensitising process" (1998; 179). 'Māori centred' schooling places "Māori at the centre; it recognises structural (as well as cultural) dynamics and locates them as pivotal to addressing Māori educational under-achievement (1998; 174). The stance of Kōhanga Reo as a whānau education provision and Kura Kaupapa Māori as a compulsory schooling provision is that Māori knowledge and cultural values and practices are their core.

Kaupapa Māori theorising has arisen out of such 'Māori centred' approaches to education and to other institutionalised systems in contemporary Aotearoa-New Zealand. Kaupapa Māori theory continues to develop out of flax roots initiatives that have emerged in response to Māori cultural, linguistic and educational aspirations. As 'theory' and 'transformative praxis', kaupapa Māori exists as much as cultural practice, as it does as theory and as structural intervention that makes space for cultural practice (G. Smith, 1997).

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

Taina Pohatu (1996) argues that kaupapa Māori praxis should not be limited to the revitalisation of language, knowledge and culture within contexts of formal schooling, but needs to be extended into the socialisation of these within so-called informal contexts such as home and whānau (see also G. Smith, 1997; 98).

Thus Kaupapa Māori doesn't function simply as a theoretical framework, although it provides theoretical direction and underpins research agenda (L. Mead, 1996). It is lived philosophy within many Māori homes, whānau, education and other Māori contexts. It certainly imbues many sociocultural contexts in which I live and of which I am a part. This article also explores to what extent psychological theory and research methods can be integrated with theory that has an essential element which is simultaneously Māori, transformative and lived. The rise of Kaupapa Māori theory has implications in efforts occurring world-wide to develop indigenous theoretical frameworks for the understanding and discussion of learning and development that often cut across a range of traditional western disciplines and fields (e.g. Cajete, 1994, Enriquez, 1989, Pere, 1994).

Is one of the paths ahead the formation of 'Kaupapa Māori Developmental Psychology' as another related field of study and research? When met with charges of academic imperialism, and challenges to make their respective fields less dangerous and more relevant for Māori, some academics within psychological fields have shrugged them off on the grounds that there "is no such thing as Māori psychology". What they generally mean is that there is nothing presented as 'Māori psychology' in forms that they accept as 'legitimate' and 'valid' academic knowledge. A substantial written body of psychological literature about Māori, for Māori, and through the medium of Māori language has yet to be developed. However,

[a] strict adherence to the union-card criterion of a psychologist would of course exclude not only a sizeable number of eminent thinkers in the Western tradition and scholars who obtained their degrees in history or anthropology in the specialized West, but also the unwritten but no less real psychologies of peoples who may not even have a tradition of publishing journal articles in psychology to speak of. The validity of unwritten psychologies does not depend on the extent and manner of their articulation.

Contemporary western society holds the written word in high regard. This reverence contributes to ignorance and dismissal of the knowledge of cultures for which oratory may be held in similar high regard, for which literatures exist in non-written forms or for whom print literacy in

their language is a recent practice. The dearth of written literature does not mean that Māori psychological models and concepts do not exist and are not valid and relevant.

However there are examples of Māori language being used in the identification and discussion of Māori psychological and developmental concepts. Many of these examples are authored by non-Māori or sourced to historical descriptions of traditional Māori, also written by non-Māori (e.g. Best, 1929; Sadchev, 1990; Smith, J. 1981). Linda Smith (L. Mead 1996) again provides an in-depth analysis of such examples. However writers such as Makareti, (1938), Tuki Nepe (1991) and Rose Pere (1982) provide insider discussions of Māori concepts linked to socialisation, development and learning, although for the most part through the medium of English.

Herein lies one dilemma. The dangers of researching, synthesising and communicating culturally valued knowledge and theoretical constructs through a high-status colonial language cannot be overstated. Issues relating to the development of written literature in te reo Māori, (e.g. Garlick, 1998) are as relevant when discussing an academic literature for psychology as they are when discussing literature for Māori children. Furthermore, many Māori audiences for writings on 'Māori psychology' understand and are literate in English. However, growing numbers of us are developing deeper understandings in te reo Māori and if we 'don't use it we are in danger of losing it'. The need to reach an audience, contrasted with the need to validate and utilise the language, is being acknowledged in some Māöri academic writing (e.g. Melbourne, 1991; Rei, 1998). Personally, while the desire and ideal is to present articles such as this in te reo Māori, I do not always feel capable or confident about writing in my first language of literacy, English, let alone my native but second language, Māori.

Many Māori students and educators with whom I have worked have commented that the developmental psychology they were expected to learn as part of their academic apprenticeship failed to acknowledge and account for development of spiritual domains. This is one site where theorising is limited, or where the primary focus is on religious, church and faith-related aspects of spirituality (e.g. Myers, 1997). The spiritual domain is viewed as critical for optimal Māori development (Nepe, 1991; Pere, 1994, 1997). Its significance is referred to explicitly in the philosophy of Kura Kaupapa Māori, 'Te Aho Matua'.

One of the difficulties identified in Serge Moscovici's foreword to Paul Heelas and Andrew Lock's (1981; ix)

Kia mau ki te aka matua: Researching Māori Development and Learning

Margie Hohepa

'Indigenous Psychologies: The Anthropology of the Self' is "how to ascertain the domain of the psychological". "Psychology is bounded by culture and evolves with history, so varying from societies in which the individual is the psychological to those in which psychology is taken away from the human self". They argue that the psychologies of some cultures (societies or civilisations) are constructed within a ternary framework that includes the internal world of the individual, the external world and the spiritual, psychic world. Western psychological theories are essentially conceived in a binary cultural framework of exterior and interior worlds.

On the surface, the study of indigenous psychologies looked as if it could be effectively drawn on to describe and theorise about Māori development and significant Māori psychological aspects, such as wairua, mauri, hinengaro. However in Heelas and Lock's book discussions of such aspects fall under the label of Māori as an 'exotic culture'. Furthermore, studies of various cultures' psychologies in this vein have drawn heavily on anthropology. As an area of study described as 'falling between the disciplines of anthropology and psychology', there is a very real possibility of it being an 'aka taepa'. Māori theorists such as Linda Smith (L. Mead; 1996) and Tereki Stewart (1995) have critically discussed problems that anthropology and psychology have posed to Māori. Stewart proposed that the biggest challenge facing various approaches to the study of indigenous psychologies is that they "predominantly represent attempts by non-indigenous authors to capture what it means to be 'indigenous' and as a consequence they have contributed to the prescribing of 'indigenous' identities by voices external to the group being studied" (1995; 58).

Enriquez' book on indigenous psychology (as opposed to psychologies) represents an alternative approach under the label 'Indigenous Psychologies'. Rather than setting out to describe the Phillipine psyche as a particular indigenous psychological type, he details the development of psychology as an academic discipline in the Philippines. His discussion involves the examination of its colonial roots, tracing these to northern America, Germany, Spain and Belgium, back into the Philippines and through to the development of "Sikolohiyang Pilipino", Philippine Psychology. Enriquez' work signals an alternative approach to indigenous psychology - one by indigenous people themselves who are committed to political, economic and cultural development of their communities (Stewart, 1995).

Enriquez (1989) describes the development of psychological thought in the Philippines as a movement involving three primary areas of protest. Firstly, protest against a psychology that maintained the colonial status of the Filipino mind. This is seen as a move towards the decolonisation of the Filipino psyche and a stage of the development of national consciousness. Secondly, a move against the imposition of psychologies developed in and appropriate to other countries and societies, and finally against a psychology employed in exploiting the masses. The move to develop a liberating psychology resulted in the strategic use of Filipino language as a medium for researching and describing Philippine realities in order to develop a psychological literature of the Filipino people and to identify and rediscover indigenous concepts.

Tereki Stewart's (1995) theoretical model of research and knowledge production for 'indigenous psychology' proposes the use of other-culture theories/methods/concepts as part of a process that remains under the control of indigenous groups themselves. This model identifies the importance of recognising "sociopolitical considerations through critical analysis".

Indigenous people endeavouring to create proactive and emancipatory psychologies in support of their goals and aspirations have taken issue with the relevance and appropriateness of western academic approaches to psychology. The existence of differential power relations contained within the discipline is also identified as being at least of equivalent concern.

I am searching for ways that 'developmental psychology' might be used effectively in the support of particular Māori aspirations to which I also adhere. At the same time I take a kaupapa Māori position, that includes not only viewing 'Māori knowledge, beliefs and practices' as valid and legitimate and fundamental to optimal Māori development and wellbeing, but also as open to informed, sensitive examination and debate. Rather than working from a perspective that sees non-western, colonised cultures such as Māori as 'recipients or targets of culture flow' (Enriquez, 1989; 71), it is one of seeing Māori culture as dynamic, active and selective. This dynamism and selectivity extends to our engagements with theories, practices and concepts of a range of social sciences, including those grouped under the term psychology.

Focusing on development and learning, the figure below attempts to illustrate this perspective of Māori engagement with developmental psychology. The relationship is not visualised as a linear one, where non-Māori psychological theory and technology impacts on Māori attempts to study, theorise and optimise development and learning at a specific, staged point in a sequenced process. Rather, the relationship is seen as

one in which there is potential for reciprocal engagement and impact at many given points. Four possible points are illustrated.

What the model is attempting to show is that it is a relationship that involves multi-directional seepage, an exchanging and interchanging. Indigenous approaches beyond being culturally appropriate, can contribute to the revision of western theories (Gulerce, in Gergen, Gulerce, Lock & Misra, 1996). The model represents a multi-dimensional interrelationship that involves interaction within, without and between any given points in the process.

For any particular research agenda, each dimension provides mechanisms or benchmarks for checking and seeking resolutions for tensions that may arise. Such tensions include identifying processes of accountability to Māori as well as by Māori as researchers. The interrelationships the model portrays are played out within a socio-political context that historically has positioned 'Māori', including Māori development and learning, in destructive and dis-empowering ways. As a result, while it is being argued that Māori approaches to development and learning have been of influence at least in Aotearoa-New Zealand, if not internationally, the direction of influence has been severely skewed in favour of 'psychology'. The reasons for this rest not only in our history of colonial experience, but also in the history of the discipline itself.

He Korero Whakamutunga

A Kaupapa Māori framework for the study of Māori development and learning involves at least the following:

(i) identifying, critically examining and validating Māori knowledge and conceptualisations of development and learning;

(ii) describing and explaining Māori development, learning and behaviour in ways that legitimate and 'normalise' Māori;

(iii) optimising or improving development and learning in areas that Māori identify as critical or essential; 11

(iv) identifying and challenging the role 'developmental psychology' along with other psychologies and social sciences, have had in negatively positioning and portraying Māori development and learning;

(v) interrogating research processes and methods from a Kaupapa Māori position.

It necessitates developing a notion of psychology as a tool, not a tool for psychology's sake, but rather for use in efforts to facilitate the achievement of Māori visions and directions. Existing tools of mainstream or conventional

psychology can be used in attempting to develop a Māori approach to developmental psychology. Psychological theory, methods and analyses can be used. But the research and theoretical 'culture' into which they are co-opted is arguably different. Likewise, the purposes to which they are put are located in Māori envisioning of alternative futures, in the process of being realised.

References

Best, E. (1929). *The Whare Kōhanga and its lore.* Wellington: Government Printer.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Whakawhanaungatanga: Collaborative research stories.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Burman, E. (1994). *Deconstructing developmental psychology.* London: Routledge.

Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education.* Colorado: Kivaki Press.

Enriquez, V. G. (1989) . *Indigenous psychology and national consciousness.* Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Fox, D. & Prilleltensky, I. (1997). *Critical psychology: An introduction.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Garlick, J. (1998). *Māori language publishing: some issues.* Wellington: Huia Publishers, 1998.

Gergen, K., Gulerce, A., Lock, A. & Misra, G. (1996) .*Psychological science in cultural context.* American Psychologist, 51,5, 496-503.

Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Critical theory and educational practice.* Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Greenfield, P. & Cocking, R. (1994). (Eds) *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Heelas, P. & Lock, A. (Eds) (1981). *Indigenous psychologies: The anthropology of the self.* London: Academic Press Inc.

Johnston, P. M. G. (1998). *Te Ao Rereke - Education policy and Māori under-achievement: Mechanisms of power and difference.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland.

Makereti. (1938). *Old-time Māori.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London.

Mama, A. (1995). *Beyond the masks: Race, gender and subjectivity.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mead, L.T.T.R. (1996). *Nga aho o te kākahu matauranga: The multiple layers of struggle by Māori in education.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland.

Mead, H. M. (1996). *Ko Tawhaki nui-a-Hema : ana mahi whakahirahira.* Auckland: Reed.

Myers, B. K. (1997). *Young children and spirituality.* London: Routledge.

Nepe, T. (1991). *E hao nei e tënei reanga: Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna.* Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Auckland.

Pere, R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts of learning in the Māori tradition.* Published as a Monograph by the Te Köhanga Reo National Trust Board, May 1994.

Pere, R. (1997). *Te Wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom.* Ao Ako Global Learning New Zealand Ltd.

Pohatu, T. W. (1996). *I tipu ai tātau i ngā turi o o tātau mātua tïpuna: Transmission and acquisition processes within kāwai whakapapa.* Unpublished Master of Education Thesis, University of Auckland.

Prilleltensky, I. & Fox, D. (1997). Introducing critical psychology: Values, assumptions and the status quo. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky, (Eds,) *Critical psychology: An introduction.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Rogoff, B. (1995). *Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship.* In J. V. Wertsch, P. del

Rio, & A. Alvarez, (Eds) *Sociocultural studies of mind.* Cambridge Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 139-164.

Sadchev, P. S. (1987). Personality development in traditional Māori society and the impact of modernization, *Psychiatry,* 53, 3, 85-111.

Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Education, University of Auckland.

Smith, J. Self and experience in Māori culture. In P. Heelas and A. Lock, (eds) *Indigenous Psychologies: The Anthropolgy of the Self.* London: Academic Press, 1981.

Smith, L. T. (1991). Te rapunga i te ao marama: Māori perspectives on research in education. In J. R. Morss & T. J. Linzey (Eds.) *The politics of human learning development and educational research.* Auckland: Longman Paul.

Stewart, T. (1995). *Ka pü te ruha, ka hao te rangatahi: Contributions to 'Indigenous Psychology' in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Auckland.

Tolman, C. W. (1994). *Psychology, society, and subjectivity: An introduction to German critical psychologists.* London: Routledge.