

7-2-2018

Being Māori and Pākehā: Methodology and Method in Exploring Cultural Hybridity

Niki Grennell-Hawke (Ngai Tahu, Ngai Mutunga)
niki.grennell@gmail.com

Keith Tudor Dr
AUT University of Technology, keith.tudor@aut.ac.nz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

This Article has supplementary content. View the full record on NSUWorks here:
<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss7/3>

Recommended APA Citation

Grennell-Hawke (Ngai Tahu, Ngai Mutunga), N., & Tudor, K. (2018). Being Māori and Pākehā: Methodology and Method in Exploring Cultural Hybridity. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(7), 1530-1546. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss7/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

LEARN MORE

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Being Māori and Pākehā: Methodology and Method in Exploring Cultural Hybridity

Abstract

This article addresses the first author's experience of identifying as both Māori and Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand. Based on her own research using both kaupapa research theory and heuristic research method, and supervised by the second author, the article describes her negotiation of the experience of being a hybrid cultural subject and object, of belonging and not belonging. The article extends the practice and understanding of cross-cultural research on a number of levels: the intrapsychic (i.e., within the principal investigator herself), the interpersonal (i.e., between the researcher and supervisor), and the methodological (i.e., between an indigenous and a Western theory).

Keywords

Māori, Pākehā, Kaupapa Research Theory, Heuristic Research Method, Cultural Hybridity, Aotearoa New Zealand

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Being Māori and Pākehā: Methodology and Method in Exploring Cultural Hybridity

Niki Grennell-Hawke (Ngai Tahu, Ngai Mutunga)
Private Practice, Queenstown, Aotearoa New Zealand

Keith Tudor
Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand

This article addresses the first author's experience of identifying as both Māori and Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand. Based on her own research using both kaupapa research theory and heuristic research method, and supervised by the second author, the article describes her negotiation of the experience of being a hybrid cultural subject and object, of belonging and not belonging. The article extends the practice and understanding of cross-cultural research on a number of levels: the intrapsychic (i.e., within the principal investigator herself), the interpersonal (i.e., between the researcher and supervisor), and the methodological (i.e., between an indigenous and a Western theory). Keywords: Māori, Pākehā, Kaupapa Research Theory, Heuristic Research Method, Cultural Hybridity, Aotearoa New Zealand

Introduction

Aotearoa New Zealand has a significant population of Māori people: significant in that they are tangata whenua, the first people of the land, and significant in that, since the time of the first European settlers (in the late 18th century) and the colonisation of the country (in the mid-19th century), the population of Māori had fallen dramatically. In 1840, at the time of the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi), the Māori population was 70,000 to 90,000 (Pool & Kukutai, 2011). By 1858, when the first official census was conducted, the number of Māori had fallen to approximately 60,000 (Pool & Kukutai, 2011) and by 1896 to 39,663, the lowest recorded number of Māori in the nation's history, with Pākehā numbers in 1893 which reached 672,265 (Keenan, 2017).

However, whilst significant, these statistics do not tell the whole story, especially that people who have Māori heritage and do not identify as Māori. Māori culture allows anyone with Māori whakapapa (genealogy or heritage) to refer to themselves as Māori, and, as more people have identified as such, the population and proportion of Māori has, from the 1920s, been on the increase. Currently (2017), the population of Māori stands at 16%, a figure that is predicted to rise to 18% by 2033 (Statistics New Zealand, 2016), though more still will have some Māori heritage (some commentators put this figure as a further 50% of those who identify as Māori), and of both these groups, most will have Māori *and* other ancestry. Currently Māori and non-Māori (who are generally referred to as Pākehā)—both people and terms—sit in a binary positioning, one which has been essential for Māori, who have needed a strength of identity in order to counter the effects of colonisation; for their part, Pākehā have also benefited from positioning and maintaining Māori as “other” in their own land. However, in such binary construction, those who have both Māori and Pākehā ancestry may be or become invisible and deny their experiences or have them denied. A relatively recent estimate of this difference, based on 2013 figures, puts the Māori ethnic population at 692,000 and the population descended from Māori at 812,000 (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). Despite the fact that there

has never been a policy in New Zealand of “breeding out the colour” (as there was in Australia), phenotype has, nevertheless, become a marker of cultural identification, both externally (i.e., socially) and internally (i.e., psychologically).

Niki identifies as both Māori and Pākehā and in the context of her training as a psychotherapist, wanted to explore this personally, psychologically, and socially. In this sense her study represents an internal version of the exploration of cross-cultural researching between Māori and Pākehā conducted by Carpenter and McMurchy-Pilkington (2008). Keith has a long interest in culture, cultural intentionality, and cross-cultural work (see Ioane & Tudor, 2017; Naughton & Tudor, 2006; Singh & Tudor, 1997) as well as a commitment to living and working in a bicultural context and frame of reference. Niki is a graduate of the psychotherapy programme at Auckland University of Technology, where Keith was, and still is, a member of staff. Niki’s dissertation narrated the personal experience of cultural hybridity (Iyall-Smith, 2008; Moeke-Maxwell, 2008) and the space of inclusion and exclusion (see Lund, Panda, & Dahl, 2008; Webber, 2008), and was supervised by Keith. The focus of this article is on the methodology and method used to inform and support the enquiry.

Within cultural studies and more generally in cultural and bicultural discourse, there are some who object to the term “hybridity” which, referring to a cross or mix between two plants or cultures, reduces the complexity of human identity to a biological base with images of genetic grafting, and worse, of eugenics. Whilst we are sensitive to this critique, we use the term advisedly and with specific reference to the literature on cultural hybridity as a term that refers to the cross(ed) and mixed experience of people who experience two cultural identities, as well as a third positionality. We refer to hybrid cultural “object” not to objectify Niki or anyone else who identifies as Māori but rather, to acknowledge the objectification of Māori as “Other,” through colonisation as well as the appropriation of cultural customs and artefacts without due acknowledgement or permission, a phenomenon that is the subject of current discussion in and about contemporary culture in New Zealand, for instance, in art, architecture, fashion, and sport.

Initially, and given the personal nature of the enquiry, we were thinking of relying on the use of heuristic methodology and method, and indeed, that was part of Niki’s choice of Keith as academic supervisor (see Tudor, 2010). We discussed heuristic research method (HRM) as elaborated by Moustakas (1990), and while, this appeared to offer a congruence between the subject and method, we both felt that something was missing. As Niki explored this further, and drawing on her own knowledge of *te Ao Māori* (the Māori word), it seemed to make more sense to draw on *Kaupapa Māori Research Theory* (KMRT) (Durie, 2012; L. T. Smith, 1999; 2011). For a while we discussed and debated this until we realised that it might be better to use both. Making use of a Western research methodology alongside KMRT parallels both the subject of the research and the dialogue and dichotomy inherent in the initial research question: “What is the experience of being both Māori and Pākehā?” In undertaking the research, we expected that there would be areas and/or times in which the methodologies were not compatible or indeed, incompatible, and we make some comments about this. Beyond this, we consider that what we might consider to be “methodological hybridity” offers a new way of thinking about and engaging in cross-, inter-, and trans-cultural research.

One of the first tasks of the research was to address the definition of KMRT.

Kaupapa Methodology

Using and developing theory based on concepts and principles located in *te Ao Māori* is a way in which indigenous researchers have developed a methodology that reflects the subject and concerns of the research, and as it is grounded in local knowledge, is emancipatory rather than oppressive (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002; G. Smith, 1997; Walker, 1996):

The term “kaupapa Māori theory” is exactly what it says it is. It’s a theory [of life] that is underpinned by Māori philosophies of the world, that has Māori foundations, that has Māori understandings. It is a theory that is about working for our people. (Pihama, 2011, p. 49)

Whilst we concur with this, there is much discussion as to the detail of what constitutes Māori philosophies, foundations, and understandings, as well as the term KMRT.

The word “kaupapa” has to be Māori, so “Māori” becomes redundant in the title ... Perhaps we need to do the same thing with mātauranga Māori. After all, what are we talking about when we say the word mātauranga is Māori? What else could it be? (Penetito, 2011, p. 38)

We agree with Penetito’s (2011) point, which, in effect, is a political one about the use and privileging of language and thus, also use the term, kaupapa research theory (KRT), and thus only refer to KMRT in citing or quoting other authors who use the term. That said, we now consider four tests, which according to G. Smith (1997) need to be applied for a practice to be called an effective kaupapa Māori-informed strategy:

The first is the praxis test: Are both practical and theoretical elements present? Second, the positionality test: What is the record of the researcher/commentator that lends legitimacy to their work in this area? Third, the criticality test: Does the commentary or analysis adequately take account of culturalist and structuralist aspirations and political analysis? And fourth, the transformability test: What positively changes for Māori as a result of your engagement or your application of Kaupapa Māori? (p. 20)

Here we discuss how Niki applied these tests to her research, especially that of positionality, and how these tests might be understood in terms of heuristic research.

Praxis

By “praxis,” G. Smith (1997) is referring to the dialectic relationship between theory and practice and the importance of both. There is also a sense in which both inform positionality, theory informs criticality, and practice informs transformability. Regarding the presence of both practical and theoretical elements, one outcome of this research is intended to be a better understanding of what it means to be both Māori and Pākehā. Penetito (2011) stated: “research on the topic of multiple identities and cultural change is relatively negligible in New Zealand” (p. 41). The practical outcome of extending theory in this area is that the positive and negative aspects of “being both” and “not belonging to either,” become conscious, and thus available to recognition and negotiation both by the individual and the group. We consider that, in the context of this research, this test was achieved by use of the heuristic concepts of “identifying with the focus of enquiry” and of “tacit knowing” (Moustakas, 1990).

Positionality

The second of G. Smith’s tests, positionality or legitimacy, is a cultural test which includes components of language, tikanga (ethics), and identification (sometimes referred to informally as “brownness”). The challenge for Niki in using KRT for this project concerned

her right or legitimacy as Māori. Pihama (2011) wrote about the need to be “grounded in yourself” (p. 53) in order to work within kaupapa. For Niki, knowing who she is and where she comes from and building relationships with whanau (extended family), hapu (which translates literally as being pregnant but is usually translated as sub-tribe), and iwi (bones/tribe) as well as Māori organisations, in order to find the place that she can stand were intrinsic to both the process and the outcome of this research. Philip-Barbara (2011) suggested that one challenge to Māori researchers is to bring kaupapa into the personal as well as the professional realm, by way of a commitment to tikanga and te reo Māori (the Māori language). Accepting this challenge was part of how the philosophy and methodology of kaupapa was addressed in this project.

Niki chose to claim legitimacy by way of a whakapapa definition of being Māori: “The whakapapa view of being Māori is our legacy, it is our inheritance, [i.e.,] it is our tāonga tuku iho. Who is going to argue with that? Nobody.” (Penetito, 2011, p. 41). She chose—and chooses—to be visible and not turn away from becoming more grounded in her identity through fear of not being Māori enough to address the research and the questions that arose. Such authenticity was, and is, crucial for research on and in identity, and especially research based on KRT and heurism.

As we have seen, the notion of “authentic” is highly contested when applied to, or by, indigenous peoples. ... Questions of who is a “real indigenous” person, what counts as a “real indigenous leader,” which person displays “real cultural values” and the criteria used to assess the characteristics of authenticity are frequently the topic of conversation and political debate. These debates are designed to fragment and marginalize those who speak for, or in support of, indigenous issues. They frequently have the effect also of silencing and making invisible the presence of other groups within the indigenous society like women, the urban non-status tribal person and those whose ancestry or “blood quantum” is “too white.” (L. Smith, 1999, p. 72)

Positionality or legitimacy is also a question of action:

The prior question is, if you are going to write about Kaupapa Māori, what can you show you have done for Māori in the real world? Show me the blisters on your hands to gain a more authoritative right to talk or write authentically about Kaupapa Māori. (G. Smith, Kawehau, & Jones, 2012, p. 13)

Niki’s “blisters” include her contribution as a drug and alcohol counsellor within a Māori social services agency, her role within tertiary training and as a high school board member promoting Māori educational goals, her mothering of her whangai daughter and her son, and her continued challenging and questioning in relationship with others.

Critically

The question of understanding the hybrid cultural object and negotiating cultural hybridity has at its core an analysis of culture and structure within the political context. The intention throughout this research was to hold a critical perspective, to critique personal perspective and experience, and to critique the work and position of others. This was supported by the second author’s commitment to critical praxis.

KRT represents critical theory, in this case one that reclaims knowledge and history that has been fed to the mainstream through schooling, the media, and political systems as the

truth. Ways of knowing have been viewed as valid only if they come from the accepted (Western) world view (Cooper, 2012; Durie, 2012; Royal, 2012). KRT derives from and is located in a dynamic Māori world view, and as being valid in its own right without need for justification and indeed, as an antidote to Western so-called objective knowledge of the other/Other. In this sense, it was important for Niki that she used KRT in order to decolonise her internal world, and to acknowledge all of her identity or *identities*. Located in the philosophical tradition of phenomenology and with its emphasis on subjectivity—and subjectivities—heurism and heuristic research also offers a challenge to more objectivist approaches to science.

Transformability

As far as positive changes for Māori as a result of engagement with and application of kaupapa research is concerned, there was a transformational component to this particular project. There is an extensive literature regarding the disconnection from and diffusion of culture and identity as being one of the major effects of colonisation and contributors to Māori deficit (e.g., Bishop, 1996, 2015; Durie, 2012; Royal, 2012). By making explicit what is implicit about hybrid cultural identification, this research was not only transformative for Niki, but it is hoped, may be so for many others who identify similarly.

I am aware that I have spent a significant amount of time attending to legitimacy within KRT. This is because (as is intrinsic to the question) I am unsure of my legitimacy. I needed to ground myself as Māori “enough” and perhaps as “good enough Māori” ... to be based in KRT for this project. My experience of exploring my legitimacy is that in my day-to-day living I have become less anxious to place myself as Māori via action and more able to place myself as Māori via just being. (Niki’s diary entry, 4/04/2014)

Heuristic Method

Heuristic research is a search for the discovery of meaning and essence in significant human experience. It requires a subjective process of reflecting, exploring, sifting, and elucidating the nature of the phenomenon under investigation. The ultimate purpose of the heuristic method is to cast light on a focused problem, question, or theme (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985, p. 40).

Moustakas (1990), the founder of the heuristic research, identified six phases in the process: initial engagement, immersion, incubation, illumination, explication, and creative synthesis. These phases are not linear and the researcher is likely to move both forward and backward during the process, returning to previous phases as required and also experiencing later phases earlier. In this, there is a congruence between the subject and the process of the research; the experience and understanding of a hybrid identity is not a linear process (Keddell, 2006).

Heuristic methodology and method allows the researcher, in this case Niki, to be the subject of the research. The process is reflective of that person’s experience in relation to the question addressed. This is of great advantage to knowing, as the experience of one, although unique, is able to give information about the experience of many (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985). As Moustakas (1990) put it, “The heuristic process is autobiographic, yet with virtually every question that matters personally there is also a social—and perhaps universal—significance” (p. 15).

This focus on the individual may appear to be contradictory to the principle of the collective that is embedded in KRT (Woodard, 2008). Reid (1995) addressed this conflict.

We tend to forget that the essential physical unit is the individual. It's true that collective units are our operational bases in many situations and circumstances, but these groups are made up of individuals, not clones. From the pool of individuals come leaders, people with exceptional talents like weavers, childbearers and childrearsers. The survivability of whānau, hapū and iwi ideally depends on the kaleidoscope of skills, strength, beauty and ambition that members individually contribute. (p. 29)

Here we explore the phases as they were attended to in the research.

Initial Engagement

Within each researcher exists a topic, theme, problem, or question that represents a critical interest and area of research. The task of the initial engagement is to discover an intense interest, a passionate concern that calls out to the researcher, one that holds important social meanings and personal compelling implications (Moustakas, 1990, p. 27).

The initial engagement with cultural identity is embedded deeply and has existed over a long period of time in the principal investigator (PI). A process of identity construction, or uncovering, has been evident since she was conscious; both identities are experienced as without beginning. As her skin colour is white, she has experience not knowing whether she could identify as Māori and Pākehā with unexplained feelings of connection and political action.

Immersion

Moustakas (1990) reflected on the fact that “once the question is discovered and its terms defined and clarified, the researcher lives the question in waking, sleeping and even dream states” (p. 28). The ways in which Niki immersed herself in the question were in keeping with the methods described by Moustakas (1990). She kept a record of her process through dreams, instances where her hybrid identity was apparent to her, reflections on her daily life in relation to hybrid identity, and reflections on literature with which she was engaged. She engaged in ongoing discussion with others, in particular her husband as well as her supervisor, regarding what she was experiencing and reflecting on. This draws on the extended family structure, which Woodard (2008) identified as one of the principles that guides research based on KMT. Much of this discussion had high levels of emotional energy and process.

In this phase her literature search focused on hybrid identity, Māori experience and history, and New Zealand poetry and writing. Artistic activity and expression, related to identity, were also part of this phase. Looking back on the data collected, the immersion phase began in late October 2013. As Niki was researching and writing about methodology, her focus was on kaupapa research. The claiming of whakapapa and “scars” (Jackson, 2011) as her right to engage in kaupapa research set her focus firmly on the experience of being Māori–Pākehā. A dream she recorded highlights this phase:

I went to a GP and at reception gave them an identity card that was not mine. We laughed and I gave it back to who it belonged to (a white woman). I was slightly confused as to why I had that identity card and also felt some ownership of it – part of me wanted it back from her. (Niki's diary entry, 24/10/2013)

As she continued in and with the methodology, her immersion was deep. She noticed daily instances where her identity was negotiated. At the time she wondered if she was “immersed enough,” a reflection which paralleled her concern as to whether she was “Māori enough.”

Reading Decolonizing Methodologies [L. Smith, 1999], there is no mention of the hybrid which seems to be the majority of Māori. Does this mean that to participate in KMRT I have to position myself as exclusively Māori? With my lack of te reo, tikanga, mātauranga and colour, am I automatically excluded? (ibid., 09/11/2013)

During the months of December 2013 and January 2014, Niki’s ability to stay immersed was challenged by a significant change in her employment status and the attendant stress. There was the added distraction of school holidays and family responsibility. HRM is difficult to maintain in the context of a full and busy life. Niki’s experience of this time of immersion was as if being immersed in water, at times being closer to the surface and occasionally breaking the surface, rather than being fully immersed.

On the last day of January 2014, this immersion became deeper, with a focus on moving forward and engaging fully with the research question. At this point, Niki ordered literature on hybrid cultural experience which she had discovered in databases. In keeping with the methodology of heuristic research, this discovery did not take the form of a formal literature review. The literature was “discovered” by following one article or book and the references within that to the next. This was guided by another key concept of heuristic research (i.e., intuition), as well as Niki’s interest as to which article or book she would read, a process which the authors came to refer to as “literature whakapapa,” or in other words, the genealogy of ideas that the reader can trace through citations and references to previous work and so on back through through the generations. Early in February the immersion phase became painful and all consuming. Niki felt as if she was unable to escape from being in the question.

I feel lost in this process. It feels like there is nothing solid to hang on to. A lot of crying last night with M [husband]. It’s like nowhere is safe for me to be in terms of my identity and I am angry that this is how I chose to do this dissertation. [I’m] way too much in my stuff. A straight literature review would be much easier.

K [supervisor] is being kind. I am doing what I am supposed to be doing is the message I am getting from him, M and MS [clinical supervisor]. I named my concern over the narcissistic extension of my kids out loud. I feel like such a bitch. I said to MS that I had some romantic idea of art and music as a means of immersion and what I am ending up with is being in places where I do not like what I find.

I want to create clothing. Make things. I wonder about that. Is my making of things for the outside to do with who I am? That would work, then I could just make things and not have to think too hard.

I don’t belong at work. I am not Māori enough. If I were, all the shit wouldn’t have happened. I could just ... what? What could I just do? I am more comfortable being Pākehā ... to be the mainstream would take away any drama. I could ignore the problem.

If I was just mainstream I would not HAVE to have a response to such stupid thinking ... I may not even hear it. If I was just Māori? I don’t know what that would mean. I have the luxury of being difficult to place. It is a luxury on some

levels but if it were clear, then there would not have to be a constant negotiation of identity. Well at least not in relationship to race. If I only am one thing I don't have to guess who I am. (ibid., 11/02/2014)

In response to feeling overwhelmed Niki decided to engage with the literature she had gathered, moving into intellect, rather than feeling, as it seemed the only option if she were to keep moving forward. The result of that shift was that she became more and more curious, and less and less overwhelmed. She found others who were addressing their own feelings around belonging and not belonging. The tone of her diary began to shift.

So she [Moeke-Maxwell, 2008] speaks of opening up the third space, a liberating space where I can be who I am without having to fit into the colonized, assimilated or traditional prescribed image of Māori women. It sounds great in theory and I wonder about how easy that is to do. The negotiation of hybridity is ongoing and daily and tiring. There is some hope in the way she speaks of being connected to the land the turangawaewae as a place just to be. Being in nature as a means of connecting to the self. (ibid., 15/02/2014)

Noticing the loneliness of self-reflection and how perhaps it is intrinsic to the method that the individual become alone. It highlights that although we on one level are all connected, at another we are very much alone. My experience is unique to me and therefore no one else can ever know it. The universal takes place where others have experience that is similar to mine. (ibid., 19/02/2014)

This reflection is made more poignant by the fact that the original work that led to the development of the heuristic method was Moustakas' own reflections on loneliness (Moustakas, 1961).

Kaupapa research is comtable with heuristic research in that there is a focus on doing the work until it is done, rather than sacrificing the result to the timeframe. (We discuss some areas of difference between the two methodologies in the last part of this article.) However, in early March 2014, we decided that in order to meet the deadline for submission of the dissertation the immersion phase needed to be concluded. Whilst it would have been possible to continue, to extend the timeframe would have cost some NZ\$400 per month, which again raises the criticism of whether heuristic research is a suitable method within the inevitable limits of academic programmes.

The difficulty in moving away from the immersion phase was that the question blankets all areas of my life. In my family, work, school, board, community, social contacts, media and social media, I am a Māori Pākehā woman negotiating my place. Given the immersion and awareness that has come from that, I cannot unknow what I now know. Also, I now am very motivated to know more about the theory intrinsic to hybrid cultural identity. The immersion is no longer painful; it is exciting and I want to stay in this place. (ibid., 1/03/2014)

Incubation

Incubation is the process in which the researcher retreats from the intense concentrated focus on the question. . . During this process the researcher is no longer absorbed in the topic in any direct way or alert to things, situations,

events or people that will contribute to an understanding of the phenomenon. (Moustakas, 1990, p. 28)

Incubation takes place as the researcher lets go of the research question and its many variants. This is an ongoing state not dissimilar to reverie (Ogden, 1997) in which implicit or tacit knowing emerges without conscious effort. As has been discussed, the move away from immersion was not an easy move to make.

Given the nature of the question and time limitations ... the ability to step away from the question currently seems impossible. I am Māori/Pākehā daily negotiating this hybrid journey. My political being cannot put action connected to the question on hold in order to incubate. Opportunity for positive change will be lost if I stop. To stop reading and actively seeking new knowledge is achievable. But to step outside of the experience and daily noticing is perhaps not achievable. To continue with the academic action and process is perhaps as close as I can come to “retreat.” (Niki’s diary entry, 10/03/2014)

From 12 March 2014, Niki stopped work completely. The shift to this space came about in a forced manner as is recorded in her dissertation diary.

It was my birthday: 48 years old. My uncle had died on the Friday and I travelled to Timaru with my mum and dad to attend the funeral, Monday, my birthday. A couple of things happened for me. On the way over I had a huge discussion with my mum about what Pākehā are supposed to do in relation the current state of race relations in NZ. We then spoke about R [my daughter] and how her journey as whangai was going to play out for her. It was a tough trip over ... every emotional soft spot was given attention. We arrived in Timaru and I began to learn about my family ... more than I had previously known ... family splits, children with varying parentage, what we don’t talk about and cousins who are in helping professions. Funeral, taken by my dad, highlighting to me his age and fragility and proximity to being the main event rather than the facilitator. I found that very hard. My Auntie P came to me and thanked me for taking R. She said that she was so grateful, as a baby from our family could not go out of the family. I felt like all the tipuna [ancestors] were giving me their blessing, I could actually physically feel them there in me. I had never considered the wider family in my decision and I had always felt alone in my journey. This acknowledgement connected me to my ancestors. So we left Timaru and I was emotionally exhausted. I could not think any more about my dissertation, identity, any of the big questions were too big to be with. I realized that my life had given me an opportunity for incubation where previously I had felt unable to stop collecting data. Immersion had to stop or I would drown. (ibid., 19/03/2014)

At this point, a week of complete absence from the question began. Initially, Niki was unable to function at all. It only lasted a day but, during that day, she was unable to engage with anyone or anything; a feeling of complete exhaustion took over. This illustrates the way in which incubation can be experienced as a complete withdrawal and on a visceral level. As the week progressed, Niki gardened, cleaned her house, walked with her husband, cooked and engaged with her children in a way that had been lacking over the previous weeks.

Illumination

The process of illumination is one that occurs naturally when the researcher is open to tacit knowledge and intuition. The illumination is a break through into conscious awareness of qualities and a clustering of qualities into themes inherent in the question (Moustakas, 1990, p. 29).

Once a full immersion in the question has taken place, incubation and illumination requires the researcher to step away from conscious effort toward understanding. Niki anticipated that there would be a period of time where other activities would be at the forefront of her experience. She engaged with the natural world and physical activity, allowing underlying understanding to emerge. However, what she discovered was that illumination was not the next *stage*, rather, it had taken place throughout the process to date (and would continue) (see Table 1). The week in which she had been unable to work had given time for incubation in the ways in which she had imagined.

Date	Illumination
24/10/13	Excluding others who don't fit the essentialised cultural object may be a way of mitigating one's own negative cultural object.
09/11/13	My journey here around hybrid identity has the potential to help make visible, that which is predominately invisible.
05/12/13	Although I would like to deny it, I relegate negative characteristics to Māori: the negative cultural object speaking something into being.
31/01/14	I am Māori by my whakapapa; I am Pākehā by my ancestry; both of these things are true and not exclusive of each other.
09/02/14	I use others as symbols/objects to soothe my hybrid angst. I don't like that I do this.
11/03/14	I am held by my tipuna.
06/04/14	To be culturally well, accepting and integrating all cultural aspects is important. Being invisible as Māori, Pākehā, or hybrid impacts on individuals and on Aotearoa New Zealand as a whole.

Explication

Explication is a further, more in-depth reflection of what has now become conscious, for which a capturing and organising of essence and theme and findings is required. As Moustakas (1990) put it, “The purpose of the explication phase is to fully examine what has awakened in consciousness, in order to understand its various layers of meaning” (p. 31). During this phase the researcher makes meaning of what has been gathered by describing the essence of the experience, and identifying and grouping themes, along with making links between personal reflection, literature, and creative forms such as poetry and art. Focusing and indwelling are the concepts and practice at the forefront in heuristic research during this phase. For Niki, this part of the method was difficult.

I notice that I find it difficult to settle to being in a reflective mode and that the discipline required to do that is hard to grasp. It reminds me of meditating in a class years ago and how I was massively resistant as being in my body was too scary given having been raped. I still find resistance to that level of quiet and am much more comfortable in my intellect and intuition. Interesting that the method chosen for the ease it may bring is one where I am required to face in to not only my cultural identity and how that sits ... but also into being quiet, allowing space and time, rather than busying myself into life. (Niki's diary entry, 23/01/2014)

In this project, focusing and indwelling took place outside of meditation. The researcher was able to think in the shower, in breaks at work, and while she was in the process of putting together the concepts, thoughts, and feelings that make up this piece of work. The stretching of illuminations to come to new meaning happened as part of the academic process. This is congruent with the heuristic method; although there may be a frame in which the research takes place, it is flexible and open to a shift in direction or action (Moustakas, 1990).

Creative Synthesis

The final phase of heuristic research is the process of creative synthesis. The researcher in entering this process is thoroughly familiar with all the data in its major constituents, qualities, and themes and in the explication of the meanings and details of the experience as a whole. The creative synthesis can only be achieved through tacit and intuitive powers. Once the researcher has mastered knowledge of the material that illuminates and explicates the question, the researcher is challenged to put the components and core themes into a creative synthesis. (Moustakas, 1990, pp. 30-31)

Creative synthesis is the bringing together of what has been discovered and the process of discovery in a way that is held together. Being excited and challenged by the initial engagement, and arriving at a question that has relevance to the researcher means that, in this context, the creative synthesis is embedded in the narrative as well as the finished product, which, in this instance, included a dress made by Niki, as well as the completed dissertation which was submitted as part of her Master's degree. The use of KRT, and Niki's legitimacy in claiming this methodology, is one example of negotiating hybrid cultural experience. Another is the use of both KRT and heuristic method, which was symbolised in Niki's changing use of punctuation with regard to Māori and Pākehā: from “Māori–Pākehā,” suggesting both

relationship and tension and from “Māori/Pākehā” suggesting alternative but also a binary “either ... or” choice, to Māori *and* Pākehā, indicating dialogue and integration.

In heuristic research, the term and stage/phase “creative synthesis” tends to refer to the product of the researcher, usually singular. In this case, we are reporting and reflecting on not only the creative synthesis of a person (Niki) and what she produced (diary, dress, and dissertation), but also two methodologies (KMT and HRM), and as a result of an ongoing relationship between two people: Niki (student) and Keith (supervisor). Thus, for example, Niki’s change of punctuation and terms was influenced by Keith’s interest in English language and grammar, including punctuation and his reading about the hyphen as signifying “an ambiguous area of liminality,” as van Dyk (2005, p. 6) put it, which represents “– a psychological space of neither here nor there, an undecidability of identity and belonging” (p. 6) and “a transit space, where the transition from one entity to the other occurs. It is the space and time of neither and either or the hybrid” (p. 27). While the hyphenated “Māori–Pākehā” acknowledges liminal and transition space and identity, the phrase, “Māori *and* Pākehā,” describes a resolution, at least for Niki, of this transition to plural possibilities. Of course, all such supervisory relationships are, or should be, cooperative and generative and we are not claiming ours to have been unusual in its creativity; we are suggesting, however, that the differences between us, both culturally and experientially, paralleled some of the differences Niki experienced in herself, while our common interest in culture helped her and this creative synthesis.

Kaupapa Māori Theory and Heuristic Research Method

A number of authors suggest that the challenge, questions, and rules of engagement in any research based on kaupapa theory all require firstly, an engagement with self around identity, kaupapa, and grounding, often expressed in finding a—or the—place to stand (Jackson, 2011; G. Smith, 1997; L. Smith, 1999, 2011). Such engagement is consistent with the heuristic concept of identifying with the focus of enquiry demanded by HRM and is familiar to psychotherapists and those training in psychotherapy. This is due to the fact that most education/training in psychotherapy requires the student/trainee to undertake regular personal therapy during the course of their training. This is, in part to raise their awareness of issues that might be evoked in their work with their clients, but it is also to build reflective—and reflexive (i.e., critical reflective)—capacity (see Murphy, 2005; Tudor, in press). Both authors have engaged in their own personal therapy and have first-hand experience of finding it helpful in exploring a sense of identity, including cultural identity. Engaging in HRM does something similar and in this sense, the heuristic method is a form of self-therapy or analysis that helps the researcher find the ground on which they stand—in Māori, *turangawaewae*—and as such, this appears compatible with kaupapa theory.

Both Durie (2012) and Royal (2012) identify some differences between *mātauranga* as knowledge which is learned or known, and kaupapa as principles and ethics that are action-focused and transformative. Whilst the reflective quality of heuristic research may be viewed as akin to *mātauranga*, though with more of an emphasis on what one learns from oneself rather than from others, including elders and *tipuna*, the intentional application of HRM may represent a heuristic kaupapa, though one with more emphasis on its contribution to transformation.

Regarding Māori knowledge and research method, Royal (2012) reflected that “this process of learning and then research entailed much rote learning, experiential learning and finally *whakatiki* (fasting) and *nohopuku* (meditation)” (p. 36). Apart from the rote learning, this is paralleled in HRM in the concepts and practice of self-dialogue, tacit knowing, and indwelling, for instance, through self-reflection, forms of self-discipline such as, in Niki’s case, meditation, as well as creativity.

Heuristic methodology is based in phenomenology. As Douglass and Moustakas (1985) put it, “Phenomenological research is, properly, the study of ordinary, everyday phenomena (e.g., time, space, materiality, causality, interpersonal factors), the phenomenological investigation attempts to reveal the actual nature and meaning of an event, perception or occurrence, just as it appears” (pp. 42–43). They went on to make the point that heuristics has the same intent as phenomenology (i.e., to see a phenomenon as it is). Importantly, in heuristic research, “the research participants remain visible in the examination of the data and continue to be portrayed as whole persons” (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985, p. 43). Framing this particular research in both KRT and HRM made Niki a participant in and the subject of rather than an object of research. This reflects one of the practice recommendations regarding humanistic research of the American Psychological Association’s Task Force (2005), that is, to “consider the participating individual as an agent and interpreter of the therapeutic situation” (p. 17). This, in turn, echoes a slogan that has its origins in central European political traditions that has been taken up by various consumer movements: “Nothing about us without us” and one of the slogans of what is referred to as the Māori resurgence (from the 1970s): “By Māori, for Māori.” This perspective became increasingly significant for Niki as she researched her cultural hybridity, and is also supported by the principle of cultural aspiration in KMT research identified by Woodard (2008).

In that KRT focuses on principles and tests for research, and HRM offers concepts and a process, they are different; however, as we have demonstrated, they are also complementary. In this sense, we propose that, and especially for “hybrid” subjects, the two traditions offer a hybrid research methodology and method. This particular research was enhanced by the fact that Niki and her supervisor each held these respective research traditions and were willing to learn about the other. Given the research context in Aotearoa New Zealand of a multi-ethnic society in a bicultural nation, we envisage further research which draws on the two methodologies used in this research and which considers their fusion and hybridity, as distinct from simply (and cynically) grafting some indigenous concepts onto a stem of Western thinking.

This research is not without its tensions and controversies. To a large extent, the concept of third space cultural hybridity is in conflict with the movement of indigenous people worldwide to (re)claim their cultural heritage. We are the first to acknowledge that, for instance, in Aotearoa New Zealand, research indicates that having a strong cultural identity as Māori is essential for health and wellbeing (Durie, 1998). However, we also acknowledge that not everyone wants or is willing to make such a claim, and that this is not all attributable to internalized racism. In the context of the history of colonization, of intermarriage and integration, and given the multiple configurations of ancestry, and multiple ways in which individuals identify with that ancestry (Kukutai, 2007), insisting on singular Māori identification relegates the person who identifies as culturally hybrid to being invisible. As Keddell (2006) put it:

a kind of minority-ancestry-as-therapy paradigm has been applied as a way of reclaiming threatened cultures, resolving personal struggles and resisting assimilation.... [and] while discourses are presented as either/or options, people are forced to choose an identity that may not coincide with their personal lived experience. (p. 55)

If both KMT and HRM teach us anything, it is to reclaim our personal—and cultural—lived experience, rather than to conform to an essentialised and potentially homogenised cultural identification. We suggest that the concept of cultural hybridity and experience of the hybrid

subject encourages more people to identify with their cultural heritage(s), whether singular or plural.

Conclusion

In the context of Aotearoa New Zealand (and the statistics cited at the beginning of this article), the hybrid cultural identification of being Māori and “another” is set to become a significant social and psychological reality, and one which acknowledges and indeed, strengthens the primacy of tangata whenua, the first peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. It is also one which has applications in other bicultural nations and multi-ethnic societies. Internationally, more attention is being paid to indigenous issues, not only by indigenous people themselves but also by personal and professional allies; one example of this was the establishment, within the American Psychological Association of An Indigenous Psychology Task Force (American Psychological Association, 2005; see also <http://www.apadivisions.org/division-32/leadership/task-forces/indigenous/index.aspx>). To acknowledge such cultural hybridity as valuable and to facilitate the emergence from the binary of something new is not only exciting personally, for both the subject of such enquiry and their allies, it is also important in terms of the development of hybrid theory and research methodology and method. One significant implication of this approach is that it acknowledges indigenous wisdom traditions (methodologies and methods) and requires researchers who inhabit or have internalized paradigms from the Western intellectual tradition to enquire rather than assume, and to dialogue across and between cultures rather than to impose their cultural assumptions. In this sense, we think that the culturally hybrid model of mixed methodologies, held in dialogue between colleagues involved, albeit in different roles, in the research process, will enhance indigenous research (by and for indigenous people), supported by their allies, and help to develop third space cultural hybrid methodologies that will both reflect and help understand dual and multiple cultural heritages in our increasingly multiple, diverse and complex world.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2005). Practice recommendations for the provision of humanistic psychosocial services. *Division 32 (Humanistic Psychology) Task Force*. Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (2015). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carpenter, V. M., & McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2008). Cross-cultural researching: Māori and Pākehā in te whakapakari. *Qualitative Research*, 8(2), 179-196.
- Cooper, G. (2012). Kaupapa Māori research: Epistemic wilderness as freedom? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 64-73.
- Douglass, B. G., & Moustakas, C. (1985). Heuristic inquiry: The internal search to know. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 25(39), 39-55.
- Durie, M. (1998). Puahoua five part plan for improving Maori mental health. *He Pukenga Korero*, 3(2), 61-70.
- Durie, M. (2012). Kaupapa Māori: Shifting the social. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 21-29.

- Ioane, J., & Tudor, K. (2017). The Fa'ásamoa, person-centred theory, and cross-cultural practice. *Person-Centered and Experiential Psychotherapies*, 16(4). doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2017.1361467
- Iyall-Smith, K. (2008). Hybrid identities: Theoretical examinations. In K. Iyall-Smith & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Hybrid identities: Theoretical and empirical examinations* (pp. 3-12). Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Jackson, M. (2011). *Hui reflections: Research and the consolations of bravery* [Presentation]. Paper presented at The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Keddell, E. (2006). Pavlova and pineapple pie: Selected identity influences on Samoan-Pakeha people in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Kōtuitui*, 1(1), 45-63.
- Keenan, D. (2017). *The New Zealand Wars: Ngā Pākanga Whenua O Mua*. Retrieved from <http://newzealandwars.co.nz/land-wars/wars/comparing-populations/>
- Kukutai, T. (2007). White mothers, brown children: Ethnic identification of Maori-European children in New Zealand. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 1150-1161.
- Lund, R., Panda, S. M., & Dahl, M. P. (2008). Narrating spaces of inclusion and exclusion in research collaboration: Researcher-gatekeeper dialogue. *Qualitative Research*, 8, 280-292.
- Moeke-Maxwell, T. (2008). Creating place from conflicted space. In K. Iyall-Smith & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Hybrid identities: Theoretical and empirical examinations* (pp. 225-244). Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Moustakas, C. (1961). *Loneliness*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology and application*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, D. (2005) A qualitative study into the experience of mandatory personal therapy during training. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research Journal*, 5(1), 27-33.
- Naughton, M., & Tudor, K. (2006). Being white. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 36(2), 159-171.
- Ogden, T. (1997). Reverie and interpretation. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 66(4), 567-595.
- Penetito, W. (2011). *Kaupapa Māori education: Research as the exposed edge* [Presentation]. Paper presented at The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Philip-Barbara, G. (2011). *A kōrero about te reo, tikanga Māori, and Kaupapa Māori research* [Presentation]. Paper presented at The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Pihama, L. (2011). *A conversation about Kaupapa Māori theory and research* [Presentation]. Paper presented at The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30-43.
- Pool, I., & Kukutai, T. (2011). *Taupori Māori – Māori population change: Population changes, 1769–1840*. Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/taupori-maori-maori-population-change/page-1>
- Reid, P. (1995). Get real. In K. Irwin & I. Ramsden (Eds.), *Toi wāhine: The worlds of Māori women* (pp. 29-30). Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Royal, C. T. (2012). Politics and knowledge: Kaupapa Maori and matauranga Maori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 30-37.
- Singh, J., & Tudor, K. (1997). Cultural conditions of therapy. *The Person-Centered Journal*, 4(2), 32-46.
- Smith, G. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori theory and praxis* (Unpublished doctoral

- dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Smith, G., Kawehau, T., & Jones, A. (2012). Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 10-20.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies*. Dunedin, Aotearoa New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2011). *Story-ing the development of Kaupapa Māori – A review of sorts* [Presentation]. Paper presented at The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research In the 21st Century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2016). *How is our Māori population changing?* Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/maori/maori-population-article-2015
- Tudor, K. (2010). *The fight for health: A heuristic enquiry into psychological well-being* (Unpublished context statement for PhD in Mental Health Promotion by Public (Published) Works). School of Health and Social Sciences, Middlesex University, London, UK.
- Tudor, K. (in press). *Psychotherapy: A critical examination*. Ross-on-Wye, UK: PCCS Books.
- van Dyk, Y. (2005). *Hyphenated-living: Between longing and belonging: An exposition of displacement as liminality in the transnational condition* (Master's thesis). Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Walker, S. (1996). *Kia tau te rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori theory as a resistance against the construction of Māori as the other*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- Woodard, W. (2008). *Entering the void: Exploring the relationship between the experience of colonisation and the experience of self for indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, and the implications for clinical practice* (Master's thesis). Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Author Note

Currently Niki lives and works in Queenstown New Zealand with her husband Matthew and her children. She works as a private practice psychotherapist and is the Family Violence Coordinator for the region. Niki is on a journey learning Te Reo Maori. As well as family and work, Niki is active in her community highlighting social discrepancies at a local political level. Niki is on the board of the local high school that her children attend. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: Niki Grennell-Hawke, 10 Herries Lane, Lake Hayes Estate, Queenstown 9304, New Zealand; Email: Niki.grennell@gmail.com.

Keith Tudor is Professor of Psychotherapy at Auckland University of Technology. He is a qualified social worker and psychotherapist. He is the editor of *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, and the co-editor, with Alayne Hall, of *Ata: Journal of Psychotherapy Aotearoa New Zealand*. He is the author and editor of over 250 publications, including 13 books. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: Dr. Keith Tudor, School of Public Health & Psychosocial Studies, Faculty of Health & Environmental Sciences, Auckland University of Technology, Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1142, Aotearoa New Zealand; Email: keith.tudor@aut.ac.nz.

Copyright 2018: Niki Grennell-Hawke, Keith Tudor, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Grennell-Hawke, N., & Tudor, K. (2018). Being Māori and Pākehā: Methodology and method in exploring cultural hybridity. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(7), 1530-1546. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss7/3>
