Who Gets Voice? (Re)presentation of Bicultural Relations in New Zealand Print Media

Kelly Barclay

Institute of Geography, Victoria University of Wellington

James H. Liu

School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington

This study investigates the role and performance of the print media in (re)presenting the voice of different groups in its coverage of bicultural relations in Aotearoa New Zealand. Specifically, it explores media coverage of Maori protest occupations in terms of the agency afforded to these groups, and in terms of the reiterative role of the media in 'performatively' reproducing the social spaces that constitute New Zealand. The 1995 occupation of Pakaitore/ Moutoa gardens in Wanganui by local Maori, was the focus for this investigation. The study located eighty articles printed in *The New Zealand Herald* and eighty seven articles printed in *The Dominion* over the 79-day occupation period. First, coding and word counts were used to determine amount of voice afforded to the main interest groups. Second, the way media (re)present these voices was examined through: amount of quoting vs. paraphrasing; length of quote; and juxtaposition of accounts with alternative accounts. The amount of voice afforded to Maori was found to be more consistent with status as a minority under multiculturalism, than with their status as equal partners under the Treaty of Waitangi (and biculturalism). Media (re)presentation of Maori voices was found to differ from that of other interest groups involved in the occupation on these measures. We contend the outcome was a diminution of agency for Maori.

Over the last two decades a number of commentators have argued that Maori voices are significantly disadvantaged in mainstream media coverage of bicultural relations (Fox, 1988, 1992; McGregor & Te Awa, 1996; Maharey, 1990; Spoonley & Hirsh, 1990). Other studies have revealed ways Maori are presented negatively, or undermined, through media discourses (most notably Cochrane, 1990; McGregor & Comrie, 1995; McCreanor, 1993). However, research has yet to provide a substantial or comprehensive examination of media performance in reporting of bicultural issues in New Zealand.

These findings echo views widely held throughout Maoridom (see Nathan, 1997; *The Dominion*, Saturday March 18, 1995: 3; *Evening Standard*, Saturday 14 October 1995:12). They can also be related to the large body of postcolonial literature which argues that the silencing of indigenous 'voices' has been both a product and a mechanism of colonial oppression (see for example Bhabha, 1990; Loomba, 1998; Said, 1993, Spivak, 1988). Over the last two decades the relationship between discourse, power, and agency has also been widely theorized within both poststructural and feminist theory, and within psychology in relation to disenfranchised, or 'minority' groups (see Butler, 1990, 1993; Foucault, 1980; Hekman, 1996; McDowell, 1997; Nicholson, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1987).

Our approach to voice in the media draws on the feminist theory of Judith Butler (see 1990, 1993, 1997) who does not locate agency as residing merely in fixed human subjects, but rather in relation to the reiterative processes of language. Butler contends that language is a regulatory practice that 'performatively' produces and reproduces both the subjects, and social spaces it appears to describe. Significantly, Butler's work points to the importance of gaining voice within the media as a critical practice for cultural politics. While Butler's treatment of agency has attracted criticism for its lack of specificity in relation to the subject and its over-reliance on discourse (see McNay, 2000), other theorists argue strongly for a discursive (Bhabha, 1993) and non-representational view of agency (Thrift, 1996) such as Butler describes. We contend Butler's conception of agency provides a useful theoretical position from which to examine bicultural politics in media discourse. Reiterative processes such as Butler describes have already

been noted within the media discourses of bicultural relations (McCreanor, 1993). In this arena, we argue agency can be seen in terms of one's ability to interrupt or influence these reiterative processes.

Negotiating the Bicultural

Our reference to 'bicultural' refers to a particular social and political terrain familiar to most New Zealanders. This terrain is generally acknowledged as encompassing the diverse out-workings of partnership between those identifying as Maori, the Crown, and others in society as expressed in contemporary and historical interpretations of the Treaty of Waitangi; in struggles for redress of historical grievances over land settlement and ownership; in the exercise of rights and claims to autonomy for Maori; in the exercise of right of settlement and belongingness for non-Maori; in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship for all New Zealanders (refer to Belich, 1996; Durie, 1998; Kawharu, 1989; King, 1985, 1999; Orange, 1987; Ritchie, 1993; Salmond, 1991,1997; Sharp, 1990; Vasil, 1988; Walker, 1987, 1990; Ward, 1974; Wilson & Yeatman, 1995).

We want to extend the bicultural to denote a wider definition of intercultural relations, being the lived-out sense of interconnectedness, both economic, social, cultural, and spatial that has developed across and within diverse Maori and non-Maori populations (Liu & Liu, 1999; Liu & Temara, 1998; Spoonley, 1995, Walker, 2001). In this sense, the bicultural does not necessarily represent a bifurcation or separateness, either present or historical, between Maori and non-Maori, as some sources suggest (see McKinnon, 1995; Spoonley, 1995). Turner (1995) and Upton (2000) have noted, those with Maori ancestry simultaneously find themselves on both sides of the Treaty partnership. In addition, longstanding and widespread practices of intermarriage have blurred the boundaries and shifted the bicultural beyond the simple categories that can be defined by subjects and bodies. On this basis Ranginui Walker (2001) has recently argued that Maori and Pakeha are not separate categories, but actually constitute each other. Recent work by Harrington and Liu (2002) showing that Maori constructions of self are both group-oriented and individualistic supports such a stand. We contend the bicultural is constituted through varying formations of agreement and disparity, of unity and separateness.

These bicultural formations do not rely on a definition of what constitutes culture or the reification of discrete cultural groups, but are implicit in the lived social spaces that constitute New Zealand. In saying this, we do not wish to naturalize either the 'bicultural', or 'New Zealand' for that matter (see Billig, 1995). Instead, we conceptualise them as a variety of interrelated social spaces that are constantly produced and reproduced through various contested and negotiated discourses and practices that also constitute relations of power. These discourses are predominantly disseminated through the media, the law, and everyday verbal interactions.

Central to this bicultural terrain are more formal discourses of 'Biculturalism' and 'Multiculturalism', primarily expressed through state institutions and reported through the media. 'Biculturalism' gained official status in New Zealand through a series of Government actions in the mid-1980's (see Kelsey, 1996; Levine & Harris, 1999; Pearson, 1996), but since then it has remained a site of contestation (see also Lealand, 1988; Nash, 1990). In particular, a preference for Multiculturalism over Biculturalism, has been widely evident within the discourse of Pakeha New Zealanders (see Coop, 1988), a position largely legitimated on a notion of equality for all (see Sharp, 1990). However, alternative arguments have suggested this Multicultural discourse provides a vehicle for a hidden Pakeha majority to continue a historical and systematic dispossession and of Maori resources, culture, and diminution of agency, by relegating Maori to minority status (Liu, 1999).

Maori interests have long argued for the need to maintain and acknowledge Biculturalism in relation to the mainstream media (see Fox, 1988). Clearly, for Maori, their status as equal Treaty Partners has been at stake. But others have argued that even this official form of Biculturalism has been far from adequate in maintaining the interests of Maori (see Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Pearson, 1996). Pearson has warned both such 'isms' may constitute 'negative ideologies promoted by the state and other agencies of the powerful for managing ethnic conflict' (1996: 249), and which act to mask the continuation of social integration and of nation-building in the interests of the dominant group. Perhaps for this reason, Maori attention has increasingly focused on regaining autonomy through the establishment of separate Maori or iwi (tribal) media, ahead of the less rewarding task of challenging the mainstream media to deliver according to Bicultural principles.

Biculturalism and Media Fairness

The discourses of Biculturalism and Multiculturalism form critical positions from which to assess media fairness in the reporting of bicultural relations. We do not suggest that these discourses are unified, uncontested, or discrete from each other. Rather, we contend, with Pearson (1996), that Biculturalism and Multiculturalism often represent discursive demands for different realities. As such these positions are related to power as much as they are to culture (Pearson, 1990). Specifically, in relation to fairness in media coverage, Multiculturalism suggests that Maori should be accorded voice in line with their minority status, while Biculturalism requires that Maori should be accorded voice in accordance with their status as equal Treaty partners with the Crown.

With regard to the current law and government policy giving status to Maori in relation to the Treaty according to Bicultural principles (see Levine & Harris, 1999), and to current perceptions of New Zealand history (see Liu, Wilson, McClure & Higgins, 1999), we argue media fairness should be assessed on the basis of Biculturalism. However, in acknowledging Biculturalism in this context, we do not wish to accord it a primacy that will mask, promote, or reproduce status inequalities in relation to gender, class and ethnicity.

(Re)presentation of voice

The selective reconstruction and juxtaposition of accounts is central to the work of journalists and editors in producing news. We refer to this process as (re)presentation. Bell (1995), with particular reference to television texts, refers to a 'process of negotiation and modification' (p. 114) that occurs during media construction of news, and suggests research into this area would be valuable. The influence of these processes in media reporting of bicultural relations has been noted by a number of commentators (Cochrane, 1990; Trlin, 1990).

Our use of the term (re)presentation to denote these processes first underlines the media's role in re-presenting the real (Shapiro, 1988; Tomlinson, 1991), in reconstructing actual events and accounts as news. Second, it refers to the interpretive space this allows to shape and reinscribe accounts (Lim Hua Weng, 1998). Critically, the process of (re)presentation provides an opportunity for the media to legitimise or undermine various positions. Third it relates to Butler's problematization of representation as a process which provides 'visibility and legitimacy' to individuals as 'political subjects' in that it sets out 'in advance the criterion by which subjects themselves are formed" (Butler, 1990, p1).

But what are the factors that might determine the forms that this (re)presentation takes? van Dijk suggests there is a need to examine the 'political and societal dimensions of media organizations at a macro level' alongside the 'interactional, discursive and cognitive aspects of newsmaking' (van Dijk, 1991, p.23). van Dijk conceptualises such dimensions as constituting the 'interpretation frameworks' which journalists and editors draw on in their reconstruction of accounts as news. One such framework is the concept of 'newsworthiness' (see McGregor, 1991). As McGregor suggests an important aspect of newsworthiness is that the media present material to suit reader expectation. As Cochrane (1990) contends:

> 'Through the selection of events and issues, the media draw upon the values and assumptions which are most familiar and most widely legitimated. The media creatively select and interpret events to fit in with preconceived models and demands of the social environment. As events are processed by ideological, social, economic, political, and organisational requirements, news ceases to be neutral, free floating description of the social world. The media effectively provide a partial account of society.' (p. 6)

Our concept of (re)presentation is concerned with the media's reiterative role in forming and reproducing the 'standard stories' (Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) or 'social representations' (Farr & Moscovici, 1984) of the dominant group through such processes. Accordingly we argue that mainstream coverage of bicultural relations will tend to align with the expectations, and the 'standard stories' of Pakeha/ European New Zealanders who form the majority of the readership, thus potentially disadvantaging alternative perspectives. We contend that these reiterative media processes act to produce both the subjects they describe and

the social spaces that constitute New Zealand (Butler, 1993). They also produce acceptable Maori subjects and unacceptable Maori subjects (McCreanor, 1993; Wall, 1997).

We found Wilson and Gutierrez' (1985, cited in McGregor & Te Awa, 1996) model of news coverage of minority groups to be useful in understanding (re)presentation processes in relation to New Zealand's bicultural setting. As we have made clear, a Bicultural stance supports Maori as having an equal partnership status under the Treaty rather than minority status. Maori also constitute a numerical minority in New Zealand and hence conform to the 'minority group' category for the purposes of Wilson and Gutierrez' model.

According to Wilson and Guitierrez, coverage afforded to 'minority' groups takes the form of a number of phases. The first stage is a systematic exclusion in the reporting of minority group news. The second stage is to present minority groups' concerns as a threat to existing social order. The third stage is having exposed the threat, to present the 'minority' group's response as confrontation. The fourth stage is to represent minorities in ways that correspond with dominant majority attitudes. The fifth stage is integrated coverage where minorities gain fair representation. McGregor and Te Awa (1996) suggest, with reference to New Zealand, that these strategies occur in a circuitous way. We contend that several of these phases may occur simultaneously (see Liu, 1999).

Van Dijk (1991, p.43) has observed that 'in present day societies the mass media have nearly exclusive control over the symbolic resources needed to manufacture popular consent'. This underlines the need for ongoing research which examines and monitors, both structural and discursive practices within media (re)presentation of bicultural relations, and the ways these influence the voice and agency obtained by different groups.

Occupations, the media, and agency

The particular site we chose in order to examine fairness in media coverage of bicultural relations was the occupation of Pakaitore/Moutoa gardens in Wanganui by local Maori in 1995. We acknowledge that land occupations are only one type of bicultural situation reported in the media, and we have researched others (Liu & Mills, 1998; under review). We also note that, being a physical and forcible contestation of space and resources, occupations may attract more extreme views and conflict than other bicultural contexts. Occupations, as a form of protest, are a significant and recurring presence within media accounts of contemporary cultural politics in New Zealand. However, only limited research has been conducted into such protest formations and their relationship to the media (Poata-Smith, 1996, Wall, 1997).

Land occupations by Maori groups have generally arisen in response to perceived and unresolved grievances over their historical dispossession or alienation from ancestral land. Reoccupation of that land is an obvious step in reversing such dispossession firstly on the basis it

constitutes a 'repossession'. More importantly, we argue occupations provide the occupiers with a means to challenge the various regulatory discourses within the law and the media that maintain this alienation.

Such occupations can be related to established psychological models that describe minority group strategies in response to status inequality (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Taylor & McKirnan, 1984). Specifically, group occupation aligns with Tajfel & Turner's 'social competition' strategies and with Taylor and McKirnan's 'collective action' stage, where 'minority' groups seek to directly challenge the status quo. Again the 'minority' label, used in these models, is somewhat problematic in terms of our earlier discussions. These models are broadly suggestive of the ways in which occupations may be related to agency, but are too generalised to explain the relationship in terms of media discourse.

We suggest agency represents a critical factor in occupations. For Maori, the reassertion of rights through the physical control of space represents a tangible form of resistance and control, a move away from being constructed as passive victims, and towards agency (see Spoonley, 1995; Maaka, 1997, in Fleras and Spoonley, 1999). Occupations can also be linked to agency in terms of the ability to gain attention and voice for grievances or causes in the media. Returning to Butler's notion of performativity to frame agency in the media, we contend occupation represents a means to influence, circumvent, or interupt the prevailing 'regulatory' discourses of the media and the law.

What we are suggesting is that Maori occupations may in part constitute a reaction to existing media behaviour. They are a response to the way in which prevailing Pakeha-dominated discourses of the law and the media produce acceptable Maori identities and spaces. Butler's (1997) theory suggests that, in doing so, these discourses effectively create a domain of excluded or 'unliveable' Maori identities and 'uninhabitable' Maori spaces. The only subjectivities and spaces able to be legitimately occupied by Maori become those which are made intelligible by the majority interests. However, Butler also suggests that these discourses only ever achieve partial closure and are therefore inherently unstable.

Two possibilities for agency emerge in relation to the media for Maori groups undertaking occupations. First, occupation may provide a direct means for Maori to gain increased attention and thus voice their concerns more effectively within the media. Second, physical occupation of space may be seen as an alternative response in opposition to the prevailing media discourses that constrain Maori subject positions and spaces. In this sense Maori may choose to shun the rather hazardous strategy of gaining voice in the media, in favour of a more direct strategy of occupation. Physical occupation constitutes a rebuttal that itself undermines the stability of the prevailing regulatory discourses such as the media and the law. This instability is also promoted through media 'coverage' of the occupation.

The fact that occupation bridges these two possibilities makes it a powerful strategy in gaining agency. It allows Maori to interact with the media on their own terms rather than simply struggling for voice on the media's terms. The weakness of this strategy is revealed in Butler's (1993) observation that reiteration tends to occur more intensively at points of contestation or instability. This means if Maori protest voices are not fairly (re)presented in media reporting, the agency they may have gained through occupation is likely to be reduced by the increased concentration of reiterative regulatory responses.

Aim of the study

The aim of the present study is to examine to what extent Maori agency is maintained or lost through media (re)presentation of bicultural relations, particularly in relation to occupations. Specifically, we want to determine if media coverage and practices of (re)presentation advantaged certain interests over others during the 1995 Pakaitore/Moutoa occupation. Using Wilson and Gutierrez' model as a basis, we suggest that any advantage is likely to be related to two factors: the amount of coverage or 'voice' afforded to certain groups, and differences in the specific ways in which accounts are (re)presented.

Method

The 1995 occupation of Wanganui's Moutoa Gardens by Whanganui River Iwi members and their supporters (hence-forth referred to as 'occupiers') provided a suitable site from which to examine media reporting of bicultural relations. This had the advantage of providing a large amount of material that was focused on a single site and involved the discourse of the same principal actors. The 79-day duration of the occupation also provided an ideal sampling frame.

We chose to focus our study specifically on newspaper accounts. Newspapers continue to be perceived as a highly reliable news source in New Zealand (Roberts & Levine, 1996) and also provide a basic news resource for most electronic media. The study set out to examine and compare coverage of the occupation by two major daily papers, The New Zealand Herald, and The Dominion. A computer search using NZLit database, and a subsequent manual search, located eighty articles in The New Zealand Herald, and eighty-seven articles in The Dominion. Only articles that referred specifically to events surrounding the Moutoa

occupation were selected. These were scanned into a computer and converted to text using an optical character recognition (OCR) programme. Four forms of content analysis were then applied to determine for different groups: 1. amount of voice; 2. amount of quoting vs paraphrasing; 3. length of quotes; 4. juxtaposition of accounts with alternative accounts within the same article.

1. Amount of voice.

First, we measured what proportion of the total coverage was comprised of accounts attributed to the main interest groups involved in the Moutoa situation. Text was coded according to the group being given voice - whether in paraphrased form, or by direct quote. The traditional newspaper measure of column centimetres, which takes account of both the size of font as well as number of words, proved difficult to use accurately when breaking the text into separate accounts. This approach was discarded in favour of word counts, which we argue provide an equally valid indication of how much voice a group or individual gets. It was decided to include all words in the count, rather than follow the common practice of excluding words less than three letters in length. It was decided the latter approach may underestimate the importance of personal pronouns such as "I" and "we" in gaining voice, and impose a methodological intervention that distances the results from what was printed.

Apart from the amount of voice afforded to each group, we also examined differences in the way media reported or (re)presented the voice of different groups. van Dijk (1991) states such a process involves "specific discursive and cognitive strategies of selection, emphasis, focusing, exaggeration, relevance assignment, description, style, or rhetoric" (p. 42). This description suggests that (re)presentation is made up of a complex and by no means coherent set of practices. As (re)presentation refers to both the structural and the discursive practices involved in the selection and reconstruction of accounts as news, we decided to employ both content and discourse analyses in our research (see van Dijk, 1991). Only the content analyses are reported here. These looked primarily at structural differences in (re)presentation of accounts of various groups and individuals, and the extent of such practices across the entire coverage.

Even though audiences are increasingly discerning of the media's (re)presentational role, it is difficult for them to determine the extent of this role from the articles themselves, that is, based on the final product. Researchers are faced with the same problems and there is a corresponding lack of research as to how to procede. Thus, in order to undertake the research, we needed to identify several structural aspects of a newspaper article that could be related to conceptions of media fairness. While our approach was largely exploratory, we chose to focus on the use of direct quoting, and the matching of accounts with alternative accounts, both of which are readily accessible within the articles themselves.

2. Amount of quoting vs. paraphrasing

Our approach was to compare the amount of material directly quoted with the amount paraphrased, for different groups and individuals. While not discounting the need to use paraphrasing, we suggest differences in the amount of quoting and the length of the quotes may be significant, in relation to the voice afforded to different groups. Paraphrasing is acceptable, but by definition the material is second-hand and (re)presented through different language structures. It is shaped according to a different discursive position than that of the original speaker.

3. Length of quotes

We also compared the length of quotes attributed to the main individuals who were given voice. According to van Dijk (1991: 152), "quotations act to enhance the credibility of the account", because using direct quotes lessens the possibility of biased reporting. However, we argue that the use of very short quotes may achieve the opposite effect. That is, the decontextualisation of the comment allows a re-articulation of voice that may misrepresent the original author's meaning. This opens the way for the media to both sensationalise and to 'push an angle', in order to meet audience expectations, or stimulate a certain audience response.

4. Matching of accounts

A final avenue of investigation into the media's active role in the reconstruction of voices was to examine the way the media positions different voices in relation to each other. The juxtaposition of alternative accounts within the same article seemed to be the most accessible indicator. Our study compared the extent to which groups' accounts were reported unopposed; or reported alongside an alternative account by other respondents. These 'target respondents' were determined as 'those groups or individuals who were directly implicated in the account, or who could be expected to provide an alternative account in relation to the issue being discussed'. The study only looked for matching of accounts within the same article, as linking accounts between articles proved too difficult. We used two analysers working blind with spot checks. A Cohen's kappa measure of agreement returned high kappas of $k = 0.94$ (df = 81) for determining the target respondents and $k = 0.84$ (df =1) for matching (a kappa above 0.6 is regarded as acceptable) (Fleiss, 1981).

Results

Amount of voice

Results (see Table 1) revealed that overall size of accounts for the main groups involved in the dispute, the Council (14.5%), and the occupiers (13.7%) was relatively balanced. The Parliamentarians received considerably more coverage overall (19%) than either the Council or occupiers. Of this the Government (being the Crown and official Treaty Partner to Maori) gained 10.8% with the Opposition having 8.2% of the coverage.

The total amount of discourse giving voice to Non-Maori MPs was more than that of Maori MPs . This can in

Table 1. Percentage of total coverage attributed to source

Source:	% of total word count attributed to source		
Main Groups	NZ Herald	Dominion	Overall
Non-Maori MP's	18.9	12.7	15.6
Council	15.2	13.9	14.5
Occupiers	16.4	11.3	13.7
Police	6.9	9.6	8.3
Wanganui Public	1.7	7.1	4.6
Other Maori interests	2.3	4.7	3.6
Maori MP's	3.5	3.3	3.4

Table 2. Percentage of attributed material directly quoted (the remainder being paraphrased)

Main Sources:	% of attributed material directly quoted (by word count)		
Groups	NZ Herald	Dominion	Overall
Non-Maori MP's	38.4	62.7	48.9
Maori MP's	9.6	36.8	23.7
Council	17.6	24.6	21.2
Wanganui Public	22.2	21.0	21.2
Police	13.8	25.6	21.0
Other Maori interests	16.1	23.2	21.0
Occupiers	10.7	18.7	13.8

part be explained numerically, in terms of the low proportion of MPs that were Maori in pre-MMP 1995 parliament. Most Maori MPs were also part of the Opposition, who received less coverage. Differences between papers across the main groups (those reported in Table 1) were not significant (t=.418, df=6).

Quoting vs Paraphrasing

Again our research was conducted through use of coding and word counts. Results (Table 2) showed that overall the proportion of material quoted for Maori occupiers was less than any of the other groups. Overall Non-Maori MPs were proportionally twice as likely to be quoted than any other group, including Maori MPs. These results suggest differences between the (re)presentation of Maori voices and the (re)presentation of those of other interest groups.

We found *The Dominion* generally used a higher proportion of quotes than *The New Zealand Herald*. The high level of quoted material from MPs in *The Dominion* as compared to that in the *Herald* may to some degree reflect geographical proximity of the former to the seat of Government.

Length of Quotes

Table 3 shows the average quote lengths for the five main individuals. These were selected because they were well above any other actors in terms of the amount of coverage they received. It is important to note that none of these voices were women. These results indicate that on average the quotes attributed to the main Maori voices were shorter than those attributed to other main voices. Overall differences in length of quotes between Maori and non-Maori voices were highly significant (t=4.01, df=510, p<.01). By contrast, a

two tailed t-test for differences between Maori voices of Tangaroa and Mair (t<1, df=101) was not significant. Similarly, t-tests between non-Maori voices of Bolger and Poynter, Bolger and Waugh, and Poynter and Waugh, were not significant (t<1). Differences in quote lengths between newspapers were not significant (t<1).

Matching of accounts

Results (see Table 4) show that overall the occupiers' accounts were matched with alternative accounts more often compared to the frequency of matching for other groups. The table also shows that in relation to each other group, the occupiers' accounts were matched on more occasions by that group, than when the reverse was true. For example, in *The New Zealand Herald*, occupiers' accounts were matched by the Council on 74.1% of occasions, whereas Council's accounts were only matched by the occupiers on 58.8% of occasions. Chi square tests showed group differences in the overall matching of accounts to be highly significant. Differences between occupiers and other groups (second part of table) were statistically significant in relation to the Council (c2 (1, n=119)=3.9, p<.05) and the Police

Table 3. Length of quotes for main individuals

Individual		Average quote length (words)		
		NZ Herald	Dominion	Overall
Poynter	(Council)	20.8	18.5	20.8
Bolger	(Government)	21.1	20.6	20.8
Waugh	(Police)	21.9	20.1	20.4
Tangaroa	(Occupiers)	13.8	16.2	13.8
Mair	(Occupiers)	13.6	13.6	13.6

Table 4. Percentage of accounts matched by other corresponding accounts.

Source Group:	% matching within article		
	NZ Herald	Dominion	Overall
Occupiers	68.8	85.6	77.8
Police	63.2	72.2	69.6
Council	66.6	72.2	68.5
Government	44.9	61.5	53.4
Maori MPs	31.5	58.3	41.9
Other groups	37.7	38.0	37.9
Opposition	29.4	43.2	36.6

Matching by target group response for group(s):

Account:	Matched by:			
Occupiers	Council	74.1	87.1	81.8
Council	Occupiers	58.8	73.7	64.2
Occupiers	Police	88.9	88.2	88.6
Police	Occupiers	61.5	61.8	61.7
Occupiers	Government	38.5	69.2	53.8
Government	Occupiers	29.4	40.9	35.9

(c2 (1, n=116)=7.1, p<.01), but not significant in relation to the Government (c2 (1, n=65)=2.47, p<.05). Maori MP's fared much better than occupiers but this result accounted for only 17 percent of the cases (and 20% of the discourse) attributable to Maori. There was no significant difference between the two newspapers for matching of accounts.

Discussion

The amount of voice given to the Maori occupiers was similar to that given to other individual interest groups reported including the local authorities, and the Government. Overall however, the results suggest that in media accounts, Maori interests are usually outweighed by other societal interests. This finding concurs with the research of McGregor & Comrie (1995) who found Maori sources are consistently outnumbered by 'Pakeha' sources. This may not be construed as being exactly 'unfair' on the part of the news media, because occupiers through their actions are presenting a challenge to society as a whole, and thus are treated no differently to any other minority interest group. But the net effect at Moutoa is that the various Maori interests were accorded the status of a minority voice within the arena of print media. They did not constitute one 'half of the story', in the reporting of bicultural issues, as one might expect in terms of their equal Treaty partner status.

The results suggest it is virtually impossible for Maori interests to gain equal voice in the media according to their Treaty partner status. Our findings support Butler's (1993) contention that the reiteration of regulatory discourse intensifies in response to contestation. On the surface, it seems Maori causes are more disadvantaged through such media attention than they are assisted by it. However it also underlines the potential for ongoing physical occupations to provide a means of resistance to destabilize regulatory discourse, eventually forcing alternative discourses to emerge.

Any notion that Moutoa occupiers represented a minority within Maoridom and as a whole, and therefore should be afforded voice on this basis, is difficult to sustain. First, those at Moutoa received widespread, though not universal, support throughout Maoridom. Second, the media presented Moutoa as something of a Maori cause celebre. Third, we argue, on the basis of existing research, that media accounts produced the occupiers as visible Maori subjects (Butler, 1990), while simultaneously separating Maori subjects whose behaviours are unacceptable, from those Maori that appear to fit the terms of acceptability (see McCreanor, 1993; Nairn & McCreanor, 1990; Wall, 1997). However, even at a local level, Maori voices were greatly outnumbered by other local regulatory voices.

We acknowledge that fairness in media coverage of bicultural relations cannot be wholly constituted in terms of an equal slice of pie. To begin with, it ignores the blurred distinctions between Maori and non-Maori that exist inside and around media coverage, and in relation to the occupation itself. While these cultural differences are often represented in the media as bounded and essentialised formations, these must be examined in terms of power relations, and the agency they afford different groups. Thus, the present

findings need to be considered alongside more detailed analyses of media content and (re)presentation that examine the discourses and arguments within the articles themselves (see Liu & Mills, under review; McCreanor, 1993). On this basis, we also conducted an extensive qualitative analysis of newspaper coverage at Moutoa as part of the same project, that we intend to publish at a later date.

Womens' voices at Moutoa

It is important to note that women's voices did not feature strongly in the whole newspaper coverage of Moutoa, with the most significant contributor, the (then) Opposition leader Helen Clark, gaining less than half a percent of the total discourse. Saunders (1996) has also noted journalists' general disregard for female occupation leader, Tariana Turia, when reporting the occupiers' stance. With reference to Berg and Kearn's (1996) arguments regarding the mutually constitutive nature of the racial and gendered differences, we argue this media coverage both reflects and reinforces the masculinisation of our social landscape within the bicultural discourse. This provides a strong argument that the present study could be re-framed to examine the voice afforded to a dominant Pakeha male population compared to other societal groups.

(Re)presentation: matching of accounts

The second part of our examination of media fairness concerned media (re)presentation of the voice of these groups. The most salient finding emerged from the examination of the matching of the accounts of various groups. The results showed that Maori voices are consistently matched by alternative accounts while this matching occurs less often in relation to the voices of other groups. On the basis of Butler's (1993) theory we suggest the agency Maori sought to gain through voicing their opinions was diminished through this higher level of matching with alternative accounts. The results again offer support to Butler's (1993) contention that reiteration of regulatory discourses is more intensive in response to contestation. Comparisons of matching may provide a useful indicator in future examinations of the way agency is enhanced or diminished by the media.

Use of Quotes:

The results indicate small but significant differences in (re)presentation through the use of quotes. Accounts of Maori viewpoints contained a lower proportion of quoting than other accounts. This can be seen as a negative effect in relation to van Dijk's (1991) statement that 'quotations act to enhance the credibility of the account' (p. 152). The results for length of quote also indicated significant differences between Maori and non-Maori voices. The quotes for the Maori occupiers were on average shorter than those in other groups, thus containing less contextual information. This aligns with McGregor and Te Awa's (1996) suggestion that a lack of contextual background information is one of the media's shortcomings in providing minorities with coverage. We argue it reduces the capacity of Maori voices to challenge the stability of regulatory

discourse and thus represents a diminution of agency for Maori.

A common criticism of Maori spokespeople among non-Maori, particularly in relation to protest and occupations, is the use of extreme or sensationalist statements to draw attention to their grievances. This argument seems credible to the extent that sensationalism may provide a valid and useful tactic for those struggling to gain voice in the media. However, motivation towards sensationalism on the part of the speaker is unlikely to produce the significant differences that we found in quote lengths and in the proportions of material quoted versus paraphrased. On this basis we suggest that levels of sensationalism of Maori voices may be partially produced by the media through differences in the (re)presentation.

These findings support Wilson and Guttierrez' (1985) assertion that the media stylise minority voice as confrontational, and act to stereotype minorities. They also relate to our earlier discussion on the creation of acceptable and unacceptable Maori subjects (see Butler, 1993; Wall 1997). Such strategies may reinforce the standard stories that Maori protesters are 'extremists' and 'that race relations problems are simply the result of a few agitators' (see McCreanor, 1993). This in turn functions to place Maori voices beyond what Herman & Chomsky (1988) refer to as the acceptable level of ' legitimate dissent', beyond the juridicial norms referred to by Butler (1990).

Constraints on the media

While the media can hardly be seen to be neutral, it is important to acknowledge that who gets voice is determined to a considerable extent by the conditions and constraints that journalists are working within. There is an uneven terrain produced by political, physical, and systemic constraints, both in the gathering of voice and in its reconstruction. Often complex ethical considerations must revolve around publication deadlines and snap decisions with little formal monitoring. One political editor has commented, "[media] ethics is a minefield of competing interests. It's no easy matter to decide the right or wrong way to cover an event or issue" (p. 5, Edwards, 1998). Judgements are further clouded by the fact that articles are often based on reports filed by another journalist, and the information is already second-hand Accordingly, imbalances do not necessarily reflect an intentional bias on the part of an individual journalist or even the newspaper. McGregor & Te Awa (1996) have noted there is a 'disparity between intention and performance in the coverage of minorities by the news media.' Such constraints, however, may only exacerbate reliance on the dominant social representations as heuristic or interpretive frameworks from which to reconstruct news.

There are other factors in the immediate situation at Moutoa that may have contributed to our results (see Brett, 1995; Morgan, 1995). It may have been that the occupiers were not as accessible, and their protocols not as familiar to the mainly young Pakeha journalists, or their spokespeople not as readily available, as compared to the publicity machines of the Council, Parliamentarians, or the Police.

As discussed in relation to agency, the occupiers may have avoided making media statements as a form of resistance, if they perceived media coverage as opposing them or misrepresenting their views (see Saunders, 1996). They may have chosen to make physical occupation itself a statement to destabilise prevailing discourses. However, we argue the net result was a lack of voice and agency for Maori interests as Treaty Partners within mainstream newspaper coverage.

The media often regard the most fair way to provide coverage in such conditions is to simply gather accounts from as many sources as possible and present them together. Tuchman (1971) has criticised the idea that reporting all sides of the argument constitutes objectivity. The results suggest there is an urgent need for the media re-examine such (re)presentational practices in relation to bicultural relations. We argue this examination needs to take into account the status of Maori under the Treaty, and to recognise the reiterative and regulatory role of media discourses (Butler, 1993).

Conclusion

In this study we have attempted to examine the agency afforded to different groups in media (re)presentations of the 1995 Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens occupation. In doing so we have theorized about the role of occupations in relation to agency as a means to challenge the regulatory discourses of the media and the law. The study suggests that within mainstream newspaper coverage of Moutoa, Maori voices were afforded coverage that aligns with their status as a minority, rather than their status as equal Treaty partners. While Maori interests were given a similar amount of voice to any other group, the collective voice of official interest groups outweighed the voice of the occupiers. In addition, we contend the agency Maori were seeking to exercise through the physical occupation of space, and through voicing their views, was eroded through differences in the way their accounts were (re)presented in relation to those of other groups.

Our purpose in reporting these findings is to increase awareness and accountability in media coverage and (re)presentation practices, rather than to present Maori interests as disadvantaged. Matahaere-Atariki, (1999) argues discourses that merely objectify deprivation are likely to further marginalise and deny the agency of Maori interests by positioning them as passive participants. These findings provide the opportunity for Maori social and protest movements to better understand media processes and hold the media accountable in relation to (re)presentation. In terms of Butler's theory, they support longstanding call for Maori to promote their own agency within the mainstream media journalism (see Fox, 1988,1992; McGregor & Te Awa, 1996). Recent efforts to establish separate Maori media, while important, are not sufficient by themselves to challenge regulatory discourses of the mainstream.

The reporting of protests and occupations present considerable difficulties for the media which no doubt account for some of these findings. Yet it is imperative the media take the time to address the wider issues surrounding the (re)presentation and voice, in order to bring a more

balanced account of bicultural relations to the public. Promoting a critical awareness of these issues among the media and the public is an obvious first step. Exploring the means and extent to which journalists and editors may be able to identify and address these differences in (re)presentation is a further area for change. The way media position themselves in relation to discourses of Biculturalism and Multiculturalism demands more rigorous attention. In particular there is a need to take account of the complex ways in which discourses operate as social processes of agency and power rather than seeing them as simple logical alternatives. The difficult question of what constitutes fairness in reporting bicultural issues needs to be further addressed.

All these avenues offer the possibility of new and alternative interpretive frameworks being brought to bear on processes of (re)presentation, which in turn may lead to more balanced media coverage of bicultural relations. Finally, we consider ongoing examination of media practices of (re)presentation to be of the utmost importance to the promotion of an open and just society.

References

Belich, J. (1996). *Making Peoples*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Bell, A. (1995). Mainstreaming the margins: the national in the 1989 Broadcasting Act, *Sites, 30*: 108-118.

Berg, L. & Kearns, R. (1996). Naming as norming: 'race', gender, and the identity politics of naming places in Aotearoa New Zealand, Environment and Planning D: *Space and Society, 14*: 99-122.

Bhabha, H. (1993) . Postmodern or Postcolonial: A question of Agency, in S. During (Ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge: 189-208.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.

Brett, C. (1995). Wanganui: Beyond The Comfort Zone, *North & South, June*: 44-59.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of Sex.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997) *Excitable speech*. New York: Routledge

Cochrane, J. (1990). Media treatment of Maori issues, *Sites, 21*, 5-29.

Coop, H. (1988). God Defend New Zealand, *Metro, Nov*: 166-182.

Derrida, J. (1981) *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Maori Self Determination*. Auckland: Oxford.

Edwards, B. (1998). Ethical dilemmas at the heart of newspaper reporting, *The Evening Post*, 25 February: 5.

Farr, R. & Moscovici, S. (Eds.) (1984). *Social Representations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, D. (1988). 'The Mass Media: A Maori perspective', *Report on Social Policy, 4*, Wellington: Government Print: 483-503.

Fox, D. (1992). The Maori perspective of News, in M. Comrie, & J. McGregor (Eds). *Whose News?*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 170-180.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Writings*. Colin Gordon (Ed.). Pantheon, New York.

Fleiss, J.H. (1981). *Statistical Methods for rates and proportions*. New York: Wiley.

Fleras, A. & Spoonley, P. (1999). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Race Relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford

University Press.

Harrington, L. & Liu, J.H. (2002). Self-enhancement and attitudes towards high achievers: A bicultural view of the independent and interdependent self. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 33*(1), 37-55.

Hekman, S. (Ed.) (1996). *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy Of The Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon.

Kawharu, I. (Ed.) (1989). *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Kelsey, J. (1996). From Flagpoles To Pinetrees: Tino Rangatiratanga And Treaty Policy Today, in P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, and D. Pearson, (Eds.) *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 177-201.

King, M. (1985). *Being Pakeha*. Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.

King, M. (1999). *Being Pakeha Now*. Auckland: Penguin.

Lealand, G. (1988). *A foreign egg in our nest? American Popular Culture in New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Levine, S. & Harris, P. (Eds.) (1999) *The New Zealand Political Source Book*, 3rd Ed. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Lim Hua Weng, A. (1998). The making of a Chinese New Zealander: (Re)presentations of place and identity within the community gallery at Te Papa Tongarewa, Unpublished research report, Institute of Geography: Victoria University of Wellington.

Liu, J.H. (1999). Majority reactions to resurgence in minority identity: stages of change in New Zealand identity. Presented at the 4th annual meeting of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists, Coolum, Australia, April 8th-11th.

Liu, J.H. & Mills, D. (1998). Tukugate Biased?, *Noted, December: 3*.

Liu, J.H. & Mills, D. (under review). Modern racism and market fundamentalism: The discourse of plausible deniability and its functions.

Liu, J.H. & Liu, S.H. (1999). Interconnectedness and Asian Social Psychology, in T. Sugiman, M. Karasawa, J.H. Liu, and C. Wards (Eds.) *Progress in Asian Social Psychology, Vol. 2*. Seoul, Kyoyook Kwahaksa: 9-32.

Liu, J.H. & Temara, P. (1998). Leadership, colonization, and tradition: Identity and Economics in Ruatoki and Ruatahuna, *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 22*(1): 138-150.

Liu, J.H., Wilson, M., McClure, J. & Higgins, T.R. (1999). Social Identity and the Perception of history: Cultural representations of Aotearoa /New Zealand, European *Journal of Social Psychology, 20* (8): 10-21.

Loomba, A. (1998) *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.

Maaka, R. (1997). Implementing National Policy at Local Level. Paper presented to the conference on The Treaty of Waitangi: Maori political representation, Future challenges, 1-2 May, Wellington.

Matahaere-Atariki, D. (1999). At The Gates Of The Knowledge Factory: Voice, Authenticity, and The Limits Of Representation., in R. Du Plessis and L. Alice (Eds.) *Feminist Thought In Aotearoa New Zealand: Connections And Differences*. Auckland: Oxford University Press: 68-75.

Maharey, S. (1990). Media, in P. Spoonley and W. Hirsch, (Eds.) *Between the Lines: Racism and the New Zealand Media*. Auckland: Heinemann Reed: 6-14.

McCreanor, T. (1993). Mimiwhangata: Media reliance on Pakeha Commonsense in Interpretations of Maori Actions, *Sites, 26*: 79-90.

McDowell, L. (1997) Understanding Diversity: the problem of/ for "Theory"., in T.G. Barnes, D. Gregory (Eds.) *Reading*

Human Geography: The politics and poetics of inquiry. Arnold: London: 124-136.

McGregor, J. (1991). *News values and the reporting of Maori News*. Palmerston North: Massey University Department of Human Resource Management.

McGregor, J. & Comrie, M. (1995). *Balance and fairness in Broadcasting News* (1985-1994), Wellington: Broadcasting Standards Authority.

McGregor, J. & Te Awa, J. (1996). Racism and the News Media, in P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, and D. Pearson, (Eds.) *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 235-246.

McKinnon, M. (1995). Separatism is not a dirty word, *The Dominion*, 3 March: 6.

McNay, L. (2000). Subject, Psyche and Agency: The Work of Judith Butler. *Theory, Culture, and Society, 16* (2), 175-193.

Morgan, J. (1995). 79 days that Wanganui's people won't forget, *The Dominion*, 19 May: 8.

Nairn, R. & McCreanor, T. (1990). Insensitivity and hypersensitivity: an imbalance in Pakeha accounts of racial conflict, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 9*: 293-308.

Nairn, R. & McCreanor, T. (1991). Race talk and common sense: Patterns in Pakeha discourse on Maori / Pakeha relations in New Zealand. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10*: 245-262.

Nash, R. (1990). Society and Culture in New Zealand: An outburst for the end of 1990, *New Zealand Sociology, 5*(2): 99-121.

Nathan, T.A. (1997). Media too Negative – Maori Queen, *Waikato Times*, 24 May: 1.

Nicholson, P. (1995) Feminism and Psychology, in J. Smith, R. Harre, L. Van Lagenhove, *Rethinking Psychology*. Sage: London: 122-142.

Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Pearson, D. (1990). *A dream deferred: the origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand*, Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Pearson, D. (1996). Crossing Ethnic Thresholds: Multiculturalisms in Comparative Perspective, in P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, & D. Pearson, (Eds.) *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 247-266.

Poata Smith, E. (1996). He Pokeke Uenuku I Tu Ai: The evolution of Contemporary Maori Protest, in P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, & D. Pearson, (Eds.) *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 97-116

Ritchie, J. (1993). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington. Huia Publishers: Daphne Brasell Press.

Roberts, N. & Levine, S. (1996). Bias and reliability: Political perceptions of the New Zealand media, in J. McGregor, (Ed.) *Dangerous Democracy? News Media Politics in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 197-209.

Said, E. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Salmond, A. (1991). *Two Worlds: First meetings between Maori and European*, Auckland: Viking.

Salmond, A. (1997). *Between Worlds: Early exchanges between Maori and Europeans*, Auckland: Moa Beckett.

Saunders, J. (1996). Skin Deep: The news media's failure to cover Maori politics, in J. McGregor (Ed.) *Dangerous Democracy? News Media Politics in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 166-180.

Shapiro, M. (1999). *The Politics of Representation*. Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press.

Sharp, A. (1990). *Justice and the Maori*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Spivak, G.C. (1988) Can the subaltern speak?, in C. Nelson, & L.

Grossberg, (Eds.) *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana, IL., University of Illinois Press: 271-316.

Spoonley, P. (1995). Constructing Ourselves: The Post-Colonial Politics Of Pakeha, in M. Wilson and A. Yeatman (Eds.) *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin: 96-115.

Spoonley, P. & Hirsch, W. (Eds.) (1990). *Between the Lines: Racism and the New Zealand Media*. Auckland: Heinmann Reed.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict, in W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole: 33-47.

Taylor, D. & McKirnan, D. (1984). A five-stage model of intergroup relations, *British Journal of Social Psychology, 23*: 291-300.

Thrift, N. (1996). *Spatial Formations*. London: Sage.

Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural Imperialism*. London: Pinter.

Trlin, A. (1990). Dear Reader, Dear Editor: An Analysis of Editorials and Letters to the Editor, in P. Spoonley and W. Hirsch (Eds.) *Between the Lines: Racism and the New Zealand Media*. Auckland, Heinmann Reed: 90-94.

Tuchman, G. (1971). Objectivity as a Strategic Ritual: an Examination of NewsMan's notions of Objectivity, *American Journal of Sociology, 77*: 660-679.

Turner, K. (1995). The April Report Of The Royal Commission On Social Policy: Treaty Partnership As A Framework For A Politics Of Difference?, in M. Wilson and A Yeatman (Eds.) *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin: 78-95.

Upton, S. (2000). Navigating a safe course around the Treaty reef, *The Evening Post*, Tuesday 11 April: 9.

van Dijk, T.A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. New York: Routledge.

Vasil, R. (1988). *Biculturalism: Reconciling Aotearoa with New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Wall, M. (1997). Stereotypical Constructions of the Maori Race in the Media, *New Zealand Geographer, 53*(2), 40-45.

Ward, A. (1974). *A show of justice*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Walker, R. (1987). *Nga Tau Toetoe: Years of Anger*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.

Walker, R. (2001). Hostages of History, *Metro*, 236, Feb: 82-87.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1987) *Mapping the Language of Racism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wilson, C. & Gutierrez, F. (1985). *Minorities and the media: diversity and the end of mass communication*. California: Sage.

Wilson, M. & Yeatman, A. (Eds.) (1995). *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Address for Correspondence:

Kelly Barclay
Institute of Geography
Victoria University of Wellington
PO Box 600
Wellington, NZ

email: Kelly.Barclay@vuw.ac.nz