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Previous research on racism has examined perpetrators’ more than targets’ perspectives. This study aimed to explore targets’ views on how racism against Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (Aotearoa NZ) might be reduced. Nineteen indigenous Māori men and women and five Pākehā (New Zealand European) female partners took part in individual interviews, which were transcribed and analysed using thematic analysis informed by social constructionism. Participants’ accounts focused on four main ways to tackle racism, namely through reducing structural racism, employing educational strategies (e.g. teaching the Treaty and Māori history), ensuring on-going daily interactions and relationships between Māori and Pākehā, and using “Kiwi” as an inclusive and uniting term. The findings contribute to knowledge regarding targets’ understandings of racism and provide unique insights that are relevant for health and other professionals in Aotearoa NZ.
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Introduction

Throughout history racism has resulted in slavery, extinction, and marginalisation, particularly of indigenous peoples, and been justified by a belief in the superiority of the dominant race. Psychological researchers began the analysis of racist assumptions in the early twentieth century, when racism was considered intrapsychic (Duckitt, 2001). Growing acceptance of the importance of contextual influences by psychologists led to racism being reclassified as personality interacting with environment (Lewin, 1936). Allport’s contact theory (1958) recommended controlled interaction in a time of apartheid and segregation, and included consideration of personality, context and cognition. Further studies in group cognition led to the development of ingroup outgroup theories in the 1970s and 1980s (Tajfel, 1978; Turner, 1985). In 1969 racism was legislated against at an international level (United Nations, 2016), a precedent followed in Aotearoa NZ in 1971 by the passing of the Race Relations Act (NZLII, 2016), the 1990 New Zealand Bill of Rights (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2016), and the 1993 Human Rights Act (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2016). Under these laws, racism and discrimination, ethnic slurs, and the inciting of racial disharmony, became prohibited. The result was a move away from blatant racism, to a more subtle, modern racism (Kinder & Seers, 1981; Pettigrew & Meertens, 2001) in which racist intent was implicit but not openly declared.

Research into racism in Psychology traditionally drew on a positivist hypothetico-deductive model where it is assumed that people hold stable, essential and universal characteristics and attitudes regarding prejudice and racism, and that these function regardless of political, social and economic influences. This deductive, ‘top down’ research approach generally employs surveys or experiments, quantifying peoples’ attitudes and views and subsequently making generalisations to specific populations based on statistical analyses of the findings. However this dominant paradigm is problematic because results are assumed to be universal, thus ignoring or marginalising minority and indigenous perspectives and opinions. Historically, Pākehā studies have compared Māori data unfavourably against Pākehā standardised norms (Gavala & Taitimu, 2007) and discredited Māori perspectives (Black & Huygens, 2007). Tick boxes or Likert lines designed by Pākehā researchers have not always included ideas outside a Pākehā ontology, and such omissions in psychometric measures have at times invisibilised serious issues. Furthermore, researchers working within this paradigm struggled to identify subtle versions of racism due to the nature of their psychometric tools, which were incapable of separating racism from other confounding variables (Bernal, Trimble, Burlew & Leong, 2002; Roets, Van Hiel & Cornelis, 2006).

In contrast, the ‘turn to language’ in social psychology throughout the 1970s and 1980s (Gergen, 1985) and the rise of research drawing on ideas from social constructionism led to research that focussed on people’s everyday talk about racism. Research from a social constructionist framework emphasizes how our knowledge and understandings of the world are socially and culturally derived. Thus knowledge is not viewed as neutral but influenced by history, politics, culture, societal power imbalances and other contextual factors (Burr, 2015). Research in psychology from this tradition suggested that racism arose almost entirely from contextual, social and situational features.

In Aotearoa NZ, understandings of racism against indigenous Māori were expanded using methodologies informed by a social constructionist perspective (Tuffin, 2013). Discursive studies contributed to perpetrator theory by analysing perpetrator talk and text in context, and underscoring that racism was a subtle, social process constructed, generated and re-created in everyday language. Influential research by Wetherell and Potter (1992) and Potter and Wetherell (1987, 1998) investigated subtle linguistic marginalisation in which direct reference to race or ethnicity was avoided. Instead, neoliberal rhetoric...
constructed Aotearoa NZ as a land of equal opportunity free of systemic racism. Pākehā structures were viewed as egalitarian, and thus Māori who did not achieve in them were positioned as blameworthy. McCreanor (1997) explored the historical beginnings of this discursive reproduction of colonial power structures in early nineteenth century writings of the colonists and found Māori portrayed in a negative light, their culture and language trivialised, and their needs marginalised. His analysis showed the use of the word ‘savage’ to construct Māori as bestial, or lower on the evolutionary chain (Johnston & Pihama, 1994) yet ‘ignorant’ or ‘noble’ and capable of rising to learn British ways. These constructions persevered in contemporary language with Māori labelled ‘good’ if they accepted acculturation and fitted into the standard story of harmonious race relations (McCreanor, 1993; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991), and bad, or ‘stirrers’ if they objected.

Researchers have also explored the role of media in producing and reproducing these and similar discourses (Abel, 2013; Lehrman, 2007). Media is shown to trivialise or vilify Māori and under-represent their positive achievements, which subtly supports a Pākehā right to rule (Nairn, Pega, McCreanor, Rankine & Barnes, 2006). Such constructions have contributed to erroneous assumptions among the public, such as the view that Māori are both innately physical rather than intelligent (Johnston & Paewai, 1999). The current lack of research on Māori targets’ perspectives may be attributed to a number of factors, including Pākehā disbelief in the existence and importance of racism against Māori (Human Rights Commission, 2007) and inaccessibility of Māori participants (Major, Quinton, McCoy, & Schmader, 2000). Māori resistance to Pākehā research may be traced to studies which have framed Māori negatively, or provided imperialistic reconstruction of Māori ideas (Cram, 1997) with loss or invalidation of their alternative understandings (Blundell, Gibbons, & Lillis, 2010). These factors coupled with the need for cultural sensitivity are said to have contributed to a ‘Pākehā paralysis’ in which interviewing Māori is mainly avoided (Tolich, 2002) and an imbalance in academic understanding created and perpetuated.

Nevertheless some studies have examined accounts from Māori participants. Webber, McKinley, and Hattie (2013) found that Māori adolescents experienced racism, including negative stereotyping involving criminality, lesser intelligence, and lower educational ability. Moewaka Barnes, Taiapa, Borell, and McCreanor (2013) analysed Māori focus group interviews to elicit the views of Māori and their partners to be fully explored and validated. The perspectives of Māori targets and their partners may provide unique and beneficial new insights which differ from those found in majority studies of perpetrator theory. The overall aim of the study was to add to local understandings by researching and exploring Māori adults’ and their partners’ views on how to reduce racism in Aotearoa NZ.

**Method**

**Research design and Kaupapa Māori approach**

This study employed individual interviews to elicit the views of Māori adults and their partners regarding how to reduce racism. This was consistent with a social constructionist approach as well as oriented to *Kaupapa Māori* principles (Smith, 1997). Here, *kanohi ki te kanohi* or “face to face” communication is preferred over academic remoteness or ostensibly neutral paperwork. *Kaupapa Māori* is well respected as a research method (Kerr, Penney, Moewaka Barnes & McCreanor, 2010) and its principles (Smith, 1997) were observed throughout the study as follows. To ensure *tino rangatiratanga*, all participants’ opinions...
were privileged over those of the researchers, and they were given the opportunity for feedback and correction. Āko Māori was observed, which included listening to and recording relaxed and lengthy face-to-face interviews. Taonga tuku iho meant that some Māori language was used in interviews, and tikanga observed, such as having a prayer before the interview if desired, and/or an awhi (hug), and talking about mutual connections. There was also acknowledgement of kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga, or the importance of improving life for all Māori by having this discussion, and the kaupapa, the fact that the findings would contribute to everyone’s knowledge. The nurturing connection between interviewer and participant meant that it was understood that a relationship had potentially begun, not ended, by the close of the interview.

The interviews were conducted by the first author, who drew on many years of working as whanau or family alongside Māori who had encouraged the project, and utilised her additional knowledge of Māori culture and language gained through a B.A. in Māori studies. The researchers therefore positioned themselves as Pākehā who would approach the study endeavours with an understanding of previous majority understandings, embrace the principles of Kaupapa Māori, and privilege participants’ accounts by using inductive thematic analysis informed by social constructionism. To negotiate the issues regarding research with Māori, approval was sought from an independent Māori cultural advisor, a respected representative of a local marae, and the University’s Human Ethics Committee.

Procedure and participants

Participants who knew the first author volunteered on the basis of a trust (Tolich, 2002) established over many years in a working relationship, which opened a door for clear communication. This trust was conveyed by those participants to the marae participants, and to those who snowballed from the first participants. Twenty-four participants took part, 19 Māori (10 women, 9 men), and five Pākehā women partners, with an average age of 53. The Pākehā partners were endorsed by their Māori partners as having equally strong views, and this was borne out in the interviews. Participants’ occupations included counsellor, communications manager, bus driver, electrician, author, foreman, cook, financial advisor, lecturer, accountant, company director, home maker, teacher, and retirees. Participants chose their own pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. The study was conducted in Wellington, Aotearoa NZ, with individual interviews taking place in locations of the participant’s choice, either their homes or places of work. To prevent biased or slanted interpretations participants were given their transcripts to read, make further comment, change, and the chance to engage in further discussion before signing off, then offered continued contact with the researcher throughout the project. Interview questions were open ended and non-directive. After talking about their lived experiences of racism (Pack, Tuffin & Lyons, 2016), how it might be accounted for (Pack, Tuffin & Lyons, 2015a) and their responses at the time (Pack, Tuffin & Lyons, 2015b), participants were asked “what do you think is the solution?” All answers were accepted as expert testimony. Key differences were noted in recruiting and interviewing for this study and previous work with Pākehā, as shown in the Appendix, which may be a useful tool in the kete (kit or basket) of other Pākehā researchers.

Transcription and analysis

The responses were transcribed verbatim using an adaptation of Atkinson and Heritage’ notation (1984), a discursive tool which records speech with as much detail and accuracy as possible using specialized typographical symbols. The excerpts presented have been edited with standard punctuation, and fillers and minimal encouragers removed for reading purposes. Thematic analysis informed by social constructionism was employed to analyse the transcripts (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this approach recurring themes are identified, and each viewpoint considered valid and legitimate within and relative to the participant’s ontology. This theoretical framework meant that analysis was open and exploratory, privileging the perspectives of the participants rather than a deductive analysis guided by a preconceived theory or model. This inductive data driven approach meant that the themes identified were heavily situated in and across the transcripts.

There were specific steps involved in the analysis. Preliminary coding occurred during the reading and re-reading of each transcript. Here, broad categories were identified from data that included rhetorical ideas or revealed strong feelings or core issues. For example, in the first transcript, there was a strong statement about racism and the first broad category identified was labeled ‘General statements about racism in NZ’; similarly the ‘Treaty of Waitangi’ was frequently mentioned and labeled as a category. Following this preliminary coding, data in the broad categories were examined for further meaning in discrete coding. Here associated common words or phrases representing a single idea, for example ‘teach antiracism’ were identified and used to generate semantic codes for all similar data. In an iterative process, re-readings of the entire data set were conducted, and re-referenced back to the codes, which were merged or re-named as analysis continued. Continual checking between data and code names strengthened the reliability of the findings and retrievability of all coded data (Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis & Dillon, 2003). Theme development occurred during this process, as the codes were merged into broader conceptualisations grounded in the data. The process required rigorous familiarisation with the data, formation of coded data-sets, and recursive data coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researchers discussed and agreed upon the final four most compelling themes on reducing racism, checking between data and codes for verification (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These are presented below.

Findings

Participants began by categorically constructing racism as pervasive and universal, claims that were supported by accounts of subtle and overt racism, and clear recollections of the emotions and feelings experienced. Many of the accounts that follow are of racist incidents, and it is from these that suggestions for intervention arose. Participants suggested possible solutions in four main themes: reducing structural
Reducing structural racism

Legislation against racism is clearly laid out in the Race Relations Act 1971 and the Human Rights Act 1993 (Human Rights Commission, 2006). However, the justice system, the health system, and the workplace, were constructed by participants as contexts within which these laws were ineffective either because of power imbalances, or because of the daunting nature of the complaints system. Within the justice system, Māori were constructed as over-policed, and more harshly sentenced. In the excerpt below, Hoa talks of her son’s experience when harshly sentenced.

Hoa: The police used to stop them you know, and he’d come home and he’d say to me oh Mum! you know and I’d say what are you late home for? And he’d say oh the police stopped me. What for? oh they didn’t even tell me. And then they had European friends too, and the European friends were allowed to go.

Hoa’s description is typical of many accounts recounting how phenotypically Māori features increased the likelihood of being stopped and detained by police. Pākehā friends who were with them would be ignored or released. Others recounted young Māori being interrogated without a lawyer present, and intimidated into a “confession”. The different treatment of Māori was constructed as racism, and the solution put forward by participants was having greater numbers of Māori in the judicial and justice workforces.

Sharlee: It would be different if it was a Māori, like say if a Māori policeman came to us and talked.

Sharlee implies a different positioning: Māori police would talk, implying a lack of bullying or intimidation, and the possibility of an opportunity for a fair hearing. Participants also constructed judges as prejudiced.

Poto: I think that some judges have a pre-conceived idea; when one who is deemed to be Māori steps before them, they deal with it in a totally different manner.

Poto and others alleged that the disproportionately high number of Māori in prisons was due to racism in sentencing, rather than essential criminality, a view supported by the literature (e.g., Fergusson, Swain-Campell & Horwood, 2003; United Nations 2016; Workman, 2011). Participants noted that this needed addressing, but the power imbalance within the Pākehā dominated justice system provided a closed system in which Māori were unlikely to obtain a voice.

With regard to the health system, participants underscored the importance of Māori driven initiatives with Māori executives and independent government funding. Ruhi gives one example of the need for bicultural options.

Ruhi: ...and then then this is another thing. Their reporting system is ticking boxes - ticking boxes! Oh! oh I said oh I refuse! It got sent back! It’s a Pākehā thing! It doesn’t clarify, it doesn’t explain what I want to say! Ah - right or wrong, is this right or wrong. It says this should be done: yes, or no. Oh gosh, it doesn’t say anything! It’s just like from one to ten, how would you rate a person? Same thing! You know I said this is not the Māori way of doing things! They said what is the Māori way of doing things? I said face to face!

Ruhi feels that her life cannot be expressed in ticks or numbers, because it limits her responses to the options a Pākehā mind has presented on a prescribed form, which may not include aspects of her world and all she wants to say. She applauded the methodology used for the current study, in which her words and ideas were privileged in a kanohi ki te kanohi or person to person encounter, where she gave a full verbal account without Pākehā baseline or parameters. Her account highlights a Eurocentric bias in work and health assessments, despite allegedly bicultural practices (Campbell, 2005), and raises strong concerns around the need to assess in a way that acknowledges Māori and Pākehā differences of approach.

Sophia talks of being passed over for recognition in the workplace.

Sophia: We all have the same perspective on that. If you’re Māori, you’ve got to do it twice as hard, twice as well to get the same amount of recognition. And we do, we work extremely hard to get the same, the same amount of - yeah, kudos as anyone else.

Sophia’s contention is that Pākehā are preferred over more capable Māori. In this example of aversive racism on the part of employers (Hodson, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Samuel, 2010), racism in promotion is strongly implied. This was underscored by other participants with phrases such as “you’ve gotta be that much better” and “better than Pākehā folks to be on the same level”. Power imbalance precludes action to reduce this form of systemic racism, as it does in the example below.

Hose: He called my worker a dumb, black, nigger.

Sylvia: Wow!

Hose: The young fellow just wanted to fight, but I said no, no, because you’ll just get into trouble. Let’s just do it their way, you know through the appropriate channels? So we had letters and we had the witnesses, and nothing happened. We went into a meeting with ahm [Hose’s boss’s name], he pulled us into the office and he says ’look, ah Hose, we try to think of our group of guys as like a rugby team! And what happens in a rugby team stays in the rugby team and what goes on on the rugby field stays on the rugby field. And I was shy of going to the Labour Department to get it sorted out. ….. he said it’s just too much writing letters and so on to get anything done. But they wouldn’t go through it that little bit further you know? And it was like the guy was still working there, the next day, no problems, not even slapped down.

Hose works in a large company and is in charge of a group of younger workers, one of whom has been targeted by an older worker not under Hose’s authority. Hose thinks to prevent a violent outburst from the younger worker, by taking the matter to his boss. His boss however uses his authority to shut down the complaint. Hose considers utilising the external and legally backed Labour Department complaints system, but is
“shy” of the process, and the younger worker tells Hose he has no faith in the on-going paperwork which would be involved. The knowledge that the perpetrator has not been “slapped down” increases the power imbalance: the boss and the perpetrator have colluded in structural racism.

Participants did not construct anti-racism legislation as being effective against systemic racism, but consistently referred to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as a means of ensuring Māori were given equal treatment and respect. Participants suggested that in depth study of the Treaty be made mandatory for all, the theory being that if Pākehā understood it and acknowledged it as their national heritage, they would not behave in a racist manner.

Education

Education contained four sub-themes: Teaching the Treaty, teaching history, teaching cultural differences, and teachers’ roles, in teaching and modelling anti-racism. Teaching the Treaty was constructed as a means of eliminating racism.

Bill: It’s not the guy that reads the Treaty, understands the Treaty and reads other documents that relate to that document (who is racist)

Bill: there’s a difference between reading, and studying, and so if you’re studying something then you get a word and you get to really understand its meaning.

Bill and other participants dispensed with what was seen as tokenistic inclusion of the Treaty; for them, a cursory reading would not suffice. They posited that people would not act in a racist manner toward Māori if they had been taught an in depth understanding of the Treaty and its history. Teaching the history of the Treaty included teaching an accurate historical account including the invasion of the land by Europeans.

Poto: You know there are a lot of students who have never heard about the Taranaki wars, and have never heard about why they wear these three white feathers in their hair. Have never heard about passive resistance similar to Ghandi, have never heard about the rape and the atrocities that have taken part in the land wars, have never….and can’t understand why Māori get upset about land that has been taken off them.

Poto draws attention to cultural racism inherent in the current history curriculum, which by leaving out the things he mentions, implicitly perpetuates the standard ideology (McCraenor, 1993). In this, Pākehā are constructed as the honourable winners of a fair fight, the Māori as savages rightfully subdued. Poto seeks to give equal weight to both sides’ perspectives, and this move is constructed as having potential to create understanding between Māori and Pākehā.

Failure to teach cultural differences was constructed as unspokenly racist, as exacerbating a sense of agentic racism in societal encounters in which Pākehā assumed that their cultural mores were the only ones to observe. Ruhi describes a meeting she attended, in which differing cultural expectations surfaced.

Ruhi: I said I’ve come here, on my own, and none of you looked up, none of you greeted me, none of you said hello, you know, so I think you’re cold hearted. And you call yourselves [professional occupation]! And at the end of the meeting one person whom I had met and did know well came up to me and she said Ruhi? all you need is a good hug. And I said you’re right. I arrived and no-one gave it to me, and she smiled at me. And so she came up and gave me a real good hug. Now she understood what Māoris needed. She understood what I needed.

Ruhi’s account is typical of participants’ accounts in which they were hurt by the Pākehā expectation that one Pākehā culture would fit all, or cultural racism. Māori were expected to learn Pākehā cultural norms, but Pākehā did not learn Māori culture. In this example, Ruhi lists what some Māori might expect when arriving alone at a strange place: to be looked at, greeted with a smile, to be physically hugged. Only one person present has the knowledge to bridge the gap.

Although participants agreed that teaching children to be non-racist began in the home, they also constructed this as something that needed to be in the curriculum.

Inap: I think the only way it’s going to happen or will happen is through education.

Inap: An environment of acceptance and that yes we have our points of difference and yes we do things differently but that doesn’t make me any more frightening or violent or intimidating or better than you.

Inap advocates a school environment where acknowledgement and respectful acceptance of ethnic and cultural differences is openly discussed, and children are taught not to associate phenotypical pointers with negative stereotypes. This would necessitate open discussion of race, appearance, and assumptions of, for example, inherent criminality. No participant suggested ignoring the issue. This position can emerge from a supposedly egalitarian but erroneously colour-blind approach, in which drawing attention to race or differences is itself considered racist and unhelpful (Brown et al, 2003). Instead, participants underscored openness. “Let’s talk about it all” said Zoe, a Pākehā teacher.

Others talked about the need for teachers to engage over racist incidents or ethnophaulisms (ethnic or racist slurs) they encountered in school. Mabel, a Pākehā with a Māori husband, recounted a time when their phenotypically Māori child had been targeted in racist bullying. The teacher had successfully countered this by teaching lessons that accentuated positive aspects of Māori culture. Tu talked about a racist incident in his trades class, where his tutor had spoken up for him and denounced verbal slurs and racism. Tu’s two fold response to his tutor was significant ‘he’s a Pākehā man but he’s really lovely’ indicating that Tu’s growing disillusionment with Pākehā had found an exception. These are both examples of commendable teaching practices, but they also highlight the power of role models to reduce racism by taking positive action whenever racism occurs.

Interaction

Most participants talked about the need for on-going daily interaction
between Pākehā and Māori if racism were to be defeated. This theme included three sub themes: integration, working together, and relationships.

Māori make up 14.9% of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a) and participants indicated that in schools or towns where there was a higher proportion of Māori, and correspondingly higher rates of integration, racism was constrained. Some cited a lack of bullying in their previous high schools of equal Māori and Pākehā students. Erana stated that three quarters of the people in their (non-racist) town were Māori; Zoe said an acquaintance was prejudiced against Māori, and would probably never change because the acquaintance’s township elsewhere was largely Pākehā, with no chance of interaction with Māori. Integration of Māori and Pākehā houses was considered important.

Zoe: it was never ever ‘we’ve got a Pākehā here and we’ve got Māori there’ we were all living together, we were all immersed.

Zoe’s excerpt is from her account of a district she grew up in where Pākehā and Māori lived as neighbours in close proximity, and there was mutual cultural interaction and no racism. Elaine, a Pākehā who lives on Māori land with her husband who is Māori, pointed out that Pākehā and Māori lived adjacent and met in everyday activities without racial disharmony. All participants who currently lived or had lived in an integrated housing situation were unanimous that Māori and Pākehā got on well in this context, rather than where Māori were in the minority.

Tu: where I grew up it was kind of like that there was probably more Māori than Pākehā? But we all got along we all got along with everyone where I came from.

Working together as a group for a common goal was also constructed by participants as conducive to reducing racism, as in Inap’s account below.

Inap: I think I started to learn about appreciating other peoples’ points of difference...sometimes we didn’t always agree but yeah, cause when you’re in a team you know you have to be able to put aside those differences for the greater good.

Inap notes that when working together and having to ignore personal complaints, the differences between Māori and Pākehā become subordinate to a common team goal which fostered mutual appreciation. Another participant, Sophia, pointed out that Māori and Pākehā had worked together historically, for example in the first building of roads and railways, and other participants cited working with Pākehā today on church or volunteer projects without prejudice or racist incidents.

On-going relationships, especially if close or personal, were possibly the most cited way to put an end to prejudice, as explained by Freya, a Pākehā with a Māori partner.

Freya: I think if you have a basic belief that Māori are inferior, you could have all sorts of stuff coming and it would just bounce off unless something’s happening to actually change you at a real... micro level. I believe personally in a relationship probably with other Māori who affect you and touch you in some way not just like another person - or there’s too much of ‘us and them’ and it’s too easy to separate.

Freya constructs negative racist stereotyping as an unyielding belief resistant to conflicting evidence or anti-racist attempts to restrain or unpack it; as she concludes ‘it would just bounce off’. She constructs the separation caused by discriminating group categorisation as becoming an indomitable “them and us”, and notes the cognitive ease of continuing the mental separation of the two groups. An interpersonal relationship, however, is constructed as having the power to bridge preconceptions and change prejudice. Ropata describes other ways a positive relationship may counter stereotypes.

Ropata: If I took my mate who was from a Pākehā home to you know, to a celebration or something, they were blown away and they’d say ‘oh I didn’t realise Māori behaved like this’ because there was no alcohol you know and it was - everything was sort of spiritually sanctioned and so on, so it was a totally different experience.

Ropata already has a positive relationship with a Pākehā “my mate” and enjoys further breaking down prejudice by introducing him to a Māori community which defies the negative stereotypes (Tausch & Hewstone, 2010). His mate responds immediately, but others noted that this could be a long or gradual process. Elaine, a Pākehā, talked about a relative’s waning prejudice against her Māori husband, Bill. Initially there was a marked prejudice, however as the relationship grew, and Bill defied their negative stereotypes, prejudice broke down to the extent that the relative lived with them at times. These accounts suggested the realisation of a common humanity, which is explored in the next theme.

Being Kiwi

Being Kiwi has three subthemes: Ngāti Kiwi, intermarriage, and mutual respect. Ngāti denotes a tribe comprised of sub tribes who are descended from, and align under, the name of that tribe. Kiwi is the generic colloquial term used for all citizens of Aotearoa NZ. The phrase Ngāti Kiwi therefore constructs an image of New Zealanders of different ethnicities and cultures uniting and functioning as one tribe, without inter-racial prejudice, as in Sharlee’s excerpt below.

Sharlee: me I think that you just have to say look why the racism against people you know? you know we’re all one people. Kiwis. Just because we’ve got different colour doesn’t mean nothing at least that’s the way I look at it.

Sharlee reasons that if New Zealanders see themselves as Kiwi, phenotype will become irrelevant, and racism will be dismissed as illogical. Hose reiterates the construction of Kiwi as a unifying force.

Hose: we’re all Kiwis. And I find sometimes that the whole Māori thing sometimes with Hone Harawira ‘we’re Māori and not Pākehā’ that creates a divide as well. I think we need to be...going together you know?

Hose refers to a Māori leader whom he feels leans towards separatism and division based on ethnicity. Separatism was commonly implied by participants to be racist, and Hose, although proud
of his Māori heritage, here constructs Kiwi as the term which will remind New Zealanders that they are not racially opposed, but one nation.

When asked how to reduce racism Rauri amplifies this by specifying the inclusion of all ethnicities, a matter he constructs as achievable through resolving the need to belong. In the excerpt below he recounts explaining Ngāti Kiwi to a relative of English descent who had expressed a lack of belonging.

Rauri: I think that he was quite upset about that side of it and I said well brother! What we are, what we can do if you feel you haven’t got a tribe and you’d like one, how about Ngāti Kiwi? That will do. And in the end, I think we’ll move towards that. It’s not going to be smooth, it hasn’t been smooth so far, a smooth and bumpy ride…but I think we will get to the point when we don’t sort of think ‘oh I only come from England’ or China or something. I don’t truly belong here.

Ngāti Kiwi is constructed here as a means by which all ethnicities can feel part of the ingroup. The English relative is compelled to rethink his allegiance to England ‘I only come from England’ and to make a conscious decision to become a Kiwi, if he wishes to have a sense of belonging. It is a construction which takes agentic charge of a situation in which Māori may currently be considered a minority, and targeted for this reason; Māori position themselves as offering the chance to become part of a united team, in which people are not separated by ethnic backgrounds. Notably, Rauri goes beyond biculturalism to implicitly define Ngāti Kiwi as inclusive and multicultural.

Racist separatism was particularly denounced by those participants with Pākehā partners, a situation common in Aotearoa NZ, where approximately half of Māori have Pākehā partners (Callister, Didham & Potter, 2007). Hose, whose wife is Pākehā, contested the biological or genetic basis of racism by saying there were no pure blooded Māori left, and talking about a melting pot. Rauri, whose partner is Pākehā, warrants voice on the topic by quoting Whina Cooper, a highly respected Māori leader (1895-1994).

Rauri: Well Whina Cooper she said the quickest way to get rid of the divisions is by marrying um marrying the dividers, or something like that, and getting as many children as possible, because then the divisions have to drop because then they’re your own damn family (laughs)

Rauri’s assumption is that the children of such unions will not be discriminated against because they belong to both groups. Others such as Kahu construct the children of such unions as “interracial” and “not easily influenced” or targeted by racism. Inap talks about prejudice being confounded by a “watering down” of differences, with intermarriage “breaking down prejudice” because of the interculturality and unique hybridism.

Mutual respect was constructed as a proviso against a tension voiced alongside Ngāti Kiwi, the fear that under this umbrella, Māori culture would become increasingly marginalised. Mutual respect involved each group’s continued culture, acknowledged equality of cultures, parallel regard for differences, shared experience, and resultant mutual benefit. Pania’s excerpt establishes Māori expectation that in a non-racist society, this should be automatic.

Pania: The solution for New Zealand…it’s to stop being negative (laughs) to have some respect and appreciate one another, instead of just trying to be the dominant person.

Pania’s reference to not being “the dominant person” is a reference to what she perceives as Pākehā assumptions of superiority (Pack et al, 2015a). Coming from a Māori perspective, this is contrary to the respected Māori value of being humble and respectful of others. Her message is not only one mutual respect but also ensuing mutual benefit, as below.

Inap: I learnt a lot living with Pākehā people they taught us things about blue cheese Sylvia (laughs)

Inap: and beef stroganoff Sylvia: oh yes yum

Inap: and we taught them things about pork bones and pūhā (laughs)

In the atmosphere of mutual respect and exchange constructed here, ideally Māori and Pākehā live interactively, retaining and sharing aspects of their culture which are capable of increasing the quality of life for both. Although acculturation frequently refers to the process by which a marginalised culture absorbs mainstream values and customs, some participants constructed a reverse acculturation they had observed in which non-Māori acquired Māori tattoos, performed the haka, and used common Māori words.

When asked their perspective on racism in the future, participants were without exception optimistic. Although they talked of racist incidents and structural racism as still occurring today, the past was seen as worse than the present and this in turn was constructed as a trend of on-going improvement in race relations. Older participants recalled being beaten in school for speaking the Māori language in the 1940s, denied permission to drink in certain pubs or sit in buses and certain parts of theatres in the 1950s, openly turned down for accommodation or employment in the 1960s and 70s, and having fewer Māori news presenters and no Māori television before the 21st century, but these things have changed. There was an assumption that most Pākehā wanted to get on with Māori (Pack et al, 2015b) and things would continue to improve. Rauri sums up:

Rauri: I think it’s going to come about naturally anyhow. I think we’re just going to we’re going to soak in being New Zealanders.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study explored suggestions for reducing racism against Māori by focusing on the views of Māori targets of racism and their partners. It contributes to a growing area of research that has the potential to shed new light on current understandings due to the exceptional motivation of targets to analyse and contextualise their experiences (Swim & Stangor, 1998). In the first of the themes discussed, participants constructed institutional or structural racism as highly prevalent (Pack et al, 2015a) a view consistent with other research (Came, 2014). Participants did not see
any easy or direct solutions. They noted that power imbalances in the workplace allowed Pākehā in positions of authority to minimize complaints and circumvent recourse to an apparently complex and stressful redress system, which suggests the need for the system’s revision.

Racism evident in the over-policing and unjustifiably high rate of incarceration of Māori led to participants calling for greater numbers of Māori police, judges and justice workers. This echoes the concerns and solutions voiced by Māori currently working within the justice system (Bootham, 2015; Thomas, 2014). Participants did not discuss the possibility of a Māori justice system running parallel to the existing system, a solution proposed by the Green Party in 2009 and the subject of on-going discussion and debate (Perrett, 2013; Quince, 2007).

Participants emphasised the importance of anti-racism teaching and Treaty training (Simmons, Mafile’o, Webster, Jakobs & Thomas, 2008), noting there was no in-depth study of the Treaty. They also noted the omission of accounts showing Māori perspectives in history curricula. Thus the educational system was constructed as a post-colonial Pākehā power structure wherein the equality inherent in the Treaty is sidelined, and Māori histories marginalised. Historical traumas are well known and alive in the psychological life of all iwi today, and could be taught by modern historians and considered collectively by psychologists as a part of the ‘lived experience’ of Māori in Aotearoa. Participants also suggested that teachers dedicate time to discuss racism against Māori openly with a view to its reduction. Their belief in the power of teachers to challenge racism is backed by studies which provide evidence that teaching non-racist concepts to students can be successful (Husband, 2012; Quince, 2007). An important issue in this context is the possible influence of neo-liberal Pākehā phrase ‘we’re all one people’ can lead to the labelling of Māori as ‘good’ if they then adopt the majority culture and thinking, and ‘bad’ if they do not (McCreanor, 1997). Participants’ desire for mutual respect, in terms of acknowledging and honouring the two separate cultures, was proposed to prevent this. Awareness and mutual regard would ensure the protection of Māori culture, needs and abilities, and promote interaction in the style of parallel partnership (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002). Some studies however have indicated that this separation can re-emphasise the power of the dominant majority culture and remarginalise the minority (Johnson, 1996). There is also the question as to whether the theme of bicultural Ngāti Kīwī can survive an increasingly multicultural Aotearoa NZ, where a quarter of residents are overseas born, and Asians make up 11.8% of the population (Statistics NZ, 2013b). Consistent with Ward and Liu (2012), participants suggest that if all cultures are maintained and respected while participating in and contributing to the wider society, the core philosophical and historical concept of bicultural partnership can still be maintained.

From a research perspective and in terms of theoretical positioning for on-going Pākehā research conducted with Māori, the challenge to negotiate a way through Māori mistrust of Pākehā researchers and produce in depth quality data was made possible by using Kaupapa Māori principles (Smith, 1997). These provided a way through Pākehā paralysis (Tolich, 2002), and indicate a way in which other Pākehā researchers can receive valuable and refreshing understandings from a Māori perspective. Thus the social constructionist approach can allow Pākehā researchers to identify and share new perspectives. An important issue in this context is the possible influence of demand characteristics. Did participants subconsciously form opinions of what was required from the research, or the Pākehā interviewer, and frame their answers accordingly? Thirteen of the participants were well known to the interviewer, and their ability to speak...
openly was engendered from previous discussions on the topic over the years. It is possible that the other eleven may have moderated their responses despite open efforts by the interviewer to privilege and honour their opinions. It is noted that five Pākehā participants gave similar responses to their Māori partners. More qualitative studies by Pākehā and Māori are needed to further investigate the views of Māori, whose embodied experience and perspectives must stand alongside Pākehā findings in terms of import and validity. Such studies have the potential to create new insights into the unique cultural context of Aotearoa NZ.

In conclusion, the views of participants on reducing the problem of racism were aligned with previous research. Attention was drawn to the need for change in institutions to prevent aversive and deliberate racism affecting the redress system and the decisions of those in power. Calls were also made for Māori police and judges to work with Māori. Educators were asked to teach the Treaty, race ethics, and a balanced historical viewpoint. Participants’ constructions of groups in which Pākehā and Māori interacted closely without prejudice strongly echoed Allport’s contact hypothesis, and the inclusive recategorisation Ngāti Kiwi spoke to the Common Ingroup Identity Model. Participants also alluded to the importance of Pākehā speaking out when witnessing racism, particularly in the classroom. This underscores the power of action oriented bystander language to reduce racism (Guerin, 2003; Mitchell, Every & Ranzijn, 2011). Where their perspectives diverge from existing studies is in the optimistic hypothesis that if the right conditions are met, all Pākehā and Māori will learn to live harmoniously, and racism rather than the targets will become marginalised.
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Appendix

Doing research with Māori and Pākehā participants; some generalised differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pākehā</strong></td>
<td><strong>Māori</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants don’t need to know the researcher; a university sanction provides sufficient credibility</td>
<td>Participants need to know and trust the researcher before agreeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to socialise is not expected</td>
<td>Researcher expected to spend time talking and eating with participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust the academic process</td>
<td>Mistrust of Pākehā research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher privilege expected and trusted within reason</td>
<td>Researcher privilege / hegemony suspected and needs to be discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An expectation that academic research would benefit ‘society’</td>
<td>A desire for the research to benefit the lives of all Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewing participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No physical contact</td>
<td><em>Awhi</em> and/or <em>hongi</em> before and after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is the only language used</td>
<td><em>Te reo</em> (Māori language) is sometimes used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spiritual element</td>
<td>Prayer sometimes expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food or drink not mandatory</td>
<td>Food and drink required as part of Māori protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Koha</em> an accepted part of university research procedure</td>
<td><em>Koha</em> indicates an understanding of the principle of <em>tauututu</em> (reciprocity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninterrupted setting</td>
<td>Mokopuna or relatives could arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisp timing with limits</td>
<td>Time not so important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom stop the recorder</td>
<td>Stop the recorder if participant wants to discuss personal issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses more focused</td>
<td>Larger holistic responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Sometimes emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer not expected to offer comment</td>
<td>Interviewer’s empathy and opinion enquired about and expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quick sign off of transcripts</td>
<td>Delay getting sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer could remain a ‘stranger’</td>
<td>Interview the start of a relationship and a connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>