

NAVIGATING THE CURRENTS OF KAUPAPA MĀORI AND PAN-PACIFIC RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

*Sereana Naepi**

Abstract

This article explores the methodological tensions that can be encountered when researching with both Māori and Pasifika communities in Aotearoa New Zealand. As a new researcher, encountering these tensions can be difficult; however, engaging with the knowledge of Māori and Pasifika academics that came before us can help to navigate these tensions. This article reflects on how emerging Pasifika researchers can engage with kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies within the same research project. This article will unpack how the “Give Way Rule” can be used to navigate these two research methodologies in a way that is still respectful to both methodologies.

Keywords

Māori, Pasifika/Pacific, research methodologies, Pan-Pacific, kaupapa Māori

Introduction

Pasifika postgraduate students face challenges today that those who came before us did not. As the second generation of Pasifika researchers

we must navigate not only Eurocentric research methodologies but also our own and other Indigenous research methodologies. Having to navigate two worlds of research is not negative; instead, it reflects how many of us experience

* Natasiri. PhD student, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
Email: sereanapatterson@gmail.com

living in Aotearoa New Zealand—we learn to navigate two spaces in order to be successful in today’s world. This article is a reflective piece on the methodological process used within my master’s thesis (Patterson, 2012, now Naepi) and how (as a Pasifika postgraduate student) I encountered and used the knowledge of Indigenous academics that came before me. This is not a traditional academic article; instead, it provides a narrative of one Pasifika postgraduate student’s effort to engage with two different Indigenous research methodologies in the same research project.

This article will examine and explore the use of kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies within Aotearoa New Zealand. There are a number of tensions that need to be addressed when researching with both Māori and Pasifika communities. This article will explore these tensions by reviewing kaupapa Māori methodologies and how Pasifika researchers in Aotearoa New Zealand can engage respectfully with kaupapa Māori research methodologies. Following on from that, a discussion of Pan-Pacific research methodologies and how individual Pacific ethnicities can engage with Pan-Pacific research methodologies will take place; then this article will discuss an example of how these two methodologies can operate respectfully in the same research project. Finally, this article will explore possible ways to conduct research with Māori and Pasifika research participants who identify as both Māori and Pasifika.

Background

This article is part of a larger research project—Voices of Taciqu (Patterson, 2012)—which was not originally designed to be an informative example of how to practise kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies. Instead, Voices of Taciqu was a social sciences education research thesis that aimed to determine promising teaching and learning practices outside

of the lecture theatre for Māori and Pasifika students. The findings from the thesis were intended to be transformative, which meant that both Māori and Pasifika learner voices needed to be included as the site of the research combined support for both Māori and Pasifika learners. The decision to look at both Māori and Pasifika learners meant that the research project needed to incorporate both kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies in order to meet not only the Eurocentric university’s ethical research guidelines, but also Māori and Pasifika communities’ expectations.

Kovach (2009) argues that research methodology frameworks are particularly important for Indigenous researchers, as Indigenous frameworks explain the researcher’s beliefs about how knowledge is produced. Pan-Pacific research methodologies provide a framework that aligns with my own beliefs on how knowledge is produced and reproduced. Pan-Pacific research methodologies call for each individual’s community to be taken into account during the research process (Health Research Council, 2005). Therefore, I made the decision to include kaupapa Māori research methodologies in *Voices of Taciqu* as a way of taking into account Māori participants’ communities.

Reflexive writing is used in this article as the use of kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies calls for a writing style that reflects the writer’s space in relation to the community they are researching with, which suggests self-reflection is necessary. G. Smith, Hoskins, and Jones (2012) have argued that it is not possible to write about kaupapa Māori methodologies at a distance; instead you have to show the “blisters on your hands” (p. 13) when writing about engagement with kaupapa Māori methodologies. I believe this also applies to Pan-Pacific research methodologies, as they were also created in response to a Eurocentric research space (Bennett et al., 2013; Health Research Council, 2005). As Bennett et al. (2013) noted, Pacific academics have been critiquing “Western thinking in arts, education

and areas such as anthropology as well, and the articulation of Indigenous-based research methods, going back to at least the 1970s” (p. 96). One way of positioning yourself as aligned with these critiques of Western knowledge is to use self-reflection to unpack who you are and your relation to the community with whom you research.

I am an Aotearoa New Zealand born Pacific Islander who conducts research within an Aotearoa New Zealand context. Within this space exists an ancient whanaungatanga relationship of tuakana-teina between Māori and Pasifika peoples (Health Research Council, 2005). This ancient relationship has continued into modern Aotearoa New Zealand society (Te Punga Somerville, 2012), with Pasifika peoples existing in the “liminal” space between Māori and Pākehā (Teaiwa & Mallon, 2005, p. 225). Pasifika refers to people of Pacific ancestry who now live in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is important to note that the term Pasifika encompasses many different ethnicities, languages and cultural practices, and the exact definition of the term is still debated amongst Pasifika peoples (Coxon, Foliaki, & Mara, 1994; Mahina as cited in Perrott, 2007; Manu‘atu & Kepa, 2002; Samu, 2010).

Given the New Zealand Government’s focus on achieving educational outcomes for both Māori and Pasifika (New Zealand Ministry of Education & Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2014) there is the possibility for a number of research projects where two Indigenous communities’ worldviews must be respected. It is important to note that Māori are Indigenous to Aotearoa New Zealand and that Pasifika are a trans-national Indigenous group who have migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand. Therefore, this educational prioritisation is reflected differently. *Ka Hikitia* (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2013a) outlines that Māori educational success is prioritised as part of the “rights and duties that stem from the principles” (p. 14) of the Treaty of Waitangi. Pasifika are prioritised as the New

Zealand Government wishes to “create the conditions for strong, vibrant and successful Pasifika communities—communities that can help to build a more productive and competitive economy for all New Zealanders” (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2013b, p. 1). Alongside this educational focus, the growing number of individuals who identify as both Māori and Pasifika (Statistics New Zealand, 2014) suggests that a conversation about how to engage individuals with dual Indigenous identities in research within Aotearoa New Zealand is of increasing importance.

Kaupapa Māori methodology

Kaupapa Māori research methodology is a research methodology that can be used when conducting research with Māori communities (Cram, 2009; Curtis et al., 2012; L. Smith, 2011). This section will visit definitions of kaupapa Māori research methodologies. Moving on from definitions, this section will then aim to find previous work that demonstrates how Pasifika or other non-Māori can engage in kaupapa Māori research methodologies.

Kaupapa Māori research methodologies refer to the use of kaupapa Māori principles when conducting research with Māori participants. Graham Smith defined kaupapa Māori research methodologies as centring the values and beliefs of Māori when conducting research, or research by Māori for Māori with Māori (as cited in L. Smith, 1999). G. Smith et al. (2012) see kaupapa Māori theory as a way to “speak back to the dominant existing theories in education” (p. 11). I saw kaupapa Māori research methodologies as an appropriate methodology to use not only for ethical research purposes (outlined earlier) but also as it aligned with my intended outcomes for the research; that the promising practices for teaching and learning identified in the research would be tools for social change.

G. Smith et al. (2012) argue that kaupapa

Māori theory is rooted in critical theory; kaupapa Māori is not only a methodological theory but also a research tool for transformative change. The wider research project from which this article derives (Patterson, 2012) was about changing the way the institution (including academic and professional staff) engaged Māori learners within the Bachelor of Arts. Therefore kaupapa Māori research methodologies provided not only an ethical research base that respected and centred Māori learners and their community, but also a theory that encouraged transformative change, which was part of the original project's intent (Patterson, 2012).

Pākehā engagement with kaupapa Māori research methodologies

It is daunting as a new Pasifika researcher within Aotearoa New Zealand to begin to engage in kaupapa Māori research methodologies. As a Pasifika person you are aware of discrimination in research and how damaging bad research can be for Indigenous peoples, particularly in education. So you begin your research journey wanting to ensure that any engagement with other Indigenous groups is done in a way that respects and centres their worldview; you want to conduct research that decentres Eurocentric research paradigms. It is therefore important that we begin to consider how Pasifika can engage with kaupapa Māori research, as not only is there the potential for research projects that will have both Māori and Pasifika participants, but we also need to consider intersecting identities given how many Māori (8.2%) and Pasifika (11.4%) identify as both Māori and Pasifika (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). Currently there is no easily identifiable research on how Pasifika engage respectfully in kaupapa Māori research, and therefore, I explored how Pākehā are expected to engage (or not) in kaupapa Māori research.

A literature review of kaupapa Māori research methodologies revealed that there has been an ongoing debate about the ability of Pākehā to

engage in kaupapa Māori research in a meaningful and respectful way (Walker, Eketone, & Gibbs, 2006). Jones (2012) has unpacked the idea of whether Pākehā can engage with kaupapa Māori research and she argued that the statement “by Māori for Māori” is a definitional statement that argues for Māori inclusion as opposed to Pākehā exclusion. Jones (2012) argued that Pākehā need to understand that “by Māori for Māori” is not addressed to Pākehā; instead, it is a statement addressed to Māori that is about providing the Indigenous presence within their research (L. Smith as cited in Jones, 2012). This suggests to me that Pasifika should be able to engage in kaupapa Māori research as long as they remember to ensure that there is a Māori presence in the research team who has equal rights to the principal investigator.

In an interview with Graham Smith by Hoskins and Jones (G. Smith et al., 2012), Smith explained the value of relationships in deciding if “outsiders” (p. 18) should be able to engage in kaupapa Māori research methodologies, noting that

this is not a black and white issue; it is about people, it is about relationships there are many people struggling in a range of sites to create a space for Māori—and this includes some Pākehā and other Indigenous peoples. (p. 19)

This suggested to me that unpacking how Pasifika can engage respectfully with kaupapa Māori research methodologies would contribute to the still growing literature on kaupapa Māori research methodologies and perhaps open a space for critical dialogue on how Māori and Pasifika can work together through Indigenous research methodologies in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The issue of non-Māori engagement in kaupapa Māori research methodologies is not simple, but G. Smith et al. (2012) provide five questions that researchers might ask themselves in order to ensure an informed engagement

with kaupapa Māori research methodologies. Without current debate on how Pasifika can engage with kaupapa Māori research, I decided that using a number of the questions raised on Pākehā engagement in kaupapa Māori research would at the very least be a place to start. The five questions identified by G. Smith et al. (2012) are:

1. Do both practical and theoretical aspects exist in the research?
2. What is the position and record of the researcher within their area of research and how does this lend legitimacy to the researcher?
3. Does the commentary or analysis take account of culturist, structuralist and political analysis?
4. What positively changes for Māori as a result of engagement with or application of kaupapa Māori?
5. What positively changes for Māori as a result of the research?

As an example of how these questions can be used when engaging in kaupapa Māori research methodologies I will unpack the question “What positively changes for Māori as a result of engagement with or application of kaupapa Māori?” Patterson (2012) has had some influence on teaching and learning practices within Aotearoa New Zealand. The research has been used by various faculties to address their teaching and learning models. Voices of Taciqu has also been used to change how Māori and Pasifika mentoring programmes are run. The research has been presented at both domestic and international conferences where student support advisors have had access to the research. Although Voices of Taciqu is not the only research on Māori and Pasifika learners available, it is important to note that the research has been used to benefit Māori learners, which, as G. Smith et al. (2012) pointed out, is an integral part of utilising kaupapa Māori research methodologies.

The lack of research and discussion on Pasifika engagement in kaupapa Māori research methodologies resulted in an investigation of how other non-Māori can engage with kaupapa Māori research methodologies. Understanding how Pākehā can engage with kaupapa Māori research methodologies enabled me to have some understanding of how to approach using kaupapa Māori research methodologies as a Pasifika person in Aotearoa New Zealand. There is space in kaupapa Māori research methodologies for Pākehā to engage (under certain conditions) and therefore there would be space for Pasifika also (under certain conditions).

Exploring the Pasifika and Māori relationship in Aotearoa New Zealand

To understand how Pasifika could engage in kaupapa Māori research methodologies within Aotearoa New Zealand I began to investigate the place of Pasifika peoples within Aotearoa New Zealand and more importantly our relationship with Māori. Pasifika within Aotearoa New Zealand exist in a unique space. Teaiwa and Mallon (2005) note that Pasifika exist in a space between Māori and Pākehā, due to their shared past and present realities in Aotearoa New Zealand (educational, social, economic and cultural disparities). The shared past is due to the historical engagement that occurred between Pasifika and Māori before colonisation within Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa (Te Punga Somerville, 2012). The relationship between Māori and Pasifika formed in Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa, and came in the form of a tuakana-teina relationship (Health Research Council, 2005; Te Punga Somerville, 2012). Whilst this does not make Pasifika Māori, it also does not make Pasifika Pākehā, as our relationship with Māori began before colonisation. As such, we need to have a separate discussion on how Pasifika engage with kaupapa Māori research methodologies and this article attempts to begin this discussion.

What was clear from the discussions around Māori and Pasifika relationships was that

although Pasifika existed in the liminal space (Teaiwa & Mallon, 2005) and our relationship to Māori (whanaungatanga relationship, tuakana–teina, Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa) differs from that of Pākehā to Māori (colonisation), it is still important that Pasifika engage respectfully with kaupapa Māori research methodologies. I could not assume that our shared pasts and current realities gave me an insider’s view. Instead, I felt even more motivated to respect the Māori right to tino rangatiratanga (Walker et al., 2006) due to our historical ties within Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa. It became quickly apparent in my research that Te Punga Somerville (2012) had clear grounds for asserting that despite acknowledgement that Māori and Pasifika shared a historical and current connection, this relationship has not been discussed at length in relation to research. What follows is an attempt to contribute to this conversation, and provide a way of exploring the Māori and Pasifika relationship within research.

A Pasifika response to kaupapa Māori research methodologies

One possible Pasifika response to kaupapa Māori research methodologies is located within Pan-Pacific research methodologies. As signalled in guidelines to Aotearoa New Zealand based Pacific research, the Pasifika relationship with Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand acknowledges the tangata whenua status of Māori (Health Research Council, 2005). The Pasifika relationship with Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand also acknowledges and affirms “the ancient whanaungatanga relationship, of tuakana–teina within te Moana nui a Kiwa, the Pacific region” (Health Research Council, 2005, p. 7). Although the Guidelines on Pacific Health Research (Health Research Council, 2005) were not attempting to provide a way for Pasifika to engage with kaupapa Māori research methodologies, this acknowledgement of tangata whenua and ancient ties led me to believe they may provide a way to interact with kaupapa Māori

research methodologies as a Pasifika researcher in Aotearoa New Zealand. The Guidelines on Pacific Health Research suggested to me that before starting the research process I needed to ensure that the research method reflected that Māori are tangata whenua and that their right to tino rangatiratanga would be respected.

In order to do as the Guidelines on Pacific Health Research suggested I needed to understand tino rangatiratanga and how I could ensure that Māori could exercise tino rangatiratanga within the research. Tino rangatiratanga is defined as self-determination, but as a Māori concept in research it encompasses a lot more. Tino rangatiratanga is tied with kaupapa Māori research methodologies (Walker et al., 2006); it is about ensuring that Māori involved in the research (as participants, researchers, consultants and so forth) have the right and ability to interact with the research at the same level as the principal investigator. This was thought-provoking for me, as it meant that the principal investigator gave over the right to draw conclusions on the research. However, this gets to the core of what kaupapa Māori research methodologies are about: research for Māori, by Māori, with Māori. The research is no longer the principal investigator’s research; it is communal property that will be contributed to, debated about and used by the Māori community. Therefore I needed to ensure that the Māori community had the opportunity to engage with the research, not just at the beginning, but throughout the research process.

The first step to ensuring that Māori participants and communities had an opportunity to engage in the research was by setting up a robust system of consultation. Consultation is a problematic word for what was arranged for the project, as the group’s role went beyond consultation; individuals within the group were able to provide not only feedback but also veto ideas and interpretations of the interview and see the final product before submission. The Māori community panel consisted of a leading Māori academic with experience in kaupapa

Māori research methodologies, a Māori interviewer with experience in the research method, a Māori senior professional staff member with experience supporting Māori students, a Māori academic with experience in supporting Māori students and the research method, a Māori professional staff member with acknowledged expertise in tikanga Māori, and the Māori student research participants (Patterson, 2012). The role of the Māori community group was ongoing and reflective, and the relationship with these individuals was understood to be a continuous and reflexive process that would enrich the research and improve outcomes for Māori students.

In Patterson (2012), *tino rangatiratanga* was maintained in particular through the roles of the leading Māori academic with experience in kaupapa Māori research, and the Māori interviewer with experience in the research method. This was not an easy process, and looking back I would advise graduate students to plan ahead and set up regular meetings with their Māori community group. I relied on individual meetings and emails, which, dependent on time constraints of the individuals, may have meant that they were not able to engage with the material as critically as they wanted to or were expected to.

It was important to ensure that Māori participants felt that they were interviewed within a safe space. This safe space would enable them to share more openly about their experiences. Therefore, a Māori interviewer conducted the interviews in order to ensure that Māori participants were able to interact with somebody with knowledge of Māori tikanga within the interview space. At the beginning of each interview the interviewer conducted a *mihi*. The interviewer's knowledge of *te reo* also meant that Māori participants were able to use *te reo* without being asked to explain what they meant. This resulted in comments like "you know" (Patterson, 2012, p. 93) in interview transcripts as participants reconfirmed that the Māori interviewer had understood a Māori

term or worldview. However, Māori participants were aware that the principal investigator was not Māori and as they were not sure of the transcriber's ethnicity, comments like "Does that machine interpret Māori?" (Patterson, 2012, p. 93) also occurred. These comments show that Māori participants were eager to ensure that their stories and worldviews were understood and interpreted correctly and it is for that reason that *Voices of Taciqu* had a leading Māori academic within the Māori community group.

The role of the Māori academic with experience in kaupapa Māori research was to provide a space where I could go for support and guidance for kaupapa Māori research whilst ensuring that the principles of kaupapa Māori research were adhered to. At the outset of the project it was intended that this academic, who also served as my research advisor, would have final say on chapters that addressed Māori participant views. This is the important difference between an advisor on any other research project and an advisor on a kaupapa Māori research project; the Māori advisor has the right to veto aspects of your research or ask for clarification and expansion on aspects of your research. A Māori advisor should be treated with the same level of respect as the principal investigator. One example of this process working during the research process was when a Māori participant spoke about their identity as Māori and the role that played in their success. In the following quote, a Māori participant (who grew up on a *marae* and is proud to be Māori) reflects on being recognised as Māori despite what he described himself as his "fair" appearance.

Tuākana is the first real experience I've had, apart from hanging out with *whānau* where that just doesn't matter ... and I spoke to a couple of other fair skin people that were involved in it and they were experiencing the same thing. It just didn't matter ... being in that group ... being accepted in that group and

I think that acceptance is what is most important. (as quoted in Patterson, 2012, p. 33)

In this instance I felt that this was not something I as a person of Pasifika descent could interpret, so I spoke to the leading Māori academic about how this particular interview piece could be interpreted; their advice was to let the participant speak for themselves. This resulted in the use of the above quote as a direct statement about the complexity of identity from the Māori learner's point of view without further analysis from myself.

This continuous and reflexive approach to consultation was made possible through the use of the Give Way Rule. The Give Way Rule was first developed by Airini et al. (2010) as a way to engage in cross-cultural research between Māori and Pasifika communities. The Give Way Rule anticipates that there will be times when there may be different interpretations of the research. Where this happens the range of views are considered and noted, and then the decision on the cultural interpretation of the incident, story or event "gives way" to the research advisor who holds the Māori or specific Pasifika expertise, depending on the ethnicity of the participant. Curtis et al. (2012) explained the Give Way Rule as useful for cross-cultural research involving Māori participants, as "the rule acknowledges everyone's contribution; however, the final decision involving cultural interpretation of the incidents would pass to a Māori project team member" (p. 15). The Give Way Rule has the potential to make researchers anxious, but if as a researcher you are committed to creating an equal partnership in research, the Give Way Rule provides a way to redress unequal power relationships between advisors and researchers.

Engaging in kaupapa Māori research methodologies as a Pasifika postgraduate student looking into Māori learner success was challenging. However, previous work (Airini et al., 2010; Curtis et al., 2012; Health Research Council, 2005; Jones, 2012; G. Smith et al.,

2012; G. Smith as cited in L. Smith, 1999; Teaiwa & Mallon, 2005; Walker et al., 2006) has shown me ways to navigate respectfully through kaupapa Māori research methodologies and has also given me tools to further develop my interaction with the Māori learner community.

Pan-Pacific research methodologies

Pan-Pacific research methodologies refer to methodologies that respond to a number of Indigenous Pacific ethnicities through shared values such as reciprocal relationships, respect and being community orientated (Bennett et al., 2013; Health Research Council, 2005; Penetito & Sanga, 2002). Pan-Pacific research methodologies have been developed to respond to the growing need to have research that reflects the values of the researched community (Bennett et al., 2013; Health Research Council, 2005). As shown in Bennett et al. (2013), Pasifika academics have been calling for Pacific research that moves away from the Eurocentric assumptions of research since at least the 1970s. As a result of that, numerous ethnic-specific Pacific research methodologies exist such as talanoa (Farrelly & Nabobo-Baba, 2014; Otunuku, 2011; Prescott, 2008; Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Vaioleti, 2006), Ula (Sauni, 2011), faafaletui (Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014), and the vanua framework (Nabobo-Baba, 2011). Pan-Pacific research methodologies were used in this research project as many different Pacific ethnicities participated in the research project and to privilege one nation's epistemologies over another would have been disrespectful and unethical. This research project used the Health Research Council's Guidelines on Pacific Health Research developed in 2005. However, it is important to be aware that other Pan-Pacific research methodologies have been discussed and developed since then (Amituanai-Toloa, 2009; Bennett et al., 2013). This section will explore how one specific Pacific

ethnicity can engage with Pan-Pacific research methodologies.

The Give Way Rule, which was also used with kaupapa Māori research methodologies, was a tool that enabled me to engage with Pan-Pacific research methodologies despite being of one Pacific ethnicity. Consistent with previous research (Airini et al., 2010), the Give Way Rule was applied to include specific ethnicities within the Pasifika category. For instance, the Give Way Rule would be applied if a participant had identified themselves as Tongan and the Tongan academic advisor to this research indicated how to interpret a cultural practice. An example of this was when I was analysing transcripts and a Tongan student told a story of her relationship with her aunty.

My aunty ... my dad's sister, she's the oldest in the family, she's very kind of traditional ... I guess she expected her children to do well, and they're doing well but they're not where she wanted them to be, and she's always drawing comparisons like "Oh your children aren't as good as mine" and stuff ... So she's ... I guess the rest of us were made to feel like we're slaves, you know? Or we're not good enough basically, or we're not good enough to wipe the dirt from her shoes you know and that's one of the reasons why I want to do well for him just to kinda show that I'm not gonna be down there ... I'm gonna make it you know? (Participant 13PF3, personal communication, April 21, 2012)

The Tongan participant had identified her relationship with her aunty as a motivation for study because they constantly told her she was not good enough. I misunderstood this as a hindering practice as the aunty was not practising positive reinforcement. However, after speaking with the Tongan academic advisor this was changed to helping as the Tongan advisor explained the dynamics of a Tongan family and the role the aunty (older sister of the father) plays in the Tongan girl's life. The

Give Way Rule ensured that I respected that Pasifika is made up of various ethnicities and that identifying with one Pacific ethnicity did not equip me with the knowledge to understand all of Pasifika. Although it was difficult sometimes to locate people from each Pacific ethnicity, it was important to ensure that each Pacific ethnicity had a voice in the research project so that their cultures and community were not misrepresented.

Using both kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies

As a Pasifika postgraduate student, navigating two separate research methodologies was a difficult process in and of itself, but realising that they would need to be used together presented another set of problems. This section discusses how I engaged with two research methodologies within one research project. The utilisation of two cultural research methodologies involves a significant level of respect. Although both kaupapa Māori and Pasifika research methodologies have similarities, they also call for two different cultures and ethnicities to be centred within the research design and implementation. Both methodologies would suggest that to share this positioning with another ethnicity is not possible.

Kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies do share similarities, which may be why using them both in the same research project was difficult, but also achievable as they did not contradict each other in the same way that they would contradict Eurocentric research methodologies. A comparison of Cram's 2009 model explained in *Maintaining Indigenous Voices* and Bennett et al.'s 2013 *Pacific Research Protocols from the University of Otago* indicates similarities in values can be found between the two methodologies (respect, relationships and so forth). This is perhaps not surprising when considering, as Te Punga Somerville (2012) points out, Māori were once

Pacific, and to many outside of Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori still are Pacific. However, different political motivations mean that Māori and Pasifika research methodologies express themselves in different ways in Aotearoa New Zealand. Pasifika are striving for research that protects and advances their communities in Aotearoa New Zealand (Bennett et al., 2013); Māori are striving for research that both protects and advances their communities and their right to tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa New Zealand (Walker et al., 2006). This relationship between kaupapa Māori research methodologies and Pan-Pacific research methodologies is something that needs to be further explored.

Despite the similarities I still needed a way to decide which value set (Māori or Pasifika) would be centred at which point in the research. A simple solution would be to centre tikanga Māori when liaising with Māori participants and Pasifika values when engaging with Pasifika participants. However, in an effort to stay true to the participants' identities it was decided early on in the research that participants should be able to name their own identities; being plural if they preferred (Patterson, 2012). The decision to allow participants to be numerous ethnicities meant that the participants' identities were respected and a more responsive and arguably accurate representation of the data eventuated. However, this decision, whilst noble in its intentions, complicated the use of two research methodologies.

Pan-Pacific research principles provided a way for me to engage with participants who identified with dual ethnicities. The Pan-Pacific research principle of respect (Health Research Council, 2005) involves treating each participant as an individual, while also acknowledging their role in their own community. In respecting them as an individual, the researcher likewise respects the community that the individual comes from as well the individual's inherent role in that community (Health Research Council, 2005). It is this research principle that made it possible to respect each participant's

own ethnicity identification. If a participant identified as Māori/Pasifika then their transcripts were treated individually in accordance with their interview comments. For example, one participant identified as Māori/Pasifika but their stories related to a Pacific student association. In this case, the reading and validity testing of that incident was done in relation to Pasifika research models. However, this treatment of the transcripts was not always successful.

Allowing participants to identify with numerous ethnicities was problematic when Māori/Pasifika participants spoke about the complications of having a dual identity:

'Cause I was brought up on my Māori side on like, maraes and that sort of thing and I never got to know my Niuean side and I'm more Niuean than I am Māori. So coming here [university] that meant that I could explore that side of my identity, which is cool ... my Nana said it and she goes, "These bloody coconuts should just go back to where they came from" and it just went quiet, and I said "Nana, if that were true you'd have to say good bye to me 'cause I'd be going back to Niue based on your theory." And the whole room just went quiet because it was my whole family ... and my Nana said, "No I didn't mean it about you, you're Māori, you're family." And I was like, "No Nana, because I'm half Niuean." I never would've said that before, I'd never acknowledge my Niuean side in front of them because I thought it was disrespectful. (as quoted in Patterson, 2012, p. 38).

This particular excerpt was used to show how complex identity can be and is a good example of how dual identity becomes complex when using two methodologies, as to whose lens we view this story through and which parts of the story we focus on. For this particular excerpt the decision was made to treat this story as a success. The participant spoke about the event as a success as they saw being able to reconnect with their Pacific side as a positive event.

However, this may not always be clear, which can make analysis difficult.

Using dual methodologies worked in the case of *Voices of Taciqu* (Patterson, 2012) as the primary intent of the research was to value the individual participant’s identity over and beyond the use of research methodologies. Kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies both call for a centring of specific cultural worldview, but do not take into account that members of the research community may identify with an identity outside of the research methodologies’ focus and what impact this may, could or should have on how research is conducted with these dual identity participants.

Conclusion

Researching with Māori and Pasifika communities in Aotearoa New Zealand can be a complex task, particularly as an emerging Pasifika researcher. There are many tensions to navigate, including how and if Pasifika can engage with kaupapa Māori research methodologies; navigating the Māori and Pasifika relationship in Aotearoa New Zealand; how tino rangatiratanga can be maintained when Pasifika use kaupapa Māori research methodologies; how and if individual Pacific ethnicities can meaningfully engage with Pan-Pacific research methodologies; navigating use of two Indigenous research methodologies within one research project; and finally, how to engage outside of the Māori and Pasifika binary when engaging with research participants who identify as both Māori and Pasifika. However, it is important we explore these tensions and expand on how respectful research can be carried out using kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies. We also need to be mindful that thinking in binaries (Māori or Pasifika) ignores that there are members of our communities who identify outside of this binary and we must begin to consider ways to address this. The Give Way Rule provides one possible

way to address some of these tensions, but we also need to consider and further develop other ways for our communities to engage in research that allows our communities’ voices to be heard.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Te Whare Kura for their ongoing support in my postgraduate journey and Sharon Stein for her comments on the drafts of this article.

Glossary

Aotearoa	Māori name for New Zealand
faafaletui	faa—a causative prefix; fale—house, or groups or houses; tui—weaving
kaupapa Māori	philosophical doctrine incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society
marae	Māori meeting space where formal greetings and discussions take place
mihi	speech of greeting, acknowledgement, tribute
Pākehā	New Zealander of European descent
taciqu	younger brothers (of a male), younger sisters (of a female), cousins (of the same gender) of a junior line, junior relatives
talanoa	Pacific research methodology informed by Tongan, Samoan and Fijian understandings of talanoa (tala—to inform, tell relate, command, ask or apply; noa—ordinary, nothing in particular)

tangata whenua	Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand	vanua	Fijian research methodology that incorporates Fijian understandings of tribal and village relationships into research
Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa	the South Pacific		
te reo	the language (Māori language)	whānau	family
teina	younger brother (of a male), younger sister (of a female), cousin (of the same gender) of a junior line, junior relative	whanaungatanga	relationship, kinship, sense of family connection—a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging. It develops as a result of kinship rights and obligations, which also serve to strengthen each member of the kin group. It also extends to others with whom one develops a close familial, friendship or reciprocal relationship.
tikanga Māori	customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context		
tino rangatiratanga	self-determination		
tuakana	elder brother (of a male), elder sister (of a female), cousin (of the same gender from a more senior branch of the family)		
Ula	Samoan research method that incorporates Samoan values into the research method		

References

- Airini, Brown, D., Curtis, E., Johnson, O., Luatua, F., O'Shea, M., ... Ulugia-Pua, M. (2010). *Success for all: Improving Māori and Pasifika learner success in degree-level studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.tlri.org.nz/sites/default/files/projects/9247-Airini-final-report.pdf>
- Amituanai-Tolosa, M. (2009). What is a Pasifika research methodology? The "tupua" in the winds of change. *Pacific-Asian Education Journal*, 21(2), 45–53.
- Bennett, J., Brunton, M., Bryant-Tokalau, J., Sopoaga, F., Weaver, N., & Witte, G. (2013). Pacific research protocols from the University of Otago. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 25(1), 95–124.
- Coxon, E., Foliaki, L., & Mara, D. (1994). Pacific education. In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins, L. Marshall, & L. Massey (Eds.), *The politics of learning and teaching in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 180–214). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Cram, F. (2009). Maintaining indigenous voices. In D. Mertons & P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *The handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 308–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curtis, E., Wikaire, E., Lualua-Aatai, T., Kool, B., Nepia, W., Ruka, M., ... Poole, P. (2012). *Tātou tātou/success for all: Improving Māori student success*. Retrieved from <https://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-1652/tatou-tatou--success-for-all-improving-maori-student-success.pdf>
- Farrelly, T., & Nabobo-Baba, U. (2014). Talanoa as empathic apprenticeship. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 55(3), 319–330.
- Health Research Council. (2005). *Guidelines on Pacific health research*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Guidelines%20on%20Pacific%20Health%20Research%202005.pdf>
- Jones, A. (2012). Dangerous liaisons: Pakeha, kaupapa Maori, and educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 100–112.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Manu'atu, L., & Kepa, M. (2002, October). *Towards reconstituting the notion of study clinics. A Kakai Tonga Tu'a community-based educational project*. Invited presentation to the First National Pasifika Bilingual Education Conference, Auckland, Alexandra Park Conference Centre.
- Nabobo-Baba, U. (2011). Decolonising framings in Pacific research: Indigenous Fijian Vanua research framework as an organic response. *AlterNative*, 4(2), 141–154.
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2013a). *Ka Hikitia: Accelerating success*. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/TheMinistry/KaHikitia/KaHikitiaAcceleratingSuccessEnglish.pdf>
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2013b). *Pasifika education plan 2013–2017*. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/NZEducation/EducationPolicies/~media/MinEdu/Files/EducationSectors/PasifikaEducation/PasifikaEdPlan2013To2017V2.pdf>
- New Zealand Ministry of Education, & Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2014). *Tertiary education strategy 2014–2019*. Retrieved from http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/EducationSectors/TertiaryEducation/TertiaryEducationStrategy2014/MOE_TES2014_V9.pdf
- Otunuku, M. A. (2011). How can talanoa be used effectively as an indigenous research methodology with Tongan people? *Pacific-Asian Education*, 23(2), 43–52.
- Patterson, S. (2012). *The voices of taciq: Teaching and learning practices in non-lecture settings for Māori and Pasifika success in the first year of a Bachelor of Arts* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Penetito, W., & Sanga, K. (2002). A conversation on the philosophy and practice of teaching research in Māori and Pacific education. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 12, 21–37.
- Perrott, A. (2007, August 4). Pasifika: Identity or illusion? *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/tongans-in-nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=346&objectid=10455473
- Prescott, S. M. (2008). Using talanoa in Pacific business research in New Zealand: Experiences with Tongan entrepreneurs. *AlterNative*, 4(1), 128–148.
- Samu, T. (2010). Pacific education: An Oceanic perspective. *MAI Review*, 2010(1). Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/article/view/311/379>
- Sauni, S. L. (2011). Samoan research methodology: The Ula—A new paradigm. *Pacific-Asian Education*, 23(2), 53–64.
- Smith, G., Hoskins, T., & Jones, A. (2012). Interview: Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 10–20.

- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. (2011). Re-storying the development of Kaupapa Māori. In J. Hutchings, H. Potter, & K. Taupo (Eds.), *Kei Tua o Te Pae hui proceedings: The challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st century* (pp. 10–15). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2014B). *Data hub*. Retrieved from <http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx#>
- Suaalii-Sauni, T., & Fulu-Aiolupotea, S. M. (2014). Decolonising Pacific research, building Pacific research communities and developing Pacific research tools: The case of the “talanoa” and the “faafaletui” in Samoa. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 55(3), 331–344.
- Te Punga Somerville, A. (2012). *Once were Pacific: Māori connections to Oceania*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Teaiwa, T., & Mallon, S. (2005). Ambivalent kinships? Pacific people in New Zealand. In J. Liu (Ed.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Vaioleti, T. (2006). Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific Research. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 21–34.
- Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Māori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(4), 331–344.