ORIGINAL ARTICLE
THEORETICAL RESEARCH

Āpiti hono, tātai hono: A collaborative bicultural social work research approach

Kora Deverick[1] and **Hannah Mooney**[2] Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Te Āti Awa, Ngā Rauru, Te Āti Haunui a Pāpārangi, Pākehā

[1] Registered social worker
[2] Massey University

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: This article introduces the qualitative research design of a research report completed in 2019 that focused on collaborative bicultural social work practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. A major focus of this article is the relationship between the Pākehā researcher (and tauira) and the Māori social work research supervisor. Therefore, reflective accounts are provided throughout the article where we have emphasised the value of the supervision process and bicultural collaborative relationship.

METHODS: The research utilised social constructivist theory and a decolonising, Te Tiriti o Waitangi lens. Data were collected from semi-structured interviews with four registered social workers. An integrated narrative approach to analysis allowed for multiple narrative levels to be considered. The researcher and supervisor modelled a collaborative bicultural relationship in the research design process.

FINDINGS: The article presents the process of research design and a critical reflection on the challenges and benefits of a collaborative bicultural supervision relationship. We argue that an interrogation of the cultural positioning of the researcher and supervisor is essential in research design in Aotearoa New Zealand. These were also reflected in the findings reported in a separate article in this issue (Deverick & Mooney, 2023).

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, RESEARCH OR POLICY: Reflections of bicultural research will be of interest, particularly to other Pākehā, Tauiwi tauira interested in exploring how they can contribute to the bicultural discourse in research. Research supervisors may also be interested.

Keywords: Collaborative bicultural research; positioning, social work; Te Tiriti o Waitangi; reflection

This article introduces the research design of a research report completed in 2019 that explored collaborative bicultural social work practice in Aotearoa New Zealand as part of a Master of Applied Social Work degree with Massey University. The aim of this article is to focus on the methodology, methods and reflections of the approach undertaken. For a detailed exploration of the findings of this research please see the companion article in this issue, "Āpiti hono, tātai hono: Collaborative bicultural social work practice—A selection of findings" (Deverick & Mooney, 2023). The study employed a qualitative approach, used data collected from semi-structured interviews with four registered social workers. These data were analysed using an integrated

AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND SOCIAL WORK *35(1)*, 21–33.

CORRESPONDENCE TO:
Kora Deverick
koradeverick@gmail.com

narrative method. The study was grounded in social constructivist theory through a Te Tiriti o Waitangi, decolonising lens. In this article, reflections are presented both from a researcher/tauira perspective and from a research supervisor perspective. This additional focus is fitting as it was also indicative of a collaborative bicultural relationship. The challenges and benefits of a collaborative bicultural relationship are presented through a description of the research approach and reflections. These were also reflected in the findings of the research which illustrated that the wider social, historical and political contexts are inseparable from research and practice. Exploration of the cultural positioning of the researcher and supervisor is essential. This first section outlines the authors' positioning and explores the tensions in bicultural research—these were recognised as essential considerations before undertaking research, particularly of this nature.

He tūranga, positioning

Kora—Researcher/Tauira

He Pākehā ahau, born and raised in the Waitakere Ranges, and I now call Te Whanganui home. I have a strong connection to Scotland where my mum grew up; I have lived and studied there, and a piece of my heart remains there. My dad's grandparents came from southeast England, arriving in Aotearoa, New Zealand in the early 1900s. I have travelled extensively, dabbling in community development, and I am relatively new to the social work profession. I am a feminist, a creative, and I have always existed just outside of the box. All of these aspects contributed to my approach in this research. I recognise the groundwork laid by my whānau in the realms of social justice. I recognise that my ancestry is heavily laden in colonial roots, something I am continually addressing, understanding, and attempting to undo.

Hannah—Research supervisor

He Māori ahau. He uri ahau nō Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Te Āti Awa, Ngā Rauru me te Ātihaunui a Pāpārangi. He Pākehā ahau hoki. My cultural positioning is that I identify as both Māori (my iwi identified above) and Pākehā. While I whakapapa Māori, I have more of a Pākehā appearance, and people do not readily recognise that I am Māori as well. This informs the way I view the world. When people get to know me, they see how both these lenses play a role in how I move through the world, in my personal and professional life. I am also a woman, a mokopuna, a daughter, a niece, a sister, a cousin, a wife, and a mother to three tamariki (among other roles!).

Bicultural research

Kora—Researcher/Tauira reflection

When I first met with Hannah to discuss my research project, I was interested in exploring bicultural social work practice, but I was not set on a topic. I wanted to engage more fully in bicultural social work, to go "beyond mere tokenism" and to explore ways it is practised successfully and respectfully (Eketone & Walker, 2015, p. 110). At first, our supervision discussions revolved around the ethics of this project; we discussed the politics of the bicultural space and how best to approach participants of all ethnicities without causing friction. We also unravelled the tensions inherent in bicultural research, which are unavoidable, just as our history is. As Hannah outlines below, a result of these discussions was to be clear about my positioning. The importance of 'knowing your positioning' become a pivotal element throughout the research process – during recruitment, within narrative analysis and in the results of the research. Our communication style helped us understand the others' processes, we could therefore listen, understand, and contribute. On reflection, I can see this is an example of an active collaborative bicultural approach to research.

The notion of bicultural collaboration was first introduced to me through the 2017 book, *Collaborative and Indigenous Mental Health Therapy: Tātaihono, Stories of Māori Healing and Psychiatry,* by NiaNia, Bush and Epston, which outlines several successful collaborative practice examples between matekite and clinical psychiatry in a Kaupapa Māori service provider. Tātaihono is described as an active process:

> In our case it is about collaborating between our Māori and Pākehā points of view. We both have to put the effort in. It requires a commitment and a genuine relationship. Sometimes it's as if you are on a steep incline and you have to hold fast to your footing; otherwise, you could slip off. There is that history of colonisation in there. For that reason we had to find a way to reconcile and forgive those things that have taken place between our cultures. At the same time there is manaakitanga, giving mana to another person. Giving mana is for me the basis of our mutual respect. Another thing that binds us together is our love of people. (NiaNia et al., 2017, p. 7)

This text provided examples of the active engagement that I was searching for, and I wanted to see if it had been practiced elsewhere. The concept and practice of *biculturalism* is contested in social work, with some criticisms as to how to genuinely apply it in policy and practice. Eketone and Walker (2015) noted that the shift to biculturalism was to challenge dominant Eurocentric worldviews in Aotearoa and recognise our two distinct cultures. It focuses on the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, bringing together Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge and practices to enhance wellbeing (Eketone & Walker, 2015).

There have been times where I have thought I understood a Māori worldview. However, there are still instances that demonstrate my western lens; discussions with Hannah really highlighted this for me. As much as I try to seek understanding of Te Ao Māori, I can easily slip back into western theory and an individualistic worldview. In this research I have attempted to critically reflect on these tendencies and seek to address them, but I am certain some slip through.

One of my main influences were a set of kaitiakitanga cards I was gifted by a colleague studying at Te Wānanga o Aotearoa. Throughout the research I read through and reflected on them whenever I sat down to study. The cards have been a source of grounding, reminding me what I am here for, whilst also helping to understand more about Te Ao Māori. I am limited in my interpretation of these kupu Māori, I will only ever understand them from my worldview.

Hannah—Research supervisor reflection

Kora and I met at the beginning of 2019 to discuss her ideas for her research report. She was not set on her topic yet but was considering the topic of collaborative practice between Māori and non-Māori in social work. We had numerous discussions about her research question in relation to how the research could be designed. A big part of this was how she could approach the topic as a Pākehā researcher, how she could best approach potential participants and her desire to engage in a tika way, the right way, with Māori participants. We discussed that while her research would not be Kaupapa Māori as she did not whakapapa Māori, it could have a bicultural lens. A risk of opening recruitment to all potential ethnicities meant that she may not have got any Māori participants. However, I believe that a key factor in her recruitment success was that she was open and clear about her positioning to participants and throughout the research. She was very respectful of Māori in her research interviews and in the analysis of data, she engaged with an open mind, utilising kupu Māori where it felt

appropriate and critiquing and reflecting as she went. In addition to this, we met regularly, at least monthly, and engaged in email contact in between. Kora engaged in supervision with respect, humility and openness. She seemed to enjoy my *thinking out loud* moments as we went through an ako process, learning from one another as we collaborated in a bicultural partnership process, tangata tiriti and tangata whenua.

It is important that the student researcher has thoroughly thought through their research approach and all ethical considerations. My role is to ensure that this is completed with rigour and integrity. Additionally, as a Māori social worker, a Māori researcher and Māori research supervisor, when it comes to research that involves Māori as potential participants, it is essential that I do my part well. I need to support the student to do the right kind of research, in the right way and they should be the right person, at the right time. Kora had an openness to learning that went beyond *good intentions*, she did not come with a rescuer or all-knowing approach. She demonstrated a commitment to the bicultural partnership but also had a sense of when it was not for her to venture into. While I bring personal and professional knowledge and skills to the relationship, I do not position myself as an expert in research or Māori research, so the collaborative aspect is a really important part of the process.

Tension in bicultural research?

The heart of this research is biculturalism, a journey both Māori and non-Māori should be on together (Bishop, 1996). However, due to the ongoing negative impacts of colonisation, the bicultural space is one of tension. Indigenous cultures have a long history of being researched by the colonisers, which has created a deep mistrust of research, particularly when led by non-Indigenous people (Smith, 2009). This research adopted a "power-with" approach, aiming to empower those involved in or influenced by the research regardless of their ethnicity or cultural backgrounds (Bishop, as cited in Eketone & Walker, 2015, p. 111). I believe as Pākehā, I must take ownership of my own learning and not rely on Māori, who have been relied on for so long already (Hollis-English, 2012; Margaret, 2013). This does not mean I embark on the bicultural journey alone, but rather recognise the part I play and not wait for others to do the mahi (the work) for me, honouring the part of tangata whenua in a collaborative partnership.

The remainder of this article will outline the methodology and include reflections on the how the bicultural collaboration played out.

Methodology and theoretical framework

This section outlines the research design, including the qualitative approach and theoretical framework. It will discuss access and recruitment.

The qualitative research design was relevant for the social focus of this research (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Qualitative research allows for multiple subjective accounts to be explored, focussing on the lived experience of the participants (Braun & Clarke, 2013). It provides a valuable contribution by exploring diverse perspectives, and understanding the differing ways bicultural practice can be applied. It used semi-structured interviews and emphasised practice examples to inform the narrative analysis approach. Narrative analysis was used to bring focus to the social, personal, interpersonal and political context of the participants' kōrero, as the bicultural journey is often a personal one, it followed that these influences should be acknowledged (H. Crawford, 2016; Ware et al., 2018).

This research was informed by social constructivist theory and took a decolonising approach. Social constructivism is the recognition that there are multiple

interpretations of human existence, constructed by interactions with social, political, cultural and historical contexts (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This aligns well with narrative analysis, as each participant, researcher and reader has a subjective view of reality, which can then be explored and compared to create meaning (Riessman, 2008). My aim was to explore each participant's perspective of the world from within their professional, social and political environments. It was continually evident that to do this, I must have a sound understanding of my own positioning within the bicultural kōrero. While the participants and I may have had similar public narratives, our personal stories and backgrounds were vastly different (see explanation of each of the narratives in section below entitled Data analysis—Narrative approach).

Decolonisation is a process of divesting from colonial power by addressing "bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological" aspects in society (Coates, 2013, p. 64). It is not a short-term fix but a process that requires engagement through both actions and cognitive processes (Coates, 2013; NiaNia et al., 2017). Mercier (2020) suggested that decolonisation is rooted primarily in cognitive processes, indicating that decolonising the mind is the most important step, and will inevitably lead to action. In Aotearoa, all of us have a responsibility to participate in decolonisation processes, particularly those in social work and social work education (Ruwhiu, 2019). Using a decolonising lens in research design and through reflections enabled this analysis to be centred throughout. Gaining awareness and locating oneself in order to work towards emancipation and liberation, is an important first step of decolonisation, one that was utilised in this research (Ruwhiu, 2019). The supervision relationship enhanced this as we could kōrero from our own positions, recognising and challenging any entrenched belief systems and where they come from. Positionality could be a way for Pākehā to move out of paralysis in research, having security in one's own cultural identity, internally reflecting on one's biases, perspectives, privileges and so on and externally stating one's position and place (Crawford & Langridge, 2022).

The timing of this research project was also influenced by the personal and public domains. The researcher's personal experience has expanded and changed since the outset of this project. Publications and conversations about racism and decolonisation are becoming more prevalent in the public sphere, for example due to the Black Lives Matter movement and the growth of Te Pāti Māori in parliament; this project may have had a different outcome or focus if started now.

Ethical considerations

As previously discussed, the ethics of this research were particularly important and guided a lot of the decisions that were made. A low-risk ethics application was made to Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) and was approved before recruitment commenced. Ethics were discussed with peers and my supervisor. The following considerations are in reference to the MUHEC Code (2017).

Bicultural considerations and Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Ethical considerations centred around an appropriate low-risk approach that involved Māori participants in a respectful and beneficial way. Initially, its aims were to explore the notion of tātaihono, collaborative bicultural practice, between Māori and non-Māori kaimahi in a Kaupapa Māori service, focussing on the experiences of Pākehā social workers. At this stage, collaboration was understood as two kaimahi co-working and sharing cases, utilising both cultural perspectives. Cross-cultural ethics were considered—as a Pākehā researcher I would have to consider my approach carefully.

The idea of approaching Māori-led services to talk to Pākehā was considered an ethical issue that may be misunderstood—it did not seem right for this research to exclude Māori participants. In-depth discussions regarding this took place in supervision. Therefore, the scope was widened to include all social workers who self-identified that they were working in a collaborative bicultural manner with their colleagues and instead advertising was through the Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers Te Rōpū Tauwhiro i Aotearoa (ANZASW). This was a beneficial decision as it allowed for the social workers themselves to decide on whether to participate regardless of ethnicity and a diverse range of voices to be heard on a topic that includes all social workers in Aotearoa, New Zealand. In addition, as Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers members this meant that respondents adhered to a Code of Ethics (ANZASW, 2007, 2019). Smith (2009) highlights tangata whenua reluctance to participate in research undertaken from western perspectives as many researchers have subjugated and disadvantaged tangata whenua. Smith (2009) argued that any research in this space must be done with respect and value for Indigenous voices. It was therefore necessary to ensure the aims and heart of the research were established and upheld. This was helped, for a large part, by continuous discussions with Hannah. Our open discussions and respectful relationship meant that I could explain my point of view, be open to correction, but that this would not disrupt any rapport we had. In fact, it built on it. This speaks to the ethical principles of tika and manaakitanga by considering the positive ways this research will impact on Māori (MUHEC, 2017). To make this clear, my positioning was emphasised throughout the research process. This shows how essential the supervisor/supervisee relationship is, especially building rapport and maintaining relationships. Clear boundaries and continual discussion are crucial.

Hope, not deficit

Following on from Smith (2009) and Coates (2013), and with the knowledge that a deficit approach limits rangatiratanga, emphasis was placed on positive examples and a positive outlook for the future. Aligning with taukumekume, acknowledgement that there will be struggle and tension in every relationship, the challenges were also recognised (Pohatu, 2008). This was difficult to do at times as it was simpler to focus on negative things that were happening. It was easy however, to focus on the dedication and passion that the participants held for their mahi, shown through what they said and how they said it. It was important to therefore balance out the challenges with the strengths and ensure the analysis process allowed for a deeper interpretation of negative experiences.

Confidentiality, avoidance of harm

For confidentiality, I worked to remove identifying information in the final report, which was done with feedback from the participants and my supervisor. Pseudonyms were used to maintain confidentiality. It was important, however, that participant profiles did not reduce the participants to basic identifying features, I took care to include parts of their story, particularly as they related to the topic. Interviews were stored on a secure computer to be deleted after five years. To mitigate any bias, participants were unknown to me prior to recruitment.

Autonomy, tino rangatiratanga

The detailed information letter and consent form explained the aims and researcher's positioning, participants' rights, and the voluntary nature of the research. It was reiterated at the beginning of each interview that they could decline to answer, or to ask questions at any time. To ensure the participant's right to privacy and consent, transcripts were emailed with the opportunity to amend, elaborate or

withdraw completely (Anthony & Worsley, 2011). Three out of four participants chose to include further reflections, included at the end of their transcripts with one participant amending their transcript significantly. This also ensured that their views were appropriately represented (Anthony & Worsley, 2011).

Access and recruitment

Each participant was required to be a registered social worker who had worked in a collaborative bicultural manner with colleagues. The recruitment email included a detailed information sheet, which included my positioning for transparency as discussed in supervision. The first three suitable participants were accessed in this way. The final participant was recruited in person at a social work event. There was a lot of interest in this project, 12 other social workers were in contact, which shows the relevance of this topic for many social workers. Before each interview, a consent form and interview schedule were emailed, reiterating that participation was voluntary and confidential. In one instance, the participant was concerned about meeting the criteria so discussed this with me to ensure their participation would be beneficial. The same participant decided to prepare answers to the questions beforehand. Recruitment was not limited based on age, (dis)ability, gender or ethnic identity, but all four participants identified as female and were over 40. One identified as Māori, one of Pacific Island descent, one as both Pākehā and Māori, and one as Pākehā with strong ties to Manawhenua, the local hapū and iwi. I was pleased to accept the first four eligible participants.

Hannah—Research supervisor reflections

The collaborative process with Kora flowed well. Kora is a diligent student who brought integrity to the research design, methodology, methods and ethics. Her ideas led the way, but we discussed them openly which, at times, shifted the decisions and added value and depth to the process. We kept in regular monthly contact for supervision, and she would also check in between times via email if needed. Kora also took supervision notes and sent these through after each session. She set up Google docs and shared her work with me and I was able to give her written feedback or we worked on the document at the same time.

Interviews

The semi-structured interview style seeks to understand the lived experience of participants, allowing them freedom to describe experiences without restricting their responses with prescribed questions (Bell & Waters, 2018). Definitions of *collaboration* and *bicultural* were kept broad, enabling the participants to define it from their perspectives. Throughout interviews, examples and stories of social work practice were encouraged, feeding into the narrative analysis that was to come.

As discussed in supervision, I wanted to ensure the research was conducted in a way that respected tikanga Māori and I made the conscious decision to approach the research in this way (National Ethics Advisory Committee, Kāhui Matatika o te Motu, 2012). This gives respect to the diverse cultural backgrounds in Aotearoa (including diverse realities for Māori) and contributes to building rapport, regardless of ethnic identity. It was preferred that our interview kōrero took place kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) in line with Māori research best practice; it is an important value in Māori society that people meet face to face so that trust and the relationship can be built (Pipi et al., 2004). However, as I was anxious about not getting enough participants, I decided to include online participants. This would increase the geographical coverage and ensure I received adequate responses, with the intention of favouring in-person and focus on whakawhanaungatanga. From the responses

I received, three were online and one was in-person. On reflection, whanaungatanga was sometimes difficult to achieve due to the online environment. The online environment allows less space for pre-interview banter that can be helpful when first meeting in person, it can quickly become awkward silence, and this then feels like it needs to be filled with the kaupapa that has brought you there. It also does not allow for shared kai in the same way, which is important tikanga. While I had scheduled in and allowed for over an hour, I was both mindful of the time that the participants were taking outside of their busy schedules and mindful to allow the time that was needed. I also tried to take time over email and at the beginning of each interview to establish a connection and build a comfortable relationship. It was easier to practise this with the interview that was in-person but by then I had also developed more comfort with the interview process, as this was my final interview. This process was a significant learning experience for me, in both bicultural research and practice situations. While kanohi ki te kanohi is preferred, Māori are not unaccustomed to the use of online approaches as this is being used more regularly to keep people connected over long distances (O'Carroll, 2013). But as experienced, the risk is that reading and responding to tone and body language can be more difficult, affecting whakawhanaungatanga (Rangiwai, 2020).

While I recognised the importance of karakia in establishing a safe space and I was pleased to offer it I realised quickly (in the moment) that I was not prepared to lead it. My first participant led with a karakia which made me realise that I had previously taken karakia for granted, and that I must take responsibility for my learning. Although I practised karakia for subsequent interviews, I either felt whakamā because it felt like tokenism, or because it felt inappropriate to offer between two non-Māori. On further reflection with my supervisor, offering an opening prayer or thoughts in English would have been an appropriate alternative. The other concern I had was how to share my pepeha, whether in Māori or English, so for these interviews I shared who I was, but not as in-depth as I would have liked in order to do my part in the whakawhanaungatanga process. On reflection, it is likely this also had something to do with the online environment, and my newness to research.

These reflections exemplify aspects of my own decolonisation process, and further establish the subjective nature of research, including the mind of the researcher. As discussed in supervision, it is essential to remember that learning happens throughout the research process, with each interview building on the last. It is, therefore, useful to have this in mind when leading research.

Each interview was recorded on two devices and transcribed by me with the assistance of online transcription software, Otter.ai, an encrypted service. Although it was transcribed automatically, I listened to each interview multiple times to imbed each kōrero in my mind. Sometimes on the second or third listen, a deeper understanding would surface. The American software also did not understand our accents, resulting in some comedic interpretations of kupu Māori and English words. My favourite was "learning how to eat the beast" (learning how to get the best).

Hannah—Research supervisor reflections

I remember our discussion of the first interview and Kora's feelings of inadequacy when the participant had asked her to lead the karakia or something similar. Kora had recognised the importance of karakia but had not thought past this point initially, that it was important that she have something prepared as the researcher (and it was not something we had discussed in detail in supervision beforehand). It was a great reminder to both of us to acknowledge that even with careful planning, things can still surprise us, and that we can learn, grow and

develop from each interview. This also leads to bigger questions in the decolonisation and Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership conversations, should Pākehā and other non-Māori social workers and researchers prepare and lead karakia if these are offered by the researcher/social worker and/or requested by the interviewee/service user? What might be acceptable from a position of cultural humility? Do all Māori researchers/social workers feel confident with karakia? If not, what might be alternatives when the process is recognised as tikanga. Again, the importance of positionality is apparent, being honest about the importance of safe spaces and wairuatanga, recognising our level of knowledge and position/s, having brave conversations, educating and pushing ourselves when needed.

Data analysis

Narrative approach

The narrative approach aligns with the exploratory aims of this research and allows for more unbiased information to arise (Kim, 2016). Narrative analysis focusses on the stories told by participants to build up a narrative in context, recognising the unerring interconnectedness of all things (Riessman, 2008). As it is in practice, the practitioner must consider the whole person-in-context. Ware et al. (2018) described a Kaupapa Māori method of narrative enquiry, including comparisons to western narrative methods. By using a narrative approach, I hoped to respect and value mātauranga Māori by emphasising pūrākau without appropriating the culture for my own (Ware et al., 2018; Webber, 2008). Data from interviews were analysed by combining the integrated narrative analysis outlined by Stephens and Breheny (2013) and subscribing to the idea of "flirting with data", a way of interpreting data from the perspective of an "unknower", allowing for the possibility of the research aims to evolve (Phillips, as cited in Kim, 2016, pp. 187–188).

The integrated narrative approach analyses interviews through personal, interpersonal, positional and public narrative contexts as communicated by the participants (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). These levels can be referred to in Table 1. A personal narrative is a story one tells about their own experience and is at the centre of the research, while an interpersonal narrative is the co-creation taking place between participant, researcher, and readers (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). Keeping this in mind enables the reader to recognise their part in the narrative. Introducing the participants in their own context tells the story through both narrative lenses. A positional narrative is the broader social and moral context, which has influenced personal narratives; this is shown through the participants' values, exemplified through experiences they describe and their responses to them (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). The positional narratives are combined with personal by using quotes from interviews and using participants' kupu throughout results and discussion (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). A public narrative includes historical and political contexts and speaks directly to the broader systems and beliefs in society (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). This refers to the shared stories that the participants and I shared about the current political and social climate, and historical influences. The public narrative underpins positional, personal and interpersonal narratives by forming a story based on sometimes unspoken but shared beliefs, such as a shared understanding that colonisation has had a negative impact on tangata whenua. The four narrative levels work together to form the women's stories, showing how their lives have informed the successes and challenges of the experiences they portray. Focussing analysis on the how and why of what they do brings practice contexts into focus (Riessman, 2008). This approach was especially relevant for this research project because of the deeply personal and political nature of bicultural practice and

Table 1. Overview of Narrative Levels

Narrative level	Description
Personal	Participants' way of seeing the world.
Interpersonal	The telling, re-telling and reading of the participant stories.
Positional	Social and moral context, overlapping significantly with public narratives.
Public	Shared political and historical narratives, influenced by values.

acknowledges that these narratives cannot be separated (Polkinghore, as cited in Kim, 2016, p. 191). Remember, you the reader will have your own take on this research and methodology, therefore building on the existing narrative.

By bringing focus to the interplay of contexts in one practitioner's experience, this analysis approach was found to add in-depth, contextual insights, providing a practical context to the theory. It showed how similar public narratives created a shared view on the importance of bicultural practice, however, differing personal narratives created differing definitions of *bicultural*. This is important to recognise in bicultural research; to bring about change, a common ground must be found, even if it is simply the recognition of differences.

The analysis process

Analysis was done by the student and included discussion with supervisor and peers as it was useful to help organise ideas. As a tactile learner, I printed off transcripts to work with by hand. Initially I colour-coded transcripts by questions which helped to centre myself in the research and locate myself in the participants' story. However, this was largely unsuccessful as this meant they were pre-categorised and did not allow for movement. I cut up the transcripts into segments by categories I had surmised, and as the lines were numbered, I could refer to the original documents to keep things in context. Segments were labelled with their pseudonym and divided into physical piles relating to patterns that emerged. Once each participant's perspectives were engrained, I summarised the personal, interpersonal, positional, and public narratives from each participant's perspective.

Evident at this stage were two things. One was the power I had over their stories, I could have easily taken them out of context and merged them to fit my pre-existing narratives and conclusions. Acknowledging this, I used the participants exact wording as much as possible, giving mana to their words whilst creating a collaborative narrative that spoke to their values. The second was the influence a personal narrative can have on interpreting others' stories and the value of discussing results with a supervisor or other researcher. My understanding of participants' responses was often given a different meaning/interpretation by my supervisor as she utilised her lens on the quotes chosen. An example of this was with one of the participants who had very candid views in the interview and had made substantial changes to her transcript. I found aspects of this challenging for two reasons; my concern that the data needed to emphasise hope and not sit in the deficit space, and my concern that my interpretation and analysis of her perspective needed to be tūturu, genuine for her. This shows the importance of acknowledging differing personal and positional narratives, in addition to historical influences on the researcher, supervisor and participants' perspectives.

Key patterns from each interview were listed on paper so they could be compared visually. This helped with drawing out the similarities and differences. After a few days, writing a draft, and discussing with my supervisor, I rearranged the categories again considering my aims more closely.

It was evident at this stage that the views of the participants needed to be presented more fully so that their representation was accurate. Discussions with my supervisor, Hannah, were so valuable at this point, although she did not read the original transcripts, certain (and simple!) questions such as "did they actually say those words?" helped to ground me.

Hannah—Research supervisor reflections

One of the reasons it is helpful to have Māori supervision, Māori members on your team or a Māori consultation panel in research is that any research involving Māori participants benefits from (and I would argue *requires*) having Māori input at all stages of the research. In this case, the bicultural collaborative approach benefitted Kora's research and added to the integrity of the research. She has a strong position and respect for Māori perspectives, and this took her so far. I was not carrying out the research and this was her role and important for her to do as the recipient of the course grade and passing her degree (though the research meant much more to her of course) but it was to both of our enjoyment that we were able to work together, collaboratively, for her to explore this kaupapa. Not only this, but I think this is also what Kora offered her participants, a space to examine and reflect from their own practice approaches and to project their voices of what works for them and to challenge social work and social workers to do better.

Limitations

As an exploration into diverse experiences, this research only represents the voices of the people interviewed and therefore cannot reflect the general population (Liamputtong, 2010). The decision to include or omit aspects of participants' stories could be problematic; however it allowed me to interpret their narratives to fit the research context (Kim, 2016). While the narrative method brings more context and understanding, it must be acknowledged that in the telling, re-telling and reading of their narratives, the meaning is subjective and will change (Riessman, 2008; Stephens & Breheny, 2013).

Conclusion

Tauira and supervisor reflections in this article show several things that worked well, and some that could be improved upon. Nonetheless, it describes an effective bicultural research model, the supervision relationship and the research methodology and design, that could be used for further research in this area. These reflections included the need to prepare and engage more in the whanaungatanga process and conduct the interviews kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face). This research process contributed to my own (tauira) bicultural journey, and I believe it is a clear example of a decolonisation process. It reinforced for me how different everyone is and understanding one's own positioning is essential for any interaction, but especially in the bicultural space. Throughout the process, the aim of the research should always be focussed on. Encouraging practice examples throughout the interviews was something that positively contributed to the narrative analysis. Further exploration in this space could include a kōrero with the two people who are working collaboratively together and more research regarding if, and how, tauiwi can meaningfully contribute to Māori research. As this research aims to contribute to increasing all practitioner knowledge, it is hoped that engaging in collaborative bicultural practice will encourage a more reflexive practice, personal growth, and spark courage for people to have more difficult conversations with themselves and others. Kia kaha, the time is now.

Submitted: 11 May 2

Accepted: 3 February 2023

Published: 7 April 2023

Glossary

These definitions are from *Te Aka Online Māori Dictionary* or from within the texts they came from. They are defined as they are understood in context of this research, which for some is simplified and may have a further meaning in different contexts.

Āpiti hono, tātai hono—Let that which has been joined, remain intact

Ako—Learning, teaching

Hapū—Sub-tribe, kinship group

He tūranga—Positioning

Iwi—Tribal group, extended kinship group, often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor and associated with a distinct territory

Kai—Food

Kaimahi—Worker, social worker, carer

Kaitiakitanga—Guardianship, stewardship, trustee

Karakia—To recite ritual chants, pray, recite a prayer, chant

Kaupapa Māori—a philosophical doctrine, incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society

Kia kaha—Be strong

Kōrero—speech, narrative, conversation

Kupu—Word

Mahi—Work

Māoritanga—Māori culture

Manaakitanga—Hospitality, kindness, generosity, support

Mātauranga Māori—Māori knowledge, originating from Māori ancestors

Matekite—"A seer of sickness and death" (NiaNia et al., 2017, p. 167)

Mokopuna—Grandchild/ren

Pākehā—New Zealander of European descent

Pepeha—Introducing yourself, sharing connections to people and places that are important to you

Pūrākau—Story, narrative

Rangatiratanga—The right to exercise authority, autonomy

Tamariki—Children

Tangata whenua—People of the land, referring to indigenous peoples of Aotearoa

Tauiwi—Non-Māori New Zealander

Tauira—Student, researcher

Taukumekume—Struggling, arguing, conflict, disagreement

Te Ao Māori—Māori worldview

Te Pāti Māori—The Māori Party in parliament

Te Reo Māori—The Māori language

Te Tiriti o Waitangi—Te reo Māori version and different from the English version (The Treaty of Waitangi)

Tika—Correct, true, just, fair

Tikanga—Correct procedure or custom

Wairuatanga—Spirituality

Whakamā—Ashamed, shy, embarrassed

Whakapapa—Genealogy

Whānau—Family group, extended family

Whanaungatanga—A relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging

Whakawhanaungatanga—The process of establishing relationships, relating well to others

References

Anthony, L., & Worsley, A. (2011). *Doing social work research*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446269602

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW). (2007, 2019). *Code of ethics.* https://www.anzasw.nz/code-of-ethics/

Bell, J., & Waters, S. (2018). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers*. McGraw-Hill Education.

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

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. SAGE.

Coates, J. (2013). Ecospiritual approaches: A path to decolonizing social work. In M. Gray, J. Coates, M. Yellow Bird, & T. Hetherington (Eds.), *Decolonizing social work* (pp. 63–86). Ashgate Publishing.

Crawford, A., & Langridge, F. (2022). Pākehā/Palangi positionality: disentangling power and paralysis. *The New Zealand Medical Journal*. 135. 102–110.

Crawford, H. S. (2016). A Pākehā journey towards bicultural practice through guilt, shame, identity and hope. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, *28*(4), 80. https://doi.org/10.11157/anzswj-vol28iss4id300

Eketone, A., & Walker, S. (2015). Bicultural practice: Beyond mere tokenism. In K. Van Heugten & A. Gibbs (Eds.), *Social work for sociologists: Theory and practice* (pp. 103–119). Palgrave Macmillan. http://ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1054031&site=eds-live&scope=site

Hollis-English, A. (2012). Pūao-te-Ata-tū: Informing Māori social work since 1986. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, *24*(3–4), 41. https://doi.org/10.11157/anzswj-vol24iss3-4id123

Kim, J. H. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research*. SAGE Publications.

Liamputtong, P. (2010). *Performing qualitative cross-cultural research.* Cambridge University Press. http://ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat00245a&AN=massey.b4559885&site=eds-live&scope=site

Margaret, J. (2013). *Working as allies: Supporters of indigenous justice reflect*. Auckland Workers Educational Association (AWEA).

Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC). (2017). *Code of ethical conduct for research, teaching and evaluations involving human participants*. Author. https://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/fms/PolicyGuide/Documents/c/code-of-ethical-conduct-for-research,-teaching-and-evaluations-involving-human-participants.pdf

Mercier, O. R. (2020). What is decolonisation? In *Imagining decolonisation*. (pp. 40–82) Bridget Williams Books.

National Ethics Advisory Committee, Kāhui Matatika o te Motu. (2012). *Āhuatanga ū ki te tika me te pono mō te Rangahau Māori: Māori Research Ethics: An overview.* Ministry of Health. https://neac.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/neac-maori-research-ethics-an-overview-2012.pdf

NiaNia, W., Bush, A., & Epston, D. (2017). *Collaborative and indigenous mental health therapy: Tātaihono—Stories of Māori healing and psychiatry*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

O'Carroll, A. D. (2013). *Kanohi ki te kanohi—A thing of the past? An examination of Māori use of social networking sites and the implications for Māori culture and society* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Massey University. https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/5323

Pipi, K., Cram, F., Hawke, R., Hawke, S., Huriwai, T., Mataki, T., Milne, M., Morgen, K., Tuhaka, H., & Tuuta, C. (2004). A research ethic for studying Māori and iwi provider success. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, *23*(3), 141–153.

Pohatu, T. W. (2008). Takepū: Principled approaches to healthy relationships. In J. S. Te Rito & S. M. Healy (Eds.), *Ta Tatau Pounamu: The Greenstone Door: Traditional knowledge and gateways to balanced relationships 2008* (pp. 241–247). Knowledge Exchange Programme of Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.

Rangiwai, B. (2020). The potential effects of COVID-19 on research interviews in Year 2 of the Master of Applied Indigenous Knowledge programme at Te Wānanga o Aotearoa in Māngere. *Te Kaharoa*, *13*(1). https://www.tekaharoa.com/index.php/tekaharoa/article/view/306/277

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Sage Publications.

Ruwhiu, P. A. (2019). *"Emancipate yourself from mental slavery, none but ourselves can free our minds": "Wetekia te mau here o te hinengāro, ma tātou anō e whakaora, e whakawātea te hinengāro"* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Massey University.

Smith, L. T. (2009). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.

Stephens, C., & Breheny, M. (2013). Narrative analysis in psychological research: An integrated approach to interpreting stories. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *10*(1), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2011.586103

Ware, F., Breheny, M., & Forster, M. (2018). Kaupapa kārero: A Māori cultural approach to narrative inquiry. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *14*(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180117744810

Webber, M. (2008). *The space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. NZCER Press.