Hegemonic Whiteness:

An Autoethnographic Examination

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Masters in Social Policy

at

The University of Waikato

by

Chulainn Mabbett-Sowerby

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2023

Abstract

Whiteness is a hegemonic force in New Zealand society. It is responsible for perpetuating racial discrimination against Māori and other ethnic minority groups. The core argument of this thesis, is that discussions concerning racial equity need to focus on hegemonic whiteness, as opposed to racial discrimination in order to make more visible where the responsibility for social change to achieve racial equality lies. In order to demonstrate the need for this specific emphasis this thesis highlights nuanced experiences of hegemonic whiteness through the use of autoethnography as a research methodology. An autoethnographic approach was used as a means of grounding the literature in lived experiences, and resisting the dominance of empirical research methodologies in educational settings.

The literature reviewed was an in-depth investigation of texts concerning hegemony and whiteness. Taking a story-telling approach, the literature concerning hegemony was examined so as to show some of Gramsci's life and thought, before detailing the notion of hegemony itself. The literature on whiteness was drawn from critical and tribal race theory. Literature was also reviewed that demonstrated how the concept of whiteness exists embedded within New Zealand's context as a result of colonisation. Whiteness as hegemony, was made clear through a discussion highlighting the way in which white norms and values are dominant within New Zealand society, and are thus hegemonic. In order to challenge the normalising influence of whiteness within power structures links to policy were made, to highlight the influence of hegemonic whiteness, within political institutions. Overall this thesis argues that it is imperative to foster a more equitable and inclusive society, which can only occur if hegemonic whiteness is acknowledged and addressed by the dominant group in society.

To my boys, Stirling and Sullivan. May you be diligent and caring like your mother, passionate and unwavering like your father, and wiser than us both.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to acknowledge my wife Sarsha. She has always believed in me, even when I did not believe in myself. She initially encouraged me to attend university. Everything I have achieved through my university education is because of her, including this thesis. Her patience is unending, though it has been tested many times. Her intelligence and wisdom have pushed me in so many ways, and she has been an amazing soundboard for many of my ideas. I owe all of this to her, and will never be able to pay her back, but will try nonetheless.

I would also like to acknowledge those who have helped me immensely at the University of Waikato during my studies, particularly my supervisor Dr Gemma Piercy-Cameron. There is absolutely no way I would have completed this thesis if not for Gemma. The encouragement she has shown me over this period is much appreciated. The technical support she has provided has been a valuable balance to my impassioned attitude and perspective. There are many other people that have impacted me to acknowledge here, but I will name a few that have made the biggest impact: Dr Carl Mika, Marcelle Wharerau, Ryan Falck, Craig Dempster, Aramoana Andrews and Nadita Beauchamp.

I also gratefully acknowledge my family and friends outside of the university that have supported me in many different ways. My father Mark, Uncle Trent, Nikol, Uncle Byron and my grandparents Mike and Julia. My father-in-law Monty, and mother-in-law Nola. My grandmother Anabelle. My best and closest friend Hamish, who is a brother to me – in the best and most infuriating ways. My old rugby coach Craig Jeffries; although he would likely have a heart attack reading this thesis, he has done so much for my family that far supersedes

the scope of being a coach. The Paki whānau, who have treated me like I was a part of their family since I was 15, and have treated my wife like a daughter and my children like their own.

There are many, many more that have helped me along the way. Not just concerning the journey of this thesis, but more importantly, my life. Without the love and support of everyone acknowledged or here or otherwise, this would have been much more difficult, and far less successful. Thank you all so much.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Racism is a white problem, and white people have to address it – Tigilau Ness

In 1978 a young man in Auckland was stopped by the police on his way home from work one evening. The police found a series of small items on his person, hair combs (The Spinoff, 2021). One was his own, and two belonged to his employer - the combs were valued at 20 cents each, he had taken them from his work (Chapman, 2018; The Spinoff, 2021). His possession of these items proved to be grounds enough for the police to arrest him. He spent a night in the cells and the following morning he pleaded guilty to theft from his employer. His name was Iki Toloa. He was 17 years old and he was from Niue. The tale of Iki Toloa appeared in the newspaper, The Auckland Star, the following day (The Spinoff, 2021). David Williams a young, white law lecturer at the University of Auckland and the secretary of the activist group Citizens Association for Racial Equality (Chapman, 2018), read the tale of Iki Toloa; he called a fellow activist friend with the intent on publishing a press release (The Spinoff, 2021). During this conversation, Williams' friend made a passing comment about the cost of the combs, comparing them to the cost of a university pen (Chapman, 2018). This gave Williams an idea, he called The Auckland Star, and asked the reporter who wrote the article on Iki Toloa to meet him at the police station the next morning (Chapman, 2018; The Spinoff, 2021). In front of the reporter, David Williams handed himself into the police, confessing that he had stolen the pen from his employer and could subsequently be sent to jail for ten years (The Spinoff, 2021). An exchange between the officer and Williams ensued, the officer would not accept Williams' confession, even attempting to provide Williams with justifications as to why he might have the pen (Chapman, 2018). Throughout the exchange,

Williams' would point out the inconsistencies in the officer's treatment of him and the treatment of Iki Toloa (Chapman, 2018). The conversation ended with the officer calling Williams' employer, The University of Auckland (Chapman, 2018; The Spinoff, 2021). The university would not press charges, thus, the police would not arrest him. Later, it came to light that Toloa had removed the combs from his work's reject bin, a common practice among employees that was permitted by management (Chapman, 2018). Meanwhile, the front page release of Williams' story led to the police vacating the charges, and Iki Toloa was released, and returned to his employment (Chapman, 2018; The Spinoff, 2021). These events took place in the height of the 'Dawn Raids', a period of time in the 1970's when, due to a directive from the Government (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2021), the police were performing early morning "raids on Pasifika homes in search of overstayers" (Chapman, 2018, para. 1). Young Pasifika and Māori men were being stopped by the police, asked for their identification papers, and often being accused of casing out places to rob (Chapman, 2018). Significantly, overstays of white European descent such as British and USA citizens were not treated in the same way by the police.

Simultaneously, Tigilau Ness, a young Niuean man and member of the Polynesian Panthers, was working towards resisting the conviction of Iki Toloa and the Dawn Raids more generally (Chapman, 2018). However, some members of the Pasifika community accepted the actions of the police, as there was a perception by some that those in power were doing the right thing (Chapman, 2018). It took Ness, and other first generation Pasifika children to show that Pacific peoples did not have to commit a crime to be arrested, instead they could be arrested simply because of how they look (Chapman, 2018). Since this time Ness has not stopped fighting racism in New Zealand (1 News, 2021).

The narrative about Iki Toloa sheds light on the experience of Pasifika people in the 1970s. The actions of David William's sheds light on the historic racism within the justice system. Racism that still exists (Ministry of Justice, n.d.). The quote given at the start of this chapter from Tigilau Ness, illustrates how the responsibility of resolving the issues racism causes lays with the group producing it.

There are a boundless supply of anecdotes that could have been used to introduce this thesis, but I chose the one above due to the framing given by Ness in his quote.

What Ness' arguments does is demonstrate the way whiteness, and white people as a group, are often glossed over during discussions of racism. As the Williams' commentary illustrates, the discussion often revolves around the discrimination that non-white people face. Whilst these experiences of discrimination are indelible when discussing racism, the literature reviewed for this thesis highlight how the focus of addressing discrimination needs to be on the conditions that foster racism and the perpetrators of it through a lens of whiteness.

Research Aims

The purpose of this thesis is to illustrate the ways in which racism is an expression of whiteness (in Anglo-colonial contexts predominantly) and the ways in which whiteness is a hegemonic construct. Hegemony is an expression of power, and it is this form of power, I believe, that needs to be addressed in order to address racism and whiteness. Racism is a white problem, and white people have to address it. Therefore, my thesis aims to describe and discuss the relationships between racism and whiteness, and whiteness and hegemony.

Furthermore, this thesis seeks to employ autoethnography as a research methodology as a means of grounding hegemony and whiteness in lived experiences. Also, engaging with research through autoethnography in this way, is an attempt to put into practice the intention of this thesis. To address the hegemony of whiteness.

There has been significant research done on the subject of Whiteness in some areas of the world, particularly in the U.S, but the scholarship in New Zealand is relatively limited. Therefore, my thesis also aims to examine Whiteness in relation to the New Zealand context. This is an attempt to locate some of the ways in which whiteness in the New Zealand context exists. Also, this research is an effort to increase the literature of whiteness in the New Zealand context generally, but specifically for Māori.

Research Design

My research is informed by international, particularly US based academic research into Whiteness, Critical Race Theory, Tribal Critical Race Theory and other relevant theories. My thesis also explores Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony. The concept of hegemony is concerned with power that is invisible and normalising. Hegemony, in this context will be used as a lens to identify and examine Whiteness as a normalising power structure. In Anglo-colonial contexts, like New Zealand, Whiteness is 'normal', expected and the status quo - in this way, Whiteness is hegemonic. In order to ground the literature to New Zealand, an autoethnographic exploration of my life will be provided. A series of events will be given, detailing different situations throughout different times of my life. Taking an autoethnographic approach is important for range of reasons::

1. It is a means of addressing research from an Indigenous perspective. Māori were and are storytellers, and I intend to continue that tradition in this thesis.

2. It pushes back on western conceptions of research that position the researchers separate from the research, and those being researched
3. It allows the voice of the writer to come through strongly, which I argue improves the quality of discussion concerning an issue such as whiteness contextually.

As stated by De Saxe (2021), “before engaging in an analysis of white supremacy and hegemonic whiteness, it is imperative to understand the importance of critical self-reflexivity and its relationship to standpoint and positionality” (p. 2). Autoethnography is one means through which this can be achieved.

The anecdotes that I have included in this thesis are indicative of my life experience as a whole. The autobiographical accounts provided are not necessarily limited to just my life experiences, but also include an array of personal musings. The experiences and musings I have included, have been chosen specifically to introduce, develop or ground the literature as part of an autoethnographic practice. In this way, the literature and the autoethnography will complement each other so as to provide as complete a representation of this discussion as possible. My desire to produce this thesis is a personal one, whereby I am not only discussing literature, experiences and thought, but also the way in which I understand and perceive myself and my identity. The aspects of autobiography that I include will be working towards illuminating Whiteness in New Zealand in some of its many forms and variations. These insights will also illustrate what it is like to experience whiteness first hand, and be incapable of comprehending the situation fully at the time, and how through my university education I have been able to write about it later – sometimes decades later, sometimes weeks later – through the lenses of Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory.

Consistent with autoethnography, this thesis diverges from the expected traditions of an empirical thesis research approach. This divergence is for many reasons: first, moving away from the empirical positivist thesis challenges biases held in relation to the ways in which research should be constructed and findings presented – which is an example of challenging hegemonic power; second, it seeks to supplant these biases, which are white, within the academy, which is also white, by presenting an alternative framework of articulated thought; third, my own perspective forms the background and context for the thesis, as I reject the notion that bias and subjectivity can be removed from research. Instead, I choose to lean in to bias and subjectivity but do so in a way that is as self-aware and transparent as possible.

I walk in both worlds, Pākehā and Māori. I admit that I have lived a relatively privileged life. There are many, much of my family for instance, that have endured hardship I have not. My family, particularly my Māori cousins, feature heavily in the narratives I provide. I am aware that I am not the spokesperson for my family, and am merely providing descriptions of events and situations as I see them and understand them. Furthermore, I am aware that my family do not represent all Māori and all Pākehā – it is not my intention to portray that they do. I do nevertheless, believe that the position I am in now accessing tertiary education, and the one that I was born in too, has provided me a scope that others may not have.

The anecdotes that contribute to my autoethnographic stories are not recounts of my overcoming physical abuse or poverty, instead, they are intended to demonstrate the pervasive and insidious nature of hegemonic Whiteness. The anecdotes provided illustrate the nuances of social and racial inequities in New Zealand society. These anecdotes will attempt to elucidate the everyday impacts of hegemonic Whiteness. To reflect the nature of hegemony the anecdotes highlight things unseen by the majority, but experienced by many.

Whilst the emphasis is on my own experiences, the intent is not to elicit feelings of sorrow in the reader. The intent is to highlight the issues in our society and the impacts they can have on an individual. In this context, obviously referring to issues concerning Race and Whiteness.

Significance to Social Policy

Whilst this thesis is in the field of Social Policy, the primary purpose of this research is to highlight the forces that inform policy, and how they can be experienced. The focus is on the 'social' aspect of Social Policy, as opposed to the 'policy' aspect. As such, there is not a large amount of discussion on policy, as a process or a field. Although policy is a part of political institutions and the power there, policy is a tool. An instrument through which hegemonic whiteness is played. Thus, the explicit links to social policy are relatively limited instead, the focus is on the hegemonic whiteness that influences policy, and what it is like to experience that. The thought behind engaging in the research in this way is that addressing hegemonic whiteness will by extension address policy issues, not the other way around. The issue of hegemony and whiteness is their insidious and invisible nature within society. As such, this thesis will discuss the concepts in a way that implies and highlights that insidiousness.

Some key policy implications of note that are relevant to the issues discussed in this thesis are outlined in the following paragraphs. I invite the reader to return to these paragraphs when considering the other chapters in my thesis. "Key decisions on education, justice and social welfare, for example, have been made with little consultation with Māori people" (Rangihau et al., 1988, p. 18). According to Moana Jackson (1988), British cultural ideals have

influenced not only the justice system, but also key sectors such as education and healthcare. The imposition of British social structures is institutionally racist, as it marginalises Māori systems from the social sector (Jackson, 1988). The New Zealand Government has historically and contemporarily introduces policies that fail Māori; the primary factors responsible for these unsuccessful policies, are poorly funded and managed programmes (Spoonley et al., 1984).

Māori account for 16.5% of New Zealand's total population, whilst comprising more than 50% of the prison population (Department of Corrections, 2020; Stats NZ, 2019). The Department of Corrections (2007) reports that within the New Zealand justice system, Māori are disproportionately subjected to systemic racism. This results in higher rates of incarceration, a higher likelihood of progressing deeper through the system, and are more likely to receive comparatively harsher treatment than non-Māori (Department of Corrections, 2007).

The New Zealand Government is currently developing a national action plan against racism. The goal is to progressively eliminate racism in all its forms (Ministry of Justice, n.d.). This plan aims to reflect the history, challenges, and aspirations of New Zealand. The Minister of Justice is leading this work – the National Iwi Chairs Forum is collaborating with the New Zealand Government on this work also. The need for a national action plan is supported by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the Human Rights Act and international commitments (Ministry of Justice, n.d.).

At the centre of the systemic issues faced by Māori in New Zealand's justice system, education, and social welfare is hegemonic whiteness. These disparities are not isolated incidents but are rooted in the structural biases and power dynamics that uphold white hegemony. Hence the focus of this thesis being on the sociological underpinnings of Scoial Policy, instead of policy processes and practices. In order to address these deeply entrenched disparities and create a more equitable society, we must acknowledge and challenge the systemic dominance of whiteness. Embracing other forms of knowledge, values, and systems can lead to the creation of inclusive policies and institutions that address white hegemony. Only through dismantling the root causes of white hegemony can New Zealand truly strive for equality, justice, and social well-being for all people.

Thesis Layout

Chapter 2 is the methodology chapter. This will cover the roots of autoethnographic research in response to the ‘crisis of representation’, through to Indigenous autoethnography. Some critiques of autoethnographic research are given and the chapter finishes with the way in which autoethnography will be used throughout the thesis.

Chapter 3 is the first literature review, this chapter’s concern is hegemony. A brief background of Antonio Gramsci is given, followed by discussions concerning his influences, and his development and definition of the concept of hegemony. A number of autoethnographic anecdotes are in this chapter also.

Chapter 4 is the second literature view, it focusses on whiteness. There are a number of autoethnographic accounts in this chapter. This chapter starts with a description of race, and finishes with a discussion concerning the nature of whiteness in New Zealand.

Chapter 5 is the discussion. There will be autoethnographic accounts in this chapter. A discussion of the literature in relation to a number of areas of social policy is included here.

Chapter 2: Methodology

I was 13 or 14, my friend and I were walking back to his house from a shopping mall after having bought some toy BB guns. The shopping mall was roughly a 15 minute walk from his house, along some back streets. We were playing with the toy guns, shooting signs and trees and letterboxes. A few hundred metres from his house a security company car tore around the corner of the road. It drove just past us before slamming on the breaks, performing a U-turn and pulling into a driveway in front of us. The security guard hurriedly removed himself from his vehicle and begins vigorously hurling instructions at us. I can't remember what he said but it was something along the lines of "Stop! Don't go anywhere! The police are on their way, they need to talk to you!" I do remember we were told not to move, and that the police were coming. I remember turning to my friend and seeing the fear in his eyes, and the tears. But, I was just confused. His look, if anything, had confused me more. I asked the security guard "why did we have to wait, and why are the police coming?" The response was that They had been told a couple of boys were walking down the street with guns. I showed him our BB guns, "they're just toys", I said, "we just bought them from the shop." I thought that would be the end of it, we did nothing wrong, maybe something silly and naive, but nothing wrong. The guard replied to my statement with a very heated question, "How do we know you didn't just rob the liquor store?" I snapped back without hesitation, but with plenty of consternation, "because we don't have any liquor or money." That achieved nothing though.

The police eventually arrived and continued the security guard's line of questioning. We were told how lucky we were that nothing bad had happened, we were told that what we did was very wrong. I was imploring them that we were only playing with toy guns, and as we had not actually done anything wrong we should not be in trouble. The police officer asked what

school we went to, I was attending Auckland Grammar School, my friend was a student at St. Peters. In what appeared to be an attempt to be relatable, the police officer told us he went to St. Peters when he was our age. His attempts at creating connections fell flat when he revealed to us that he would be taking our photos to upload to their database and add to the file of whatever this situation we were in was. I don't remember if they took the guns off us, I think they did. Then they let us go. Our parents were furious when they heard about what happened. Our mothers in particular were livid. There were tears, cries and screams, not at us, but at the police. They were devastated that we went through that. They talked about what they should do. Eventually, they called the police, and after lots of arguing, got the file deleted and our photos removed.

That day has never left me, I have never forgotten, and I have not trusted police ever since. There were times that I thought about joining the police to right some of the wrongs, or to be one of the good ones. That obviously did not happen, as here I am writing this now. Instead through my university study I have more deeply considered the experience I had. I have realised that even with the best of intentions, I am not sure I could right the wrongs that have happened and keep happening. Ironically, the friend who I was with that day is now a police officer. He was prepared to go into a system that normalises the apprehension of brown boys for playing with toys. His decision sits with me very uncomfortably. I hope that I am wrong, and that he is able to make some difference in the absolute juggernaut that is the New Zealand Police, but I doubt it very much. Especially when I see, over 10 years later, nearly the exact same thing still happening to Māori and Pasifika boys on the news.

Police in the Wairarapa were illegally photographing Māori boys for no apparent reason (Cardwell, 2022). Some of the families complained, which triggered a joint investigation by

the Independent Police Conduct Authority and the Office of the Privacy Commissioner (Thomas, 2022). This inquiry sought to examine the incident and shed light on the extent of the privacy violations committed by the police. A report by the Deputy Privacy Commissioner, found police were engaging in illegal practices of collecting fingerprints and photographing young Māori people (Thomas, 2022). Systemic failures within the police facilitated these actions, and emphasised need for a significant overhaul in their methods. The Police Commissioner acknowledged the mistakes and publicly apologised to some of the whānau.

Years later, some friends of mine were out in Auckland city one night. Bar hopping, drinking and smoking, enjoying themselves. As the night proceeds, and the drinks flow, they decided that they had reached their limit of legal fun for the evening. A construction site nearby garnered their attention, they decided they should climb up into it, seeing it as an opportunity not to be missed. Fencing, signs, their better judgement, all proved to be no recourse as they entered the building site and began to climb the scaffolding in search of a place to get a view of the city they had conquered. They reached their destination, and revelled in their success for some time. Shouts, rose above the busy city night sounds, disturbing their nirvana. The police had come.

The boys scampered, splitting up. But there were too many cops, and the boys were too drunk. A number were caught and taken to the police station. One of them, who was not 18, had been using someone else driver's licence that night. The licence actually belonged to one of the others that had been caught, who was now sitting in a cell. This caused quite the stir when the police realised they had two of the same person in custody. Trapped in a web of lies, they told the truth, and the 17-year-old boy was subsequently chauffeured to his parental

home in Remuera by the police. He was met at the door to his house by his father, the police and the son make the father aware of the events that had transpired that evening. The rest of the young men - who were caught - spent a night in the cells.

The first time I heard this story, I was astonished. I heard it from multiple narrators, as each of my friends told their part of the story. They laughed, and joked. It was hilarious to them. Comments claiming that "boys will be boys" and "it was good for them, learn about the real world" spewed from their parent's mouths – there was a little anger and frustration at the time, but when retelling it a week or so later, it was OK. They were joking and laughing. Why would it not be funny? They broke the law, multiple times, endangered their lives and the lives of others. Their punishment was a night in the cells, and an official warning that existed only on the police database. That is hilarious. Their parents were right, they did learn about the real world. They learnt about their real world, a world which is so very different from my own.

I stopped listening. There was too much noise. I could think only of how I might have managed in that situation. I would not have gone onto the construction site, it would not have been an option. I would have tried to talk them out of doing it, probably would have succeeded with some. But why? Why would I not have done it? My thoughts then transitioned to the consequences of if, for some reason, I had gone with them. Police. First thought. I would get in trouble, I don't want that. Had bad experiences with the police, avoid them as much as possible. Why did my friends not care about the consequences? Which brought me back to the laughter and the joking. Because the consequences were inconsequential.

As I relived my experiences with the police, the reactions my family had, I was caught up in all the differences. The fight that was required to remove our pictures, the fear that permeated my friend and I when the police arrived. The confirmed distrust and reticence in my family's and my interactions with the police. The anger and furore that consumes us when we are persecuted unfairly, or at the very least, perceive the persecution as unfair. None of that was present within my friends and their families. I don't blame them, I wouldn't be wary of the police if that's how they treated me too. The existence of these differences is the essence of this research – not just they are wealthy, but they are white.

Introduction

Story telling is central to the nature of this research, as such, this chapter will explain to the reader what autoethnography is as a research methodology. In this way, I will make it clear why my personal stories represent a valid form of academic research and writing techniques. I will also explain the epistemological position that underpins this research methodology, and what it represents to undertake research in this way. I will also explain how the method of autoethnography can be significant and empowering to those engaged in indigenous research, as indigenous researchers. The chapter concludes with a section where I explain how I am using autoethnography in my thesis. The way in which this chapter is written, intentionally focuses on perspectives by particular authors, as opposed to grouping specific themes across the literature base. This has been done in an attempt to reproduce the individual perspectives that autoethnography is intended to promote. The purpose of using this methodology is to represent the author's uniqueness, and the methodology section of this thesis will reflect the uniqueness of the authors who write about autoethnography.

Development of Autoethnography

The 1970s and 80s proved to be a somewhat reflective time amongst social science researchers. Historically research that included emotions and personal experiences were disregarded by the view that such studies lacked objectivity and rationality (Adams et al., 2014). However, post-structuralists argued that objectivity cannot be achieved, because our lives and experiences are indelibly linked and inseparable from our research projects, social life is messy and unpredictable, and research on social life should reflect that. A large factor regarding the validation of objectivity and rationality in social science research, was the apparently transferable scientific methodologies that underpinned the natural sciences. Adams et al., (2014) argue that the role of scientific methodology with regard to experimental control and predictions in the natural sciences is of little relevance to the ever evolving transient nature of human interactions and thought regarding society – at best, only educated guesses and generalisations can be made.

According to Jackson and McKinney (2021), autoethnography began as a research method in response to the 'crisis of representation' in the social sciences, in the latter half of the twentieth century (also see Butz & Besio, 2009). Notions of objective social science research were under threat, as social science researchers began to realise objectivity and rationality were unethical – a facade behind which sat the researcher's own biases and prejudices (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). Qualitative researchers had come to realise that ethnographic research was not simply a way in which to record culture/s, because the position of a researcher as merely a narrator was no longer appropriate (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). The proponents of autoethnography were concerned with the way in which their conventional research was gathered, undertaken, and the way in which it represented the particular groups it affected. Due to post-modernism, the presentation of discourse as objective and rational

was under scrutiny, some calling research in that manner being completed from a, “God’s eye view” (Butz & Besio, 2009, p. 1662). The “God’s eye view” allowed researchers to simultaneously claim to be absent as subjects in relation to their research, whilst also possessing the indisputable authority and capacity to perform the research. Furthermore, this position was used to justify an illusion of objectivity concerning the research, as the objects of their study, and their findings and writing, were separate from the position of researcher.

Quantitative data and study was being displaced by an attempted alternative project set out to not just examine human conduct, but to understand it. Examinations regarding historical practices were undertaken, and many pre-existing social science research methodologies and findings were challenged. Among these pre-existing methodologies were: the exclusion of narrative and story-telling as a means of knowledge production and projection; the disregard of local knowledges and the intersection of identities within those locations; biases against emotional awareness; and, the “use of colonialist and invasive ethnographic practices – going into and studying a culture, leaving to write about (represent) this culture, and disregarding member concerns, relational ethics, and what the representation might do to the culture” (Adams et al., 2014, p. 10). As a result of realisations such as these, and many others, social science researchers began to desire more tangible and realistic ways of representing their research. As such, ethnographers produced work that began to embrace personal experiences, narrative and other supposedly subjective means of research methodologies.

Where the researcher's voice and position were traditionally and conventionally removed, the crisis of representation led to an emergence of emotional, grounded and subjective research practices (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). Furthermore, autoethnographers assert that the notion of objective and impartial research is an illusion; the lived experiences of people, and

their comprehension of those experiences, are an inevitable aspect of social science research. Attempting to remove the lived experiences of those being researched and the researcher from the research, would serve only to remove the reality of peoples' lives from the research, which is not what social science research should be about. Nevertheless, by locating oneself within the scope of the research, if not the central thesis of it, researchers that undertake autoethnography reject notions of objectivity and rationality (Chang et al., 2016). As such, value is placed on the subjective nature of researcher-subject relationality (Chang et al., 2016). Furthermore, approaching research from this perspective, challenges the hegemony of objectivity and the synthetic separation of researcher and subject that objectivity is supposed to achieve.

Adding to this shift in perspective, was the realisation of white researchers in the role white colonial research methodologies have removed knowledges from other cultures (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). Traditionally, white researchers would enter into non-white settings, perform a supposedly objective form of research, and then report the findings back to other white researchers. This method came under heavy criticism, and as a result, some ethnographers moved into an area known as 'critical ethnography'. Critical ethnography involves investigating the role of ideology in the perpetuation and sustaining of inequity within particular and/or various settings. Furthermore, critical ethnography does not merely acknowledge the existence of social forces that produce inequity and other social conventions, but actually seek to generate change for the better (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). Critical ethnographers also pay attention to the social conventions and positions they exist in, whilst undertaking ethnographic research, and the way in which that positionality may affect their relationships, perspectives, writing and findings. Other ethnographers however, moved to autoethnography, which obviously differs from critical ethnography in so much as the

researcher is the central focus of the study.

Chang et al. (2016) state that “only recently have we allowed our research agendas to be explicitly influenced by our experiences” (p. 26). Importantly, emotions were framed as an exemplar of the necessity of research in this fashion – emotions are a reflection and reaction to the world we inhabit, and greatly influence the way in which we interact with it (Adams et al., 2014). Prioritising emotions in research came about as a form of opposition to the dominance of objectivism and realism within ethnographic research. Therefore, to seek immutable objectivity through social science research fundamentally disregards the way in which people live. Autoethnography represents one research technique that prioritises the inclusion of emotion.

Adams et al. (2014) claim that the study of the social sciences should not leave out the complexities of social life, in the place of the self-regulation of silencing one’s own voice to produce supposedly academically rigorous subjectivity. If the study of social sciences is indeed to examine the social life of peoples, then emotions, experiences and identities are inherently a part of that. Undertaking autoethnography requires one to look externally, towards our society, relationships and environment; whilst simultaneously being grounded internally, examining our experiences, perspectives and feelings. Conducting research via autoethnography, allows one to confront the dichotomy between social constraint and social practice and between internal and external perspectives.

Definitions of Autoethnography

Adams et al. (2014) state that “the term autoethnography invokes the *self* (auto), *culture* (ethno), and *writing* (graphy)” (p. 46). Autoethnography is the study of, and subsequent writing, concerning culture, society, thought and experiences in relation to, and from, the perspective of oneself. Autoethnography seeks to recount narratives and stories concerning culture from the researcher’s perspective, even if “it may be impossible to report objectively and omnisciently on a culture”(p. 5) because it is perhaps more valuable to report on one’s experiences within it (Jackson & McKinney, 2021).

Autoethnography according to Butz and Besio (2009) is fundamentally a research practice that places oneself within their social context through the form of self-narrative. Chang et al. (2016) state that “autoethnography is the study of self, writing about individual experiences of life within the context of family, work, schooling, and society and interpreting the meaning of the experiences” (p. 11). Butz and Besio (2009) further define autoethnography stating it is “a retrospective label that groups together a variety of existing self-representational practices” (p. 1664). However, they do make a proviso that not necessarily all research practices that fit under this umbrella of self-representation are considered autoethnography by the person/people undertaking the research; neither does their definition exclude any piece of research that does not necessarily fit neatly within their definition when the researcher/s considers their approach to be autoethnographic. Butz and Besio (2009) state “that all types of autoethnography dissolve to some extent the boundary between authors and objects of representation, as authors become part of what they are studying, and research subjects are re-imagined as reflexive narrators of self” (p. 1660).

Adams et al. (2014) provide a criteria describing autoethnography as a research methodology:

- Autoethnography uses self-reflection to locate and investigate the intersections between political and personal, and society and self.
- It demonstrates the processes some undergo in the process of understanding their life, struggles and the manner in which they live.
- It is premised on the researcher's personal life and experiences, used to critique and describe socio-cultural practices, beliefs and experiences.
- Autoethnography acknowledges the inherent connection the researcher has with the research, and others.
- It seeks to accommodate academic methodology and intellect, alongside personal creativity and emotion.
- "Strives for Social Justice and to make life better." (p. 2).

Jackson and Mckinney (2021) provide three central tenets to autoethnography: autoethnography is a qualitative methodology, it is internally focused, and it is conscious of the context within which it exists. The qualitative nature of it is rather clear and obvious, however the difference between other kinds of qualitative study and autoethnography, is the way in which the approach to collecting data is purely in relation to oneself. Which aligns seamlessly with the second notion provided earlier, the researcher is both the subject and the object in ethnographic research. Finally, the researcher's context is the foundation of this research methodology; put simply, autoethnography is an exploration of oneself in relation to their context and environment, and in turn, how they have responded to their environment and context. Furthermore, identity is often seen as a result of the effects of many social conditions working in conjunction to generate a presentable image of self-understanding, autoethnography may be considered the conscious, academic practice of examining the environmental phenomena that elicit oneself (Butz & Besio, 2009). Williams (2021) states it

is necessary to take into account one's "own cultural variables, such as class, gender, socioeconomic status, educational background" (p.10) among others, when undertaking autoethnographic research.

Autoethnography focuses on the individual writing the piece, but not from a shallow personal narrative position, but from one that is searching for understanding about oneself, and their context in general. The stories told by the researcher undertaking autoethnography, are vital in order to allow the interpretation of cultural connection and relevance between society, others and oneself. Williams (2021) begins their article, *Autoethnography: A Decolonizing Research Methodological Approach*, describing autoethnography as a method of qualitative research where the author locates themselves within the scope of their research, through self-reflection and introspection concerning their lived experiences in regard to the cultural, social and political contexts within which they reside.

Autoethnographies can take form in a multitude of various ways: reflections of a researcher's fieldwork; indigenous autoethnography; subaltern resistance to the historical representation of their group in other ethnographic research; and, the inspection and investigation of one's own experiences in an attempt to marry academic rigour with the social conditions in which they exist (Butz & Besio, 2009). Across these variations of autoethnography, however, Butz and Besio (2009) claim that they all are predominantly concerned with reflexively working within one's own understanding as a means to better understand the world in which they inhabit. Generally speaking, autoethnography offers diverse opportunities through which connections between grounded biographical anecdotes, and macro-analytic social commentary and data can take place.

Concerning autoethnography as a practice, Gray-Sharp (2021) frames it as a research method that deploys a systematic analysis of personal experiences in an attempt to investigate, and better understand their cultural context. In relation to the etymological breakdown of the term autoethnography, Gray-Sharp (2021) provides the usual ‘self’, ‘culture’, ‘study’ breakdown. Furthermore, the ‘self’ predicates narrative and context, but also can be represented through multiple versions of oneself, or through the addition of external voices. In response to the supposed objective nature of academic, autoethnography in this way “takes another route, relying upon the writer’s ability to represent [their] experience convincingly” (Gray-Sharp, 2021, p. 206). However, as mentioned in other sources discussed earlier, there are more factors at play when concerning the reader; the meaning ascribed to particular narratives and context are at danger of detachment from the author, and being misconstrued by the reader. Whilst this can not necessarily be abated, it is suggested by Gray-Sharp (2021) that the author seeks to produce text that “helps the reader grow” (p. 207).

Overall, autoethnographic research is qualitative, it provides particular knowledge in relation to specific environments and lives; as opposed to large swathes of general information concerning large swathes of people (Adams et al., 2014). Qualitative research at its heart, focuses on “human intentions, motivations, emotions and actions, rather than generating demographic information and general descriptions of interaction” (Adams et al., 2014, p. 21).

Techniques

Autoethnography is a mode of processing and attributing meaning to experiences, it is a means through which one can come to understand an experience differently – this can be through self-reflection via journaling, or through transformative realisations and epiphanies

(Adams et al., 2014; Jackson & McKinney, 2021). Irrespective of the particular force that generates autoethnographic research within us, it always starts from where we are. Autoethnography is the "story told in existing writing and research on our topic or experience, and the stories told by others" (Adams et al., 2014, p. 49).

The reasons that have led a researcher to autoethnography may differ greatly. However, there appear to be two types of autoethnographic research, evocative and analytic. Analytic autoethnography, also termed interpretive ethnography, is "typically characterized by the genre conventions we associate with social science writing; it likely includes specific and expected sections' (Jackson & McKinney, 2021, p. 8). Analytic autoethnography will often mirror closely a more traditional research paper, with literature reviews, findings and discussion chapters. Anderson (2010) provides five central tenets of analytic autoethnography, they are:" (1) complete member researcher (CMR) status, (2) analytic reflexivity, (3) narrative visibility of the researcher's self, (4) dialogue with informants beyond the self, and (5) commitment to theoretical analysis" (p.378). The first tenet is rather self-explanatory, the researcher must be a member of the study, this obviously produces the most intimate transmission of knowledge from the researched, to the researcher. There may be problems, when the researcher has to mitigate their cultural identity with their academic one – so whilst some members of their cultural group may share experiences with the researcher, the researcher is also undertaking the documenting and analysing of said experiences.

The second point Anderson (2010) raised, analytic reflexivity, is concerned with the "self-conscious introspection guided by a desire to better understand both self and other through examining one's actions and perceptions in reference to and dialogue with those of others"

(p. 382). Thus, this second tenet emphasises the importance of the researcher to be aware not only of the way in which they represent the social processes which have formed them, but the way in which they also form the representational process itself.

As outlined earlier, historically and conventionally, ethnographic research has been undertaken from an objective, omniscient position. A position from which researchers simultaneously claim to possess the only means of relaying information from the study, but also reject their subjectivity in the relaying of said information. As such, autoethnography sets out to establish the world encompassing the research, to be the same one in which the researcher lives - thus, the researcher's construction of the topic, the world and the study are front and centre in regard to the actual research process.

The fourth tenet, dialogue with informants beyond the self, emphasises the necessity for the inclusion of other voices. With the insular nature of autoethnography, slipping into a spiral of self-though and absorption is a possibility; as such, there should be conversation and discourse with other media, be that in the forms of interviews or literature. The inclusion of interview material or literature will simultaneously inhibit the research from divulging into a pit of self-absorption, whilst also enlarging the social and cultural areas with which the research may have relevance.

Another way to include more voices is to draw on collaborative autoethnography. The name ‘collaborative autoethnography’ is self-explanatory as to its divergence from autoethnography, it is a form of autoethnography in which researchers share, cooperate and collectivise their personal narratives and self-reflections in the context of their research. Chang et al. (2016) state that collaborative autoethnography is “a qualitative research method

in which researchers work in community to collect their autobiographical materials and to analyze [sic] and interpret their data collectively to gain a meaningful understanding of sociocultural phenomena reflected in their autobiographical data" (p. 24). Furthermore, when conducting collaborative autoethnography, researchers will alternate between personal work and group work. When working communally, fellow research members will probe each other's individual voice and narrative, so as to add depth to the levels of internal critique. Individuals, will then retreat to work alone on their piece with the added meaning from their peers. One of the most beneficial aspects of collaborative autoethnography is in this area, with the inclusion of more voices and perspectives, the potential for more academic rigour and the greater scope the research is likely to have.

Finally, the fifth tenet, is the commitment to an analytic agenda. Anderson (2010) claims that the "defining characteristic of analytic social science is to use empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves" (p. 387). The goal of an autoethnography should not just be to capture the minutiae of someone's personal life, but to serve as a grounded example of the impacts of particular social conditions, in a particular context.

Evocative autoethnography differs from analytic, in that it seeks to blend stories and narratives within research (Jackson & McKinney, 2021). There are often large divergences from conventional research paper structures and an amalgamation of literature and experiences that often cross over mirroring the manner in which life and academia also cross over. One preeminent form of autoethnography however, is the 'personal experience narrative' - it involves the writer adopting two identities, one of which is their academic self, and the other, their personal self (Butz & Besio, 2009). In this way, academics undertaking

this style of autoethnography attempt to focus on circumstances they have experienced in their own lives as a means of understanding and critiquing larger socio-cultural and political phenomena (Betz & Besio, 2009). Self-narratives replaces quantitative data, or other similar qualitative accounts, as the chief source of information through which literature and other relevant critiques and observations can be made. This is the quintessential tenet of autoethnography that I am using in this thesis.

Self-narratives are perhaps the most widespread and successful means through which social science researchers resist the conventional monuments of academic research. This method often diffuses the delineation between academic representation and the performative representation of oneself in text; often this can be seen through the use of anecdotes, journals and poetry. The manner in which these narratives are included within the autoethnography vary greatly from author to author (Chang et al., 2016). Some have posited that autoethnography is tri-axial, with delineations along the borders of auto (*self*), ethno (*culture*), and graphy (*research*); in this way, most autoethnographic research would be found at different locations along these axes. Others however, place autoethnography on a sliding scale from autobiography on one end, to ethnography on the other. Autoethnographies that are nearer the autobiographic end, tend to focus more on self-narration, and those that emphasise cultural investigation are situated nearer the ethnographic end of the spectrum.

There is an important caveat noted by Chang et al. (2016) here, whilst both autobiography and autoethnography rely heavily on the recount of personal stories, autoethnography uses the stories explain social, cultural and political phenomena. Chang et al. (2016) argue that this variance in autoethnographic research allows researchers from diverse disciplines to include and locate their personal narratives within the scope of their study. ‘Evocative’

autoethnography. This style leans heavily towards the autobiographic end of the spectrum mentioned earlier, and often involves the production of rich personal narratives that touch on subject areas that conventional social science research had avoided. Topic areas such as: death, grief, abortion, inter-family relationships, abuse, mental health issues and homosexuality, among many others.

Colonisation and Autoethnography

The task of applying this in scholarship for indigenous academics has been challenging, due to not only the colonial nature of western institutions and their marginalisation of indigenous knowledges, but also due to the breadth of indigenous experience (Hokowhitu, 2009). Furthermore, for indigenous peoples, research has been undertaken on and to them, disregarding their own knowledge systems, values, nuances and epistemologies – in this way, research as a word and idea, is tarnished within indigenous communities (Smith, 2012). As such, there has been an emphasis by indigenous academics to focus their research within their local context in such a way as to predicate shared dialogue across colonial conditions (Hokowhitu, 2009). Thus, not only does autoethnographic research reflect indigenous (Māori) modes of thought concerning groundedness and holism, but it also represents a means through which indigenous experience can be translated academically.

Colonisation has an immeasurable impact on indigenous populations, and because of that, there remains potential for us to contribute introspective research in the academy regarding our behaviours, aspirations and resilience (Whitinui, 2014). Whilst it is widely known and accounted for that European powers stripped Indigenous groups of their land and resources, it is perhaps less well known that these European peoples also set about deculturating the

indigenous inhabitants also (Williams, 2021). Through various means in which power, self-determination and recognition were sequestered, indigenous groups were coerced to betray their cultural values and to adopt Western ideals. The assumptions of indigenous groups' inferiority was used to justify assimilative practices, and general European cultural, social and political superiority.

Having taken up the mantle of the European, and embraced European ways, Indigenous peoples were left holding themselves accountable to a set of behavioural and metaphysical standards that did not belong to them. This has led to intergenerational trauma among indigenous groups, and of importance to Williams (2021) in particular, the role colonisation has played in affecting the psychology of these groups. Williams (2021) highlights a way in which the presupposed inferiority of indigenous groups was further reinforced with research that claimed that black people were less intelligent than white people on the basis of some standardised test results and the measuring of skulls, in that those belonging to black people were smaller and thus indicative of a smaller brain. Inferior genetics were to blame for the subordinate social position of non-white peoples.

Contemporarily, non-white groups are often perceived through a deficit lens in regard to psychological research; there is at times, a complete disregard for some of their cultural strengths and values systems. As such, some Indigenous academics have presented the idea of decolonising research methodologies. Indigenous people have constantly been researched on, and the findings have only served to reinforce the colonial, Eurocentric mindsets concerning marginalised groups' inferiority. Two factors loom large here, the assumed objectivity of a researcher – and subsequent subjectivity of those being researched – and the detachment of the researcher from the context of those being researched. In this way, a group

of researchers can enter a community, have no understanding of the nuance or context of the community under the facade of objectivity, conduct their research, and then leave with no regard as to the impacts those research practices and their findings may have on the community (Williams, 2021). This is particularly difficult for indigenous academics to deal with, when working within Western institutions that still prioritise traditionally Eurocentric means of knowledge creation.

Furthermore, the role the academy has played in inculcating us into maintaining their modes of (re)production needs to be addressed. For example, there remains pressure from academic institutions on Indigenous peoples to apply Western research methodologies in Indigenous contexts (Bishop, 2021). As such, it remains a reality for Indigenous peoples to walk in both worlds; the normalised white world, and the oft-misrepresented Indigenous world. Whilst undertaking indigenous autoethnography, one must be aware of the potential risk associated with the exposure of one's person in a structure that is built on the opposite of self-introspection. Thus, one must be aware and self-critical of their position as a researcher in a Western institution, acknowledging the fact that their research may be misrepresented and appropriated (Bishop, 2021).

Decolonisation, however, is not just a theoretical framework with which to remove the fetters of Western colonial frameworks; it is a lifestyle and a way of being. Some frame decolonisation somewhat abstractly, an empowering of indigeneity in its conflict with Western hierarchical epistemologies. Others view it as a means through which colonialism can be engaged with and challenged, particularly in relation to the assumed values and motivations that inform research methodologies. Either way, it remains an important facet of research undertaken by Indigenous researchers grappling with the pre-eminence "Western

hegemonic knowledge systems" (Bishop, 2021, p. 372). This is often one of the most difficult crosses to bear for Indigenous academics, highlighting to fellow academics the inherent power imbalance in the supposed superiority of White knowledge systems and frameworks that are presumed organic and universal.

In my second year of my undergraduate study, I undertook a paper called Decolonising methodologies. It was considered a Māori research paper. The paper largely represented its namesake, Linda Tuhiwai Smith's book. Linda was also the paper convenor and provided a number of lectures. The content was phenomenal, and advanced my perspectives on research in so many ways. However, the paper itself is not what this is about.

At the end of that year, I was going through the process of picking my papers for my third year. Someone from the faculty provided me with assistance in this regard. They noted that I had not yet done a compulsory research paper. In order to complete the degree a designated research paper had to be finished. I was a bit surprised and pointed to Decolonising Methodologies as the research paper. I was told that for the sake of the degree requirements, that Decolonising Methodologies was not regarded as a research paper.

I immediately pushed back and argued that the faculty, and university, should not call it a research paper, if it cannot be counted as a compulsory research paper. I could not believe it. On one hand, the university was co-opting the ideology behind the paper and the content, whilst simultaneously disregarding it as not providing adequate research methodology to be considered a research paper. The person assisting me tried to justify it, and argue that the

other research papers would be beneficial – perhaps they would have been. That was not important to me then, and it still is not now.

I pleaded my case a little bit and understandably did not get anywhere with the person helping me, they had no power in this area. So I went over their head, and emailed the faculty. I laid out what the situation was, and it was approved as my research paper. Which I obviously appreciated, but it did highlight to me the way in which power structures, in this case the university, can subsume ideas that are intended to push back on their structure, and not make any actual changes – whilst benefitting from the knowledge produced.

I still feel these forces today. Writing this thesis perhaps has been the biggest example of that for me. I am writing this in a very specific manner, with a very specific purpose; to challenge this structure. I am writing about hegemony, and whiteness and the supremacy of ideas, whilst having to right in an intentionally specific tone. I have to reach an arbitrary number of words, it is not enough to just say what I want to say. I am writing about different ways of knowing, whilst having to reference in an extremely particular manner. I have to write about things I don't want to write about. None of these rules are mine, and they certainly aren't Māori.

The university is a white institution, and it shows in the expectations on all students, not just post-graduate students. Those with power in the university uphold them, including the person who was helping me choose the papers, who was Māori. Including myself, I am no different. I am currently working in a university, I am no better. I am not saying these expectations or

these people are inherently bad, at all. I am just attempting to highlight that adding a Māori 'research' paper, does not automatically decolonise the university's – or those of us who work in universities – perspectives and expectations concerning research.

Indigenous Notions of Knowledge

The subsuming oneself within the context of their research, and the rest of the world at large, is considered by some indigenous academics to be organic; as stated by Mika (2015a), "a general indigenous philosophy is concerned with groundedness *(or otherwise)* of an individual as an entity related to and indivisible from the rest of the world" (p. 1136). Being Māori, indigenous scholarship is important to me, especially in regards to locating oneself within their research. Furthermore, in *te āo* Māori, there exists no clear division between self and the world in general (Mika, 2015a). The world for Māori was holistic, everything encountered by an individual was deemed to influence oneself, and in return the self would influence everything else (Mika, 2015b). Traditional knowledge systems are a foundational aspect of indigenous existence contemporarily, especially concerning the oral nature of Māori society historically. Storytelling was/is an integral mode of knowledge transmission across time and contexts . As such, indigenous autoethnography can be seen "as a culturally informed research practice that is not only explicit to Māori ways of knowing, but can be readily validated and legitimated as an authentic 'Native' method of inquiry" (Whitinui, 2014, p.456).

Williams (2021) acknowledges the potential of autoethnography as methodology in the investigation of issues pertinent to discriminated peoples, in particular indigenous groups. This is where the power in indigenous or decolonising autoethnography lies. Whilst there are

many things to consider when undertaking research from this position, indigenous autoethnography allows for, and even prioritises, the self-reflexivity and critical introspection of the author. Significantly, as Bishop (2021) states, “indigenous autoethnography encourages a shift in the research gaze, from studying Indigenous peoples, communities, cultures, to look instead at institutions and structures of power” (p. 376). This position facilitates the generation of dialogue and resistance to colonial power in Western institutions. This is an important aspect of my use of autoethnography in this thesis. “Autoethnography and its narratives offer a means for applying *mana motuhake* as a research principle” (Gray-Sharp, 2021, p. 65). *Mana motuhake* refers to the notion and practice of self-determination - as a methodology however, *mana motuhake*, is concerned with transmitting practices, concepts and knowledge continuously. Knowledge is not merely the capacity to comprehend in this context, knowledge is a reflection of culture and context (Gray-Sharp, 2021). As the ‘self’ is subsumed within context, oneself is inextricably located with the means and processes of knowledge creation, production and extension. Simply put, when an individual is involved in research, they are not separate from the historic, contemporary and future context of that research.

Indigenous Autoethnography

Western autoethnography is seen, as discussed earlier, as a qualitative approach to research, in which the researcher centres their research around their experience; propagating transitions in academia away from outsider forms of knowledge collection and to move towards subjective introspection concerning context, culture and society. Whilst indigenous autoethnography is fundamentally the same from a purely academic perspective, differences occur when addressing the nature of history, social injustice and power (Whitinui, 2014).

Furthermore, indigenous autoethnography, or a “Native” method of inquiry, quintessentially takes into consideration the epistemological fibre of groundedness, connectedness and context, coinciding with the western conception of autoethnography of *self, culture* and *writing.* Furthermore, Indigenous autoethnography is inherently a form of resistance, aiming to restore, reclaim and rewrite the lived experiences of indigenous peoples. Whitinui (2014) argues that Indigenous autoethnographers must also be aware that merely recounting anecdotes is insufficient in achieving resistance, Indigenous autoethnographers must be willing to discuss the nature of their lives in an authentic and genuine manner.

Where western researchers view the subjective nature of autoethnography in regard to oneself as an opportunity to generate different thought and discourse in scholarship, Whitinui (2014) claims there is an “ethical and moral responsibility” (p. 476) of indigenous researchers to share their narratives to discuss their struggles and place in society. However, when undertaking autoethnography from an indigenous (Māori) perspective, it may be considered vain or self-serving to talk about oneself, a concept known in *Te Reo* Māori as *whakahīhī* (Whitinui, 2014). This coincides with historical conditions surrounding Māori knowledge transmission, in order to learn, one has to listen. It is difficult to listen if one is talking about themself. Nevertheless, Whitinui argues that undertaking indigenous autoethnography is still appropriate when a few things are taken into account prior to, and during, the research process. Such as the following:

- Is this an appropriate time and place for such discourse?
- What limitations are there to your narrative?
- What is your reasoning and purpose behind this research?
- Who is the intended audience?
- Have you recognised the gaps/shortcomings of your own knowledge?

- Are you willing to search for deeper meaning concerning yourself? (Whitinui, 2014).

Whitinui (2014) also provides four central tenets with which to frame and undertake indigenous autoethnographic study: Ability to protect, ability to problem solve, ability to provide, and ability to heal.

The first, ability to protect, is concerned with the conservation of one's own essence within the scope of their research. Importantly, for Māori, the constitution of oneself, is the constitution of their environment, their culture, their language, their knowledges and their being. Thus, by protecting oneself in this way, one is also protecting who they are as Māori. The ability to problem solve, relates to the indigenous researcher's consideration of adjustments that must be made to mould a story that is authentic and trustworthy. The capacity to adjust oneself in relation to one's shifting contexts, allows for more authenticity to be achieved, especially concerning the topics indigenous researchers generally cover, such as, struggle, hardship and resistance. The third, ability to provide, is concerned with supporting the collective nature of Māori, from *whānau* (family) to *hapū* (sub-tribe) to *iwi* (tribe). Fostering access to new methods of reconnection, self-determination and rediscovery in a uniquely Māori way. Finally, the ability to heal is obtained when introspection is "seen to be critical to one's existence and survival as a collective of cultural human beings" (Whitinui, 2014, p. 479).

Thus, one must be aware of the inherent power in learning about oneself and one's context in order to move forward in indigenous ways of knowing. This framework seeks to establish an equilibrium in the way in which we investigate, understand and connect with our existence as indigenes. It is an equilibrium because to produce a framework in which the steps were prescriptive and definite, would not only contradict the idea of autoethnography, but it would

also be antithetical to the intended liberating practice of indigenous autoethnography (Whitinui, 2014). “Indigenous autoethnographers cannot and will not be defined or reduced to a checklist. They operate from a different axiology and ontology that does not seek to categorise, classify, or simplify" (Bishop, 2021, p. 368).

It is the role of indigenous autoethnographers to develop their families, communities, knowledges and other modes of cultural agency. The burden for Indigenous peoples that work in the academy is that by adopting Western methods of qualitative inquiry, as opposed to ‘Native’ methods of inquiry, we inadvertently perpetuate the colonial process that disenfranchised us historically. Concerning autoethnography more specifically however, Bishop (2021) raises an interesting point, the notion of self (*auto*) is restrictive. Furthermore, Bishop (2021) states that “[she] is not an individual” (p. 372), despite presuppositions by western academic institutions and Western society in general. The idea of self needs broadening, it is fundamentally antithetical to many indigenous epistemologies and ways of being; such as the concept of groundedness mentioned earlier. The conception of self is in relation to one’s communities, ancestors, family and circumstances; the stories being told should not just be the author’s story, as the narrative does not belong solely to the author.

Also, the knowledge with which the author undertakes their research, is not endogenous. There is a history to that knowledge, be that through the use of libraries, or passed down intergenerationally. Bishop (2021) provides an example that delineates rather simply, the difference between the idea of self in Western and Indigenous contexts. The parameters surrounding Western introductions generally involve personal conditions, such as qualifications and employment; however, Indigenous introductions often prioritise grounding and relationality, concern is shown in regard to where one is from, or who they are related

too. Furthermore, Gray-Sharp (2021) brings the use of *Te Reo* Māori into the discussion; linking the flexible nature of *Te Reo* to the subjective position of the reader as the one whom the autoethnography belongs too.

Critiques of Autoethnography

There are also perhaps a few risks, or unintended outcomes when undertaking autoethnographic research. Writers may fall into a trap of solipsism, where the self is too heavily regarded as an arbiter separate from the literature and other work they may have done (Butz & Besio, 2009). Autoethnography may pose a risk to self-identity, in the case of oppressed peoples seeking to represent themselves, they may inadvertently allow too much liberty on behalf of the audience in regard to the way in which the self-narration positions identity and social context. Thus, whilst an autoethnographer from an oppressed group may attempt to highlight certain aspects of their lived experience within their narrative, the audience – which is predominantly made up of others – may take from that narrative aspects that are either unintended by the autoethnographer, or perhaps aspects that justify the positionality of the audience in relation to the autoethnographer.

Furthermore, even though audiences are likely to not consist of oppressed groups for the most part, the breadth of audience is still rather exhaustive, particularly in regard to academia. As such, researchers may have to adjust their self-representations in order to avoid the ire, or catch the attention of particular groups that may share similar interests. Even within autoethnography, a research method used as a means of promoting the essence of a researcher, the researcher is still forced into a position in which some aspects of their voice must be altered or silenced (Butz & Besio, 2009). There have been huge steps made

regarding the status of autoethnographic research in the academy, state Anderson (2010). However, most of this work has been concerned with emotive autoethnography, which whilst a necessary form of resistance to conventional research methodologies, may incidentally limit the overall range in which autoethnography may be relevant. The pre-eminence of emotive autoethnography may eclipse the other potential methods of autoethnographic inquiry concerning social, cultural and political inquiry.

Autoethnography in this thesis

The composition of this thesis will attempt to produce not only an autoethnography/Native method of inquiry that takes the shape in which I choose with the aid of the literature cited above, but will also seek to further the discourse concerning research methodologies that push back against traditional Western research methodologies. In many ways, this thesis will be purposefully be in opposition to tradition in many ways. Regarding the literature cited above, I will incorporate particular aspects that I deem important and relevant to this thesis. Firstly, from this point on, autoethnography will be referred to as autoethnography/Native method of inquiry. This is to keep the reader aware that although autoethnography is a Western means of engaging with research in this way, using narrative and subject positionality (again, Western phraseology) always has been an Indigenous means of engaging with the world generally – with research obviously existing within the world. With that being said, I would add that engaging with the world this way is not exclusive to Indigenous experience; it is, however, totally relevant to this thesis.

As stated in the research aims, the objective of this thesis is to explore the interconnectedness of racism and whiteness, and to highlight how whiteness operates as a dominant and

hegemonic construct. I argue that addressing racism and whiteness necessitates confronting this hegemony. In particular, to investigate whiteness as hegemony within the New Zealand context. Consequently, the thesis aims to analyse and discuss the relationships between whiteness and hegemony through autoethnography – as doing so in this way, grounds the literature firmly in the New Zealand context.

Drawing on the literature reviewed for my methodology I have identified central, defining tenets of autoethnography/Native method of inquiry that guide this thesis. They include:

1. Autoethnography/Native method of inquiry is a form of resistance for Indigenous academics in regard to Western research practices. Particularly the notions of objectivism and the researcher-imposed separation between the researcher and those being researched.
2. Autoethnography/Native method of inquiry is the examination of one's self and one's context through the medium of narrative writing. For Indigenous authors, this is important when addressing notions of self and context, which are broader than in Western perspectives.
3. Autoethnography/Native method of inquiry is concerned with social justice, and in this case, the issues concerning racism and hegemonic Whiteness.

Chapter 3: Hegemony

I grew up as an only child in a solo parent, single-income household. I was fortunate enough to be pushed into working hard at school from a young age, because of this, I was also fortunate enough to attend King's Preparatory School. Through my young life at a private and prestigious school, I experienced many things consistent with those reported by people from ethnic minorities. I could write many pages about my life whilst going to that school. My mother could not afford for me to attend that school, I was there on scholarship. The Endeavour Scholarship. Every year, four Māori and Pasifika boys were – maybe still are –awarded full-scholarships to attend King's Preparatory School for year 7 and 8, with the scholarship continuing on for them at King's College.

Being a scholarship student at this school influenced the nature of my experience there, although it was not the only factor. I'm sure this is not controversial or ground-breaking, but there were not many Māori or Pasifika students attending the school. I have no idea what the percentage of us was, but we were grossly out-numbered and I remember only one brown staff member – he was Tahitian. Understandably, we had a good relationship with him and he looked after us. Nevertheless, I faced some challenges through virtue of my relative position at the school. Some blatant, and some not so much.

I remember one mufti day (day in which no-one had to wear the school uniform) – I hated mufti days – I was wearing a grey shirt, my had mother bought from the hokohoko (op-shop or second-hand clothing store) specifically for that day. Hokohoko shops is where most of my shopping was done as a child. The shirt was nice, it was button up and was not stained; not that I really cared, but it was important to my mother that I look respectable. A number of my

classmates were having a discussion about the clothes they were all wearing, comparing brands and prices. It was clear that none of their mothers had taken them to the hokohoko. At some point during the discussion, one of my classmates turns to me and says "What brand is that? Concrete?". They all start laughing. I had no idea what brand it was, I knew that he wasn't genuinely interested. Not a huge deal, not the worst thing anyone has ever said to me. It was a little hurtful at the time, but I shrugged it off and moved on. Reflecting on this experience now I can see that the conversation was designed to put me in my place, to remind me, as if I could forget, that I was different from my classmates, that I didn't belong because of my class and my race.

It is interesting to me now, to see the people who I grew up with, some of whom attended King's or similar schools, actively engage in clothes shopping at op-shops – some preferring it to buying clothes new. Something I did because we had little money, now is a hobby of rich, white people who made fun of me for doing it. I find it incredibly frustrating listening to my white friends talking about how great op-shopping is. Going to op-shops is an effort perhaps on their part to make some small impact, or maybe save some money. Whiteness has appropriated wearing second-hand clothes as a form of climate responsible fashion. Shopping at second-hand stores was once something that only poor, in New Zealand, predominantly brown people did. As the ruling classes have done throughout time, the spaces of the poor are appropriated as part of their playground.

Introduction

This chapter describes Antonio Gramsci's concept of Hegemony. Originally appearing in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* only briefly, the term has since emerged as one of the pre-eminent social theories relating to power in society. There are copious amounts of academic

discussion concerning hegemony in addition to Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* (1975). Hegemony, in the form in which is attributed to Gramsci, has since become one of the most common and powerful theoretical tools today (Crossley, 2005; Femia, 1981; Jones, 2006), and Antonio Gramsci one of the most popular social theorists of the 20th century (Crehan, 2018; Dainotto & Jamieson, 2020; Femia, 1981, Kreps, 2015). However, the concept of hegemony can cause confusion, particularly in relation to the relevance of hegemony to contemporary society as many theorists seek to use the idea separate from the context in which Gramsci was writing. For example, Femia (1981) claims that the use of the term hegemony has been misused and poorly defined by "certain Marxist analysts" (p. 23) and that "[their] lack of rigour tends to preclude a full appreciation of Gramsci's efforts" (p. 23). Nevertheless, many include it in their work (Wilson, 2017; Crossley, 2005; Hall, 2016; Mayo, 2010a).

The central purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that the concept of hegemony is still relevant even when considered in tandem with its Gramscian context and its historical roots in Marxism. Femia (1981) argues that it can be used to provide insight contemporarily, as it actually evolves with society. Wilson (2017) claims that "hegemonic power is always on the move; it has to keep winning our consent to survive" (p. 22). In this way, hegemony is predicated on evolution, if it does not adapt to fit the context, it will be unable to garner society's consent. The enduring relevance of the concept of hegemony, and the scope and breadth to which it is applied, should be seen as a commendation of Gramsci's thought.

The first section of this chapter will provide a description of Gramsci's childhood and early context. The second section will give a brief account of two thinkers that influenced Gramsci's thought: Marx and Lenin. Next, will be a section detailing Gramsci's thoughts on

the ‘state’ and ideology. Finally, a definition of hegemony will be given.

Gramsci’s Early Context

Born in 1891 in Sardinia, Antonio Gramsci grew up in an Italy that was only 30 years old (Femia, 1981; Jones, 2006). Prior to 1861, Italy had predominantly consisted of a number of disparate provinces ruled by either foreign entities or traditional local monarchs (Jones, 2006). It shared similarities to other European states, in that the large swathes of agricultural land, owned by gentry and tilled laboriously by subjugated peasantry, was broken up sporadically by a number of small modern, industrialised areas. The impoverished living standards of large numbers of the population, led to some agitation in regard to nationalisation; however, there was no mass uprising, instead self-rule came about through three wars known as the Risorgimento. Although the constitution of the Risorgimento was tenuous, Italian unification was achieved nevertheless (Jones, 2006).

In the time period after the Italian unification, and the formation of a democratic representative democracy, the Moderate Party and the Action Party who had shared the uneasy relationship during the Risorgimento, became in effect “largely identical” (Jones, 2006, p. 14). The way in which these groups became largely identical informed much of Gramsci’s conceptions of power. Particularly in relation to the way in which political power can manufacture a governing structure that assimilates potential dissenters into perpetuating the structure in order to have any political power at all (Jones, 2006). Furthermore, the nationalism being displayed in Italy was mirrored in other areas of Europe, to Gramsci, this highlighted the precarity of feudal-type power structures at the time; but he also noted that the people in power did not really change, only the structures did (Burgio, 2020).

Industrial capitalism was expanding across Europe, spreading bourgeois ideologies and replacing the pre-existing aristocratic societal structure. Perhaps the largest difference however, in regard to the new bourgeois social conditions, was the promotion of some historically disenfranchised peoples into positions of relative authority for the first time. Coinciding with this, was the general improvement of living standards of the low ranking social and political classes. However, the breadth of bourgeois inclusion was limited; if it were to spread infinitely, it would inevitably crumble as the reality of private property for everyone would undermine the bourgeois power structure (Burgio, 2020). If the proletariat were to own too much private property, and thus have a means to generate wealth, it would threaten the bourgeoisie existing hegemony. Thus, the bourgeoisie had to ensure that the capacity for some people to ascend into the bourgeois realm would not threaten their positions of power.

The end of aristocratic feudalism proved relevant to Gramsci's life, in that his father was a mid-level public servant (Jones, 2006). For a while the Gramsci family lived relatively comfortable lives, however, his father lost his position for supporting an unsuccessful political candidate and was unfortunately imprisoned (Jones, 2006). Despite the promise Antonio Gramsci showed at school, he had to be taken out of school because of the family's loss of income (Jones, 2006). Nevertheless, in 1911 Antonio Gramsci earned a scholarship to the University of Turin, enrolling in Modern Philosophy and specialising in Linguistics (Jones, 2006; Femia, 1981). Gramsci's arrival at Turin, had coincided with increasing anti-positivism discourse pushing back against the dominant idea that social life could be understood through the same objective mechanisms that were used to understand the natural world (Jones, 2006). He became interested in ideas concerning 'two cultures', which was a

concept centered around the divide between middle-class, bourgeoisie power and the subordinate working-class Italians; in Gramsci's opinion, the divide stifled the social growth of Italy as a whole (Jones, 2006).

Gramsci's years at University were difficult due to his physical and economic limitations, and although embracing the concept of socialism, he ultimately had to abandon his degree in 1915 and instead moved into political activism (Jones, 2006; Mayo, 2010a, Holst, 2010). Two years later, in 1917, Gramsci began writing articles for the journals *Avanti!* and *Il Grido del Popolo* (Jones, 2006). These early journalistic endeavours proved to be useful means through which he could not only articulate his thoughts concerning social conditions, but also the counter-cultural resilience with which he would engage his future endeavours (Hill, 2010). This resilience and desire to produce critical discourse concerning his society's shortcomings culminated in an extensive library of commentary, even in the face of sickness and prison later in his life (Jones, 2006; Hill, 2010; Fresu, 2022).

Gramsci's Influences

Buey and Gray (2014) state that "Antonio Gramsci was the most original Marxist communist in the interwar period and, probably, alongside Guevara, the most internationally acclaimed of the Marxist communists who lived in the twentieth century" (p. 61). Many commentators argue that Gramsci was heavily influenced by the dialectic work of Marx (Burgio, 2020; Hill, 2010; Hall, 2016; Jones, 2006; Mayo, 2010a; Mayo, 2010b), despite having little access to Marx's early work (Mayo, 2010a). It is important to note, that Gramsci did not seek to offer "another reading of Marxism or another set of abstract concepts which could define a materialist analysis" (Hall, 2016, p. 157).

Marx and Engels discourse in regard to power dynamics, materialism and economics informed Gramsci's thought, but he was acutely aware of the failure of Marxism to bring about genuine social change. As such, he sought to develop and translate Marx's general framework to contemporary contexts that could not be foreseen by Marx and Engels. Perhaps not unforeseen but certainly unacknowledged by Marx and Engels, were the completely disparate social and cultural contexts across different countries. Although united by similar economic circumstances in many ways, the different lived reality and worldview of working class groups in different countries proved to be too great a hurdle for Marx's revolution to surmount. Gramsci was also thoroughly impressed with the actions of Lenin in regard to the Bolshevik revolution.

Gramsci actually stated Lenin was the originator of the term hegemony, although Lenin did not use the term frequently (Crossley, 2005; Jones, 2006). Lenin's discourse concerning cultural struggle, the role the bourgeoisie played in maintaining their power, and the necessity of all oppressed groups to unite in order to overthrow the established ruling class, were important to Gramsci's conceptualisation of Hegemony. In some regard, Gramsci was a 'Leninist' (Jones, 2006). Lenin, alongside Trotsky, was largely responsible for the revolutionary movement that overthrew the government that was propped up in response to the Tsarist dissolution. Lenin was also responsible for supervising the implementation of new policies, the silencing of political challengers and generally creating some social and structural faculties that laid the foundation upon which Stalinism was built. Ideologically, Lenin was concerned with the nature of imperialism, colonialism and the way in which a revolutionary party could be manufactured. Gramsci saw in Lenin's efforts the significance and potential of leading and educating disparate working groups, along revolutionary lines,

from within political institutions (Jones, 2006). Gramsci's penchant for Leninism is brought into question by Joseph Femia (1981) and Perry Anderson (2017) with claims that Gramsci was aware of the shortcomings of the Bolshevik revolution, as it failed to transition from the Russian context to the rest of the subjugated world. Even if this is the case, Gramsci was critical of the failures of Marx to bring about a workers revolution, and these commentators still call him a Marxist. Nevertheless, the roots for Gramsci's hegemony lie with Lenin, and the roots of his dialectic lie with Marx.

The State and Ideology

I have established some of the fundamental underpinnings concerning Gramsci's concept of hegemony, but it is also important to take into account Gramsci's perspective on the state and ideology, after all, Hall (2016) claims that "the centrality which has been given to the State in contemporary Marxist debates is largely due to Gramsci and those who have learned from him"(p. 163). Gramsci rejects the original Marxist notion of the state being only a coercive arm of the bourgeoisie and argues instead that it is multifaceted. The state is coercive and non-coercive, in that it is also educative and allows for some movement within the social structures. The state, in this way, is a contradictory apparatus of the ruling class – it simultaneously maintains the ruling class' power whilst giving subordinate classes some limited power.

Furthermore, the state is also concerned with "public opinion in the sphere of civil society" (Hall, 2016, p. 164). The state has a vested interest in this area, it is integral for the state to regulate institutions so that public opinion does not become too critical of the ruling class. Institutions in the form of legal systems, education systems and other forms of societal

regulation. The state cannot be seen as directly concerned with public opinion, or be seen as overly involved in attempting to influence it. However, according to Fresu (2022) , “Gramsci defines public opinion as a point of contact of the dialectic between political society and civil society, between force and consensus” (p. 287). In order for the state to impose social control, and remain an instrument of the ruling class, it needs to be viewed to some extent as separate. This perceived separation further allows the state to simultaneously reinforce the ruling class’s economic, social and cultural power, whilst providing the working class with the perception of decision-making power and the capacity for some limited movement within social structures. Nevertheless, the state does seek to mobilise its social control in insidious ways when there are threats to the ruling class’s position. The state achieves this through a combination of coercive and non-coercive measures – non-coercive in the form of regulatory and educational measures. Gramsci deviated from his contemporary Marxists, in that he recognised the state’s role in regulating socio-political institutions and the state’s influence over culture, ideology and society.

Gramsci’s thoughts concerning ideology are not totally dichotomous from ‘classic’ or ‘traditional’ definitions of ideology; it is a view or philosophy of the world that takes form in the manner of a culture, religion or faith that has produced a practical movement or activity (Hall, 2016). In simpler terms, ideology is the way in which the world is seen and interacted with. However for Gramsci, it is important to note the manner in which activities and interactions take place considering ideology. For whilst, philosophy underpins ideology, Gramsci asserts that there are certainly material forces that influence the nature of said philosophy. These material forces are themselves underpinned by existing, or historic, ideologies and philosophies. As material conditions change, new ideologies must compete with historical ideologies if there is to be a change in the material conditions. Furthermore,

attempts to alter material conditions and ideological shifts are inhibited by the deposits of historic ideologies.

Although there have been ideological shifts throughout history, each of the existing or historic ideologies have left some ‘sedimentation’. That is to say, the terrain upon which ideological battles take place is a patchwork of historic ideologies. These are, according to Hall (2016), taken-for-granted or assumed philosophical perspectives maintained by the masses. As such, these layers of ideological sedimentation become increasingly normalised, and in turn, make the possibility of large ideological shifts increasingly difficult. Furthermore, this terrain allows ideologies that do not deviate, or challenge the existing ideologies, an advantage. As such, the pre-existing material conditions and the ideological perspectives that underpin them, have been created by historic conditions (ideologies and material conditions) and are also reinforced by the remnants of said historic conditions. Furthermore, Gramsci claims there is never one, sovereign ideology “which pervades everything” (Hall, 2016, p. 167). There are instead multitudes of philosophical thought and ideologies co-existing simultaneously within society. Thus, examination in this area must address the complex patchwork of philosophical thought. This obviously is far more difficult than if there was just one supreme ideology that could be examined. Furthermore, Gramsci believed that, whilst there were similarities and connections between ideologies and social structures, one does not exactly mirror the other. These differences, sometimes slight and sometimes large, further the difficulty in attempting to address social structures. A change in ideology does not inevitably change social structures and material conditions; nor does changing social structures inherently change ideologies or philosophical thought.

Hegemony

As stated in the introduction, hegemony is a concept that is used often to describe any instance of ideological dominance, though that is not necessarily an accurate description of what Gramsci determined. As such, I will first detail what hegemony is not; for instance, according to Hall (2016) “hegemony is not ideological mystification” (p. 169). Femia (1981) claims that ideological predominance is itself not free from ambiguity and the “use of hegemony is generally marred by conceptual vagueness” (p. 23). Furthermore, hegemony is not merely cultural domination or control – it does not subsume all of civil society within one culture (Gramsci, 1975). If this were true, it would imply that all opposition – historic and contemporary – is simply engulfed by the dominant culture. This is clearly not the case, society is constituted by a myriad of views, cultures and ideologies. Hegemony also does not encompass merely economic rule or refer to the state’s coercive power. Economic stratification in the form of classes, and the position of the bourgeoisie is not itself hegemonic, but alludes to the existence of hegemony. Furthermore, the state itself is not hegemonic, but hegemony is exercised through some political mechanisms. The state is both coercive and non-coercive; where hegemony is only non-coercive in that hegemony is not power, influence or rule through force or coercion.

Ives (2004) states that “Gramsci redefined hegemony to mean the formation and organization of consent.” (p. 2). As stated earlier, hegemony was a term already in use, albeit not to the same extent or in the same context, but the efforts by Gramsci to provide new meaning to the term is the reason for the use of the word ‘redefined’ here. Furthermore, Ives (2004) states that Gramsci’s use of hegemony was analytical, as opposed to the more practical Leninist use of the term. Cammet (1967) claims that hegemony is the dominance “of one social group over the whole of society exercised through so-called private organizations, such as the

church, trade unions, schools" (p. 204). Gramsci determined that social control manifested in two forms, coercive and non-coercive; non-coercive in this context, referred to control through consent.

Gramsci saw, in the failure of the Marxist revolution to take place, that analysis and critique of merely material conditions or coercive and political mechanisms did not take into account the way in which society-maintained power through consent. Hegemony in its simplest meaning is power by consent (Femia, 1981; Hall, 2016; Ives, 2004). The notion of consent traditionally referred to a relationship where those who are governed give some authority to those who govern. It was founded in morality, perceived morality at least, where both those in power and the subjects were responsible for each other. However, for Gramsci consent was more than just a moral responsibility, it was a psychological acceptance of the socio-political order. Furthermore, consent can occur whilst there is still opposition to the social order. There must be, according to Femia (1981) "a substratum of agreement so powerful that it can counteract the division and disruptive forces arising from conflicting interest" (p. 39). This agreement, interest or set of interests, must be common and shared among the population in order for widespread consent and adherence to occur and be maintained. These shared interests exist in the form of accepted beliefs, norms, practices and worldviews that reinforce the social structure. This aligns with Gramsci's perspective on ideology.

The voluntary acceptance of these norms can exist to varying degrees ranging from absolute necessity, to internalised feelings of moral obligation and even complete, zealous adherence. There is one notion of consent or conformity that is particularly relevant to hegemony, it is known as pragmatic consent. This occurs when an individual recognises that adhering to these norms produces benefits in their life. On the other hand, the individual recognises that

refusing to behave in certain ways according to the social order and norms, can produce negative results. However, in regard to pragmatic consent, the individual is aware that within the social structure, certain behaviours produce certain benefits. These benefits exist only when surrendering oneself, or part of oneself, to the hegemonic order. Furthermore, these benefits exist only in relation to the nuanced context of the social order – the social order is constantly creating and reaffirming the positive outcomes for individuals if they adhere. Hegemony in this way moulds and manipulates an individual's personal convictions to replicate social norms. These convictions are so ingrained within an individual that they are considered natural, normal and even right. As mentioned earlier, in order for the social structure and ideological dominance to remain in place, a large enough number of the population needs to be in acquiescence.

Furthermore, hegemony does not dominate society, hegemony seeks to lead society. Domination tends to be related to more coercive mechanisms within society, where hegemony. The dynamic between hegemony and domination differs greatly from society to society. In *Quaderni del Carcere*, Gramsci claims that “the greater the apolitical mass, the greater the weight of illegal forces should be. The greater the politically organised and educated forces, the more it is necessary to ‘protect’ the state of law” (as cited in Fresu, 2022, p. 286). This infers that the nature of hegemony influences, and is influenced by, the nuanced context of society in relation to time and place. Marxists previously had attempted to identify a set of shared material conditions irrespective of contest as a starting point from which to revolt. Where Marxist thinkers historically had failed to recognise the importance of these differences, Gramsci did not – hegemony does not exist separate from social context. Hegemony in a way, is the social context. For hegemony to remain in place, it is required to constantly adjust for and manipulate these nuances within societies. In this way, hegemony is

never fully realised or completed. It is not a state, but is rather a process. In this way, the nature of hegemony is such that it is constantly being reconstructed and evolving. This makes the already challenging task of locating hegemony, perpetually difficult.

Conclusion

Antonio Gramsci's provided a unique and nuanced analysis of power, ideology, and social change. Born in 1891 in Sardinia, Gramsci witnessed the formation of a unified Italy, which largely influenced his understanding of power dynamics. During this unification, the Moderate Party and the Action Party became nearly indistinguishable, highlighting the assimilating nature of political power. This observation influenced Gramsci's critique of power structures and the limited inclusion of historically marginalised groups by the bourgeoisie. Despite the sever personal hardships he faced, Gramsci attended the University of Turin, where he studied philosophy and linguistics. These studies led him to critically analyse the divide between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Whilst heavily influenced by the dialectical framework of Marx and Engels, Gramsci sought to develop and adapt their general framework to his contemporary context. He was acutely aware of the limitations of traditional Marxism, he had seen no great revolution bring about genuine social change. He noticed the absence of diverse social and cultural contexts across different countries in the dialectic. Gramsci's observations aligned with Vladimir Lenin's ideas on cultural struggle, the role of the bourgeoisie, and the necessity for oppressed groups to unite. Lenin's discourse, although not frequently using the term ‘hegemony’, laid the foundation for Gramsci's eventual conceptualisation of hegemony. Gramsci's critique of

Marxism's failure to bring about a workers revolution demonstrated his commitment to Marxist principles while acknowledging the need for adaptation. His views on the state had a significant impact on contemporary Marxist debates, as he rejected the traditional Marxist notion of the state solely serving as a coercive instrument of the bourgeoisie. Instead, he presented a multifaceted understanding of the state, emphasising its coercive and non-coercive functions. The state functioned as an educative apparatus that allowed for some social mobility within existing power structures. In Gramsci's perspective, the state also played a crucial role in shaping public opinion within civil society. It regulated institutions such as the legal system and education system to prevent public opinion from becoming too critical of the ruling class. Gramsci viewed public opinion as a point of contact between political society and civil society, representing the dialectical interplay between force and consensus. This departure from his contemporaries highlighted the state's influence over culture, ideology, and society. Regarding Ideology, Gramsci emphasised the interplay between philosophy and material forces. As material conditions change, new ideologies begin to compete with the pre-established ones. This is difficult nevertheless, the deposits of past ideologies hinder attempts to alter material conditions and bring about ideological shifts. There is a complex array of multiple ideologies coexisting within society, creating a patchwork that is increasingly difficult to examinate with each new ideological layer.

Hegemony extends beyond mere ideological mystification or cultural domination. It is not solely confined to economic rule or the coercive power of the state. Instead, Gramsci redefined hegemony as the intricate formation and organisation of power by consent. It involves the dominance of one social group over society, and is exerted through various organisations such as the church, cultural institutions and schools. According to Gramsci, individuals willingly accepted and conformed to prevailing norms, beliefs, practices, and

worldviews that reinforced the existing social structure. Consent in this way, was not solely based on moral responsibility but also a psychological acceptance of the socio-political order. Gramsci recognised that consent could coexist with opposition as long as there was a substratum of shared interests powerful enough to counteract and sometimes subsume, opposing forces that arise. This shared interest manifests in accepted beliefs, norms, practices, and worldviews that strengthen the social structure. Individuals acknowledge and adhere to these norms, acquiring personal benefits – where deviating from the hegemonic order would likely have negative consequences. Hegemony moulds and manipulates individual's personal convictions so as to replicate social norms; perpetuating the norms an re-establishing their social position as natural and morally right. It is important to note that hegemony does not seek to dominate society outright, but rather seeks to lead it. The dynamic between hegemony and domination varies across different societies and contexts, it is absolutely necessary to understand the specific nuances of each society and its social context. Hegemony is intimately intertwined with time and place, constantly adjusting and manipulating these nuances to remain in power. As such, it is not a fixed state but an ongoing process that is continually reconstructed and evolving. Studying and locating hegemony is a perpetually challenging task due to its ever-changing nature and its reliance on the interplay of power and consent within the social fabric.

I remember spending some time at one of my friend's houses when I was at King's School. The house was amazing. I had never been inside a house like that, and can't think of house I have been in since that is more grand. The family treated me quite well, I would often go over after school and play until my mother finished work. One day, the father took me aside to have a chat. I was getting in trouble at school. Nothing too serious, being a bit difficult with teachers. If something happened that I did not like, I would say something about it – this led

to a few meetings with various teachers and principals to discuss my attitude. The father wanted to talk about this. I don't remember too much of the particulars of the conversation, but I remember the tone, it was a growling. I do however, remember him telling me that I should be grateful to be at King's, that I was fortunate to be there. I'm fairly sure I was crying. I was sitting in this beautiful house, being lectured by a very wealthy man, about how I should be more grateful. I can't remember saying anything. I was fully aware of how fortunate I was.

As I got older, I came to realise that although I was fortunate, framing me as being fortunate to go to that school, implied that others were not. I had earned my way into that school. The only means at my disposable to gain entrance to that school were accessed. There were only seven other people at that school that earned their way there, everyone else was there by chance. They were fortunate, I was not lucky enough to be born to rich parents. His son was fortunate. I was grateful. I saw the lives my cousins were living, the condition of their schools. The position I am in now, compared to them reflects that. I am not better or worse than them, but I am certainly more fortunate. What I was not, was submissive. Needless to say, I told my mother when she picked me up, and I stopped going over there.

Turns out, he was right. One day, my mother and I had a meeting with the Headmaster of King's College, he asked about my future aspirations at King's College, and the trouble I had got into at King's School. We talked for a bit, I thought it was going well. He told me that he was not going to accept my enrolment into King's College. I remember the reason he gave vividly, I "lacked integrity". A grown man, told me, a thirteen year old boy, that I lacked integrity. It hurt, even though I didn't really know what it meant. Perhaps that made it hurt

more. The scholarship I had earned was taken from me.

I was fortunate to have made some friends at King's School. One friend's family allowed my mother and I to live in a small flat on their property in Remuera, as such, I was in zone to attend Auckland Grammar School. The house my mother bought in South Auckland so I could easily commute to King's College, had to be rented out. True to form, I started getting a reputation for being disruptive at Auckland Grammar as I did at King's School. So much so, that one day I, in my fourth form year, I had to have a meeting with my dean. He asked me to sit down, wrote a word on a piece of paper, and slid it across the table to me. On it was written the word 'conviction'. He pointed and said "you're full of it". He asked if I knew what it meant, I did not. So he told me, "It means you have strong beliefs, and you're willing to fight for them". In that moment, I felt empowered. I was looking at someone, who had power over me, and instead of using that power to growl, or expel; he used it to encourage. I have never forgotten that. The difference that made on how I viewed myself, I no longer lacked integrity, but was full of conviction.

Unfortunately, my behaviour didn't change much. I kept getting in trouble, but at least I understood why. Lots of things took place that I did not agree with. Predominantly regarding things considered normal within school. I hated the idea of uniforms, and our particular uniform more so. I found classes boring and uninteresting – except of course New Zealand History. Schooling was structured to make us the same, not enhance our uniqueness. It made sense, there were so many of us. Easier to manage, if there are less differences. Easier to get the desired outcomes if we are all told that we should be striving for certain outcomes. It wasn't about us, it was about the outcomes. Some of the teachers were great, and some of

those with power were great too; but it was the nature of the system. I pushed back, I wanted to. I did not stop, even until the very final day I left the school's grounds.

I did not understand what I experienced at these schools and in these social spaces, why I needed conviction, where it came from and what it was for, but I think I felt it though. The first time I really began to understand it, was when I came across the idea of hegemony. Social Policy 100, my first year at university. It ensnared me. I was astounded. It made so much sense. To me, it perfectly translated a lot of the feelings I had into an idea. I thought back to my time at school, the challenges I had, and the challenge I was for the poor teachers. School was not about our intelligence, it was about power. We were being taught to be a particular way, so as to maintain the power structure. No one person was, or is responsible. It is far more insidious than that. From there, with my other studies, a clearer picture of hegemony became apparent. It was so broad. So influential, so invisible, and as such, near impossible to address.

Chapter 4: Whiteness

During a three-way phone call with myself and two of my Pākehā friends, one of them mispronounced a Māori place name. This was not unusual for him, and nor was my correction of his mispronunciation. Witnessing a universal disregard for te reo Māori was commonplace in my younger life, so much so, that I would in some instances pronounce words incorrectly so as to not stand out. A decision I know now represents the internalisation of colonisation. My friend continued his anecdote, taking barely any notice of my comment except to claim the way I corrected him was too harsh. Later on in the conversation, I mispronounced a Spanish word. The friend that disregarded my comments concerning his pronunciation of te reo, then castigated me for my mispronunciation of Spanish. I was furious but I took a breath and I apologised and pronounced it correctly for the rest of the conversation.

A few months go by, and then I see this friend in person. I had not talked to him since the phone call. Within five minutes of catching up, ridiculing me, he brought up my mispronunciation of this Spanish word. Furthermore, and much more denigrating to me and our country/context, he compared the way in which he reprimanded my mispronunciation of Spanish, to the way in which I reprimanded his mispronunciation of te reo. When he knows that my exposure to Spanish in no way equalled his exposure to te reo in the slightest. I responded in complete disagreement and an argument ensued. The general gist of his argument was that I should be more gentle when correcting peoples' mispronunciation of te reo. He brought Asian immigrants into the conversation, he was trying to argue that as I should not expect them to pronounce te reo correctly, I should not expect him to. He claimed the colonisation of New Zealand was my belief system, at which point I cut him off and he

stormed out. The conversation took place in front of a few other friends, one of whom was the other party in the three-way phone call; significantly the other friend is a Black Canadian. In the past we have had several discussions about similar experiences in our upbringing, as he also grew up surrounded by rich, white people.

After the friend I was arguing with stormed out, it was quiet for a little bit, the other Pākehā friend broke the silence by saying that maybe I was a little too harsh. In reply I said, if a discussion like this occurs, and the focus afterwards is on the way in which someone was right, as opposed to the focus being on the fact that someone was completely wrong, we are valuing the wrong thing. By framing the conversation around the way in which it is engaged, as opposed to the nuance of the topic, those engaging only have to be equal in terms of temperament, as opposed to equal in terms of topic knowledge. Thus, it becomes a discussion between those who have the epistemological capacity to engage, and those who do not.

A few days later, I was at a post-graduate lecture of which the topic was epistemic exploitation. Epistemic exploitation refers to the manner in which members of a dominant group position themselves as equals to marginalised individuals regarding the nature of the marginalised group's oppression (Berenstain, 2016). This exploitation manifests in various ways: marginalised individuals being compelled to explain their oppression to dominant individuals, constant compromise by marginalised individuals to appease the egos of the dominant group, the dominant group receiving praise and recognition for their supposed "improvements" while the marginalised group bears the emotional and physical burden, and scepticism from the dominant group even after marginalised individuals share their lived experiences as requested (Berenstain, 2016).

These forms of exploitation are interconnected and do not occur in isolation. Furthermore, epistemic exploitation results in violence in terms of lost years, psychological distress, trauma, and marginalisation in social relationships and situations (Berenstain, 2016). Oppressed individuals also experience exploitation through the unpaid labour forced upon them when coerced into educating the dominant group (Berenstain, 2016). In addition, the recognition received by members of the dominant group as a result of this epistemic exploitation coincides with the profit gained by neoliberal institutions and political structures that possess this knowledge (Berenstain, 2016). Policies built on this exploited epistemic labour often cater to the ego of the dominant group and fail to genuinely challenge existing power structures (Berenstain, 2016). Universities, in particular, engage in this behaviour by increasing diversity rates in a way that benefits from superficial diversification without challenging the dominance of Western epistemological hegemony (Berenstain, 2016). The labour undertaken by oppressed groups is exploited both in its pursuit by the dominant group and in the unequal benefits it provides to the dominant group compared to the oppressed individuals who perform the labour.

Learning about this only a few days after the conflict with my friend was unbelievable timing. It put in to words, so succinctly and concisely, what I experienced then and on many other occasions. It has also given me a tool I have used since then, to understand situations better, and address them more effectively when similar things occur.

This chapter describes and discusses the concept of Whiteness. The purpose of this chapter is to illustrate how whiteness is an expression of hegemonic ideas. However, before Whiteness can be explored it is important to address the concept of race. Race is a considerably difficult concept to discuss without the appropriate framing. Social discussions and academic

discourse concerning race are often extremely contentious and met with a variety of disparate responses, which can range from vitriol fuelled condemnations, to a series of apathetic repudiations. This perhaps, is the reason why there is so much misrepresentation concerning race when engaging in discussions about it. In this way, one must address race, before addressing Whiteness. As such, the first section of this chapter will discuss race in order to provide contextualise how the word race is being used in this thesis. The next section will focus on Critical Race Theory (CRT), describing the value of CRT in relation to race and how CRT is used as a tool to analyse societies. Tribal Critical Race Theory will also be discussed in this section. The third section will examine literature concerning whiteness, how it was produced, how it is maintained and how it is an expression of the concept of hegemony. The final section will discuss how whiteness is evolving, and whilst it is addressing some of the racial inequities it created, it is not addressing its hegemonic position.

Race

I was at the gym one morning, I had not been there long and was starting to warm up, when I overheard a conversation between two people not far from me. They were talking about the use of te reo Māori in New Zealand media. The first of the two that I heard in this conversation, was bemoaning the presence of te reo in the newspaper they had read that morning. The second replied with an anecdote detailing their disgust at hearing te reo on a news broadcast on television the night before. The word 'disgust' grabbed my intention, and without thinking I turned to look at the two of them. At which point, I saw the first person I heard talking gesture to the second person, apparently alerting them as to my reaction to their comments. The second person then turned to face towards me, as such, I turned away from the mirror to face them. The words that they said are engraved in my memory, "yes I

said it, and I don't care!". Whilst I had heard comments along a similar vein to the ones that were made initially many times, the manner in which that person reinforced their comments took me quite by surprise. After a brief time, my shock subsided and I responded with faux consternation, saying something like "I'm sorry, you don't care about your blatant racism?". Their face twisted in resentment having hear my response. It is worse to be called racist, than to be racist evidently. "It's not racism, it's not. If anything, it is reverse racism to have 'maari' language forced on us" was the reply I received.

Not only did this person completely dismiss the vituperative nature of their remarks, but also attempted to reframe the positionality of those involved so as to label themself as the victim. What social context must this person live in and come from, to conceptualise the nature of oppression in this context as one in which they are a victim? Standing in the middle of a public area, spouting blatantly racist vitriol and responding to any admonishment with increased acrimony; yet, they conceive of themselves as the one being wronged - not just in that moment of confrontation with myself, but even in having to hear another language spoken on television. There appeared to be a complete awareness of their safety in this situation, there were no repercussions for them, barring some comments from someone like myself. A complete disassociation between their perceived victimhood, and the context within which they were supposedly oppressed. If indeed there were repercussions, perhaps the interaction between the two of them would not have occurred in the first place. The context has facilitated the potential for discussions, such as this, to occur somewhat organically. Even in talking about the context thus far, I have not. The idea or reverse racism unfortunately inhabits some space in the public lexicon in regard to addressing the historic injustices of the past that were meted out upon racial minorities.

Race as a term emerged in the 1600s. The term was used to refer to ancestral and genetic differences among groups of people, as an attempt to classify human beings into various categories. Conceptions of race can be traced back to religion (Christianity in anglo-saxon contexts such as New Zealand) notions of barbarism and civility, and science (Orkin & Joubin, 2019). Some ideas that reflect the desire to categorise groups of people include the Great Chain of Being, a popular Christian concept in the middle ages (Lovejoy, 1971; Marks, 2013), and the Linnaean classification system, which was developed by Carl Linnaeus who supported the notion of biological differences between human races (Marks, 2013; Peregrine, 2013). Locally, Jack Hunn's (1961) report separated Māori into three distinct categories based on their willingness to conform to White New Zealand standards. Much of the classification in these examples were related to supposed 'genetic' differences, such as skin colour and cranial shape. These classifications were then used as a justification by some races to place different types of humans into a hierarchy that privileged some and dehumanised others as being more animalistic.

Given the different ways racial categories have been created in different times and places there is no consistent definition of race. For example, there were racial delineations regarding where a group was from, there were also 'racial' groups based on language and religion (Takazawa et al., 2023). However, the concept of race is really important some of the greatest atrocities to occur in human history were committed on the basis of race. Contemporarily, the conception of race has changed dramatically. It is now common for race to be described as a category in which a person's membership is dependent upon their ethnicity, and the social conditions they have experienced due to various political, systemic and historical phenomena (Takazawa et al., 2023). However, the existence of some of these contemporary social conditions are a direct result of the atrocities mentioned earlier. For instance, the current

(historical) social conditions experienced by black communities in North America are inextricably linked to the Atlantic Slave Trade.

Given the hierarchical discrimination embedded in these historic depictions of race it is also important to define racism. Societies are racist, as are individuals, but few are avowedly racist" (Rangihau et al., 1988, p.18). Rangihau et al., (1988) state that "racism is [a] belief or practice based on the assumption that one race, culture or ethnic group is inherently superior or inferior to another. Elaborating, Rangihau et al., (1988) provide three distinct sects of racism: personal, cultural and institutional. Personal racism is a form of racism most people would consider racism; it often involves offensive or harmful behaviour delivered from one or a few members of one racial group upon an individual or individuals from another racial group based on race. Cultural racism results from the superior positioning of one racial group's culture over others, usually due to an imbalance of power. This can take place in many ways, one of which is when the racial group from a position of power, removes and subsumes some of the other racial groups cultural nuances with their own, whilst maintaining the power dynamic and cultural superiority. This is also known as cultural appropriation, and usually involves the powerful group benefitting from the cultural theft.

The final type of racism discussed is institutional. To Rangihau et al., (1988) institutional racism is considered the "most insidious and destructive form of racism" (p. 19). Institutional racism happens due to the manner in which institutions and structures have been built to reflect the cultural, political and social values of one culture whilst disregarding other culture's values. Systemic racism encompasses not only explicit acts of discrimination but also implicit biases, institutional policies, and societal norms that perpetuate racial inequalities. In order for members from other cultural groups to engage in society, they must

neglect their own cultural values, and incorporate the values of the powerful culture. Given the complex ways race is defined and racism can be perpetuated, there are, understandably, a number of different ways in which race is examined. Delgado and Stefancic (2017) introduce two ways in which some engage in this examination. They term one group 'idealists', who see race as completely underpinned by social conditions, a social construct (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). In this way, racial discrimination, according to these thinkers, can be mitigated by educating, changing ideas and perspectives. The other, 'Realists', are concerned predominantly with the manner in which tangible privilege and benefits accrue for certain peoples and not others. This group claim race is the means through which powerful racial order hierarchies are framed.

Bonilla-Silva (2012), states that "racism, as a social structure, [is] a system of practices and mechanisms to maintain systemic white privilege"(14:08). Mills (2015) also contends that the construct of race is a social fabrication rather than a natural or biological classification of people. Expounding further, Mills (2015) elucidates that the foundations of white racism were initially rooted in the belief of innate superiority, but in contemporary times, white racism conveniently denies any existence of advantage or differentiation whatsoever. The inherent harm embedded within this formulation of racism lies in its utter dismissal of the historical exploitation, suffering, and discrimination endured by oppressed communities. This dismissal extends beyond mere social perceptions and permeates concentrated institutional and political realms, where the acknowledgment of past violence and white privilege is callously disregarded. The very cultures, institutions, and individuals that once erected their favoured social order upon the premise of presumed natural superiority now conveniently absolve themselves and their predecessors of any responsibility, instead feigning ignorance. According to hooks (1989), racism should be understood not merely as the subjugation of

people belonging to racial and ethnic minorities, but primarily as the manifestation of white supremacy and whiteness. To effectively challenge the power dynamics perpetuated by racism, it is necessary to recognise and acknowledge the particular ways in which white individuals receive benefits and advantages from their whiteness. Understanding racism in this comprehensive manner is essential for addressing its deep-rooted impact and promoting effective strategies to combat it.

There are also a variety of ways in which discussions of race take place. Gillborn (2015) claims that undertaking discussions of race, from a race-conscious perspective, can be misrepresented in politics and media as racist itself. Race-consciousness is a concept concerned with the awareness and consideration of race when interacting with people and spaces. It is used often in work that discusses or is focussed on race (Brown & Jackson, 2013; Flagg, 1998; Gillborn, 2015; Horford & Grosland, 2013; Nnawulezi et al., 2020; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008). Race-consciousness is sometimes met with disregard and twisted to be racist itself (Gillborn, 2015), in that policies or decisions made on the basis of race, are racist. Johnson (2017) introduces the idea of 'dysconscious racism', the lack of self-awareness that precipitates understandings of injustice and inequity through the acceptance of the standard social conditions as natural. Furthermore, Johnson (2017) states that "dysconscious racism is a type of racism that implicitly accepts whiteness, the normalization of whiteness, and white privileges" (p. 477). Approaches to studying race often overlook the significance of whiteness by regarding it as an assumed and even favourable aspect within race relations. These perspectives tend to focus on highlighting issues and complexities of the 'other' in relation to whiteness, thus centering the discussion around non-white racial identities. Two ways in which race and whiteness is discussed in the following sections are Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Theory.

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Critical Race Theory (CRT) emerged as a movement led by coloured academics in the United States and has evolved into a global endeavour, involving scholars and activists dedicated to studying and transforming the intricate relationship among race, racism, and power (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Writer, 2008). Delgado & Stefancic (2017) state that CRT "is a collection of activists and scholars engaged in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power" (p. 3). Its origins can be traced back to Critical Legal Theory, as legal scholars began delving into the central role played by law in establishing and perpetuating white supremacy in the United States (West, 1995).

Over time, CRT has garnered attention from academics in similar positions worldwide (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).As such the theory has been used to shed light on the historical marginalisation of indigenous, Asian, African-American, and Latin legal scholars within the academic sphere and peoples more widely (West, 1995). The perspectives of scholars engaged in CRT may vary depending on their respective contexts; however, they are united by two fundamental principles outlined by Crenshaw et al. (1995): first, to comprehend the mechanisms through which white supremacy has been created and maintained; second, to actively work towards transforming the complex relationship between law and racial power (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p. xiii). In essence, Critical Race Theory aims to critically examine racial inequities by identifying white supremacy as the underlying cause and seeks to challenge white hegemony in order to foster meaningful societal change.

CRT faces several challenges in its pursuit of racial justice. One significant obstacle is the prevailing perception of racism itself, as established earlier. One aspect of racism, not mentioned earlier, is the idea that racism historically has been conceptualised from the perspective of the perpetrators. This framing acknowledges race as an issue but dismisses the existence of systemic racism within structures and institutions. Racism from the perpetrator's perspective is a deliberate yet irrational behaviour, carried out by individuals who perceive it as a legitimate and fair (Crenshaw et al., 1995). By narrowly attributing racism to individual acts of conscious bias, the broader structural and systemic dimensions of racial oppression are often overlooked. Racism in this way could be addressed by altering behaviour and other individual changes.

One way in which CRT seeks to overcome the marginalisation of institutional racism, is through the emphasis on lived experiences and the voices of marginalised communities. By valuing the insights and knowledge generated by those directly impacted by racism, CRT challenges traditional academic frameworks that have historically excluded these perspectives. By integrating personal narratives and counter-narratives into the discourse, CRT amplifies marginalised voices and highlights the diverse ways in which racial oppression manifests itself.

The central objective of CRT is to interrogate and challenge the status quo, striving to dismantle systems of oppression and eradicate racial inequities. By centering the analysis on whiteness, CRT seeks to unravel the complex web of power relations that sustain racial hierarchies. It recognises that racism is not merely a product of individual attitudes or actions but is deeply embedded in social, economic, and political structures. Furthermore, Solorzano (1998) emphasises that while race and racism are the central tenets within CRT, they are also

examined in relation to how they intersect with other forms of oppression, such as gender and class discrimination. By examining the intersections of race, class, gender, and other social categories, CRT aims to illuminate the intersection of different forms of oppression and identify strategies to address the damaging impacts of power structures.

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit)

Attending university has been an incredibly liberating experience. It was not something I planned on doing when I finished High School, I did not feel drawn to it at all. I spent a few years floating about, trying to make careers out of baseball and subsequently rugby. I was in Taiwan playing baseball, when I got injured and could not play anymore. Although I was good at rugby and baseball and rugby growing up, baseball was the sport that I was invested in – despite the relative exclusivity of baseball compared to rugby. Baseball in New Zealand is very much a rich person's sport. Not only is rugby part of New Zealand's social fabric, but New Zealand is the pinnacle when it comes to rugby, baseball is not the same. As such, it is less accessible and in order to play in decent competitions, one has to travel internationally. Baseball fields were also predominantly located in wealthier areas, the registrations were expensive and so was the equipment. All of these things played a part in the unofficial exclusivity.

I was fortunate enough to be good, so people looked after me – especially some that I knew from my time at King's School. Some of the boys I met through baseball are still my closest friends. These friends, as my stories illustrate, have played a large part, albeit unconsciously, for exposing me to the differences in people's lives. We had some great times together, and still do – but we also had some tough times together, and still do. Although, our perceptions

of why there were tough times, or good times, I would argue would be different. That is why it is important to talk about some of these events, some of these guys, and some of the reasons things happened the way they did, or did not. University has provided me with some tools through which I can return to the past, unearth some of the remnants left there, and begin to study them. Thinking back on some of these times, with this new knowledge, is so different to what it was like being in it at the time. Being berated by the children of politicians and CEOs about 'Maaris' trying to own the airwaves, listening to them talk about how the 'Pakeha Party' was so great – it hurt, and it was difficult, and I didn't know what to say. I spent years as their elected spokesperson and representative of Māori – Māori issues, Māori current events, Māori history. When it came to discourse concerning New Zealand, I was positioned as either not one of them, or directly opposed. I was held responsible by a group of 15-year-old rich, white boys for the actions of Māori. If I was to push back against something that is said or implied, I was framed as the aggressor or the antagoniser. In this way, not only was I made responsible for Māori, but I was also made responsible for appeasing the feelings and social position of my white friends in relation to me and the people I represent.

Tribal Critical Race Theory has its origins in CRT, a number of indigenous scholars and academics (Brayboy, 2005; Hermes, 1999; Rains, 2003; Williams, 1997) began using CRT to examine the indigenous experience. TribalCrit is grounded in the diverse and complex ways of knowing found within Indigenous communities. These ways of understanding the world have been shaped by the unique histories, cultures, and environments of Indigenous groups (Brayboy, 2005). TribalCrit values and embraces this rich knowledge, which provides insights into various aspects of Indigenous life. These aspects include identity, connection to the land, spirituality, and community values. Furthermore, it recognises that these ways of knowing are not the same for every Indigenous group and that they continue to evolve and

adapt over time (Brayboy, 2005). In this way, with the depth and diversity of Indigenous knowledge, TribalCrit challenges dominant narratives and seeks to promote a more inclusive and respectful approach to learning and research. Brayboy (2005) provides nine key tenets to TribalCrit, they are:

1. Colonisation is inherent within society and is deeply embedded within societies' structures and systems. Colonisation is a powerful force, both historical and contemporary, that has shaped and continues to shape institutions and influences power dynamics and ideologies.
2. United States' policies concerning Indigenous peoples are founded upon a history of materialism, imperialism and White supremacy. These policies, and their ideological underpinnings, have directly persecuted and marginalised Indigenous peoples in the United States.
3. Indigenous peoples exist in a liminal space that encompasses both the political and racial dimensions of their identities. This notion of liminal space refers to how indigenous peoples exist on the margins of society, simultaneously existing within social structures whilst having limited influence or power within those spaces.
4. Indigenous peoples aspire to secure and assert their sovereignty and self-determination. Indigenous communities strive to reclaim their right to self-governance and assert their unique cultural identities.
5. The notions of culture, knowledge, and power from an Indigenous perspective gives rise to new understandings and interpretations of the world. When these concepts are viewed through an Indigenous lens, they take on a different meaning to the dominant meaning.
6. Governmental and educational policies regarding Indigenous peoples are driven by the goal of assimilation. In this way, these policies disregarded and sought to destroy

the nuance and uniqueness of Indigenous cultures and ways of life.

7. Indigenous beliefs, philosophies and ideas are pivotal in understanding the lived realities of Indigenous peoples. Whilst there are similarities across Indigenous groups in terms of perspectives, and the impacts of colonisation, acknowledging these differences across Indigenous groups provides an opportunity to understand the Indigenous experience more completely.
8. "Stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are, therefore, real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being." (p. 488)
9. Theory and practice are interconnected in deep and explicit ways, requiring scholars to actively engage in creating social change.

Where CRT asserts that racism is inherent within society based on a critique of white supremacy TribalCrit stems first from the position that colonisation is endemic within society as the main structure that perpetuates racism. As such, TribalCrit is a culturally nuanced approach used to examine the lived experience of Indigenous peoples since their initial encounters with Europeans (Brayboy, 2005). It is Brayboy's (2005) aspiration that TribalCrit will address the diverse range of experiences among individuals who identify as Native American and recognise the distinct and sovereign relationship between Native American Peoples and the U.S government. In this way, this perspective is essential in understanding the unique context in which Native American communities exist, both physically and intellectually (Brayboy, 2005). As Wilson & Yellow Bird (2005) state, "since the truth about injustices perpetuated against Indigenous People has been largely denied in the United States, truth-telling becomes an important strategy for decolonization [sic]" (p. 7).

TribalCrit also provides a theoretical framework to tackle the pressing issues confronting Native American communities today. These include challenges related to: language preservation and the loss of indigenous languages; management of natural resources; low rates of Native American students graduating from colleges and universities; disproportionate representation of Native Americans in special education programs; and power struggles between federal, state, and tribal governments. Whilst Brayboy (2005) is referring generally to the lived experience and nuanced position of Native American peoples, TribalCrit can be relevant for all Indigenous groups.

Whiteness in Theory

Academics and researchers in the 1990s produced a torrent of work on the concept of whiteness (Davy, 1995; Frankenberg, 1993; Giroux, 1992; Harris, 1993; Hyde, 1995; Ignatiev & Garvey 1996; Mahony, 1995; Morrison, 1993; Nakayama & Krizek, 1995; Roediger, 1994; Van Dijk, 1993; Wellman, 1993). One of the most important early pieces examining whiteness that led to this emergence, was Peggy McIntosh's (1988) paper that provided a catalogue of 46 advantages/privileges that she had experienced through virtue of being white; she claims these range from wearing second-hand clothes and not be concerned with other people attributing that to her having made bad morals or poverty, to being sure that when she does well in a difficult situation she would not be considered a good example of her race. McIntosh's arguments set a precedent regarding the awareness that white academics have to achieve in regard to recognise their privilege and safety in whiteness.

This aspect of whiteness is white privilege, which refers to the unearned advantages and benefits that white individuals receive solely based on their racial identity (McIntosh, 1988).

These privileges manifest in various aspects of life, such as education, employment, housing, criminal justice, and representation in media and politics. White privilege is often veiled and remains invisible or unacknowledged by those who possess it. McIntosh (1988) speaks candidly in her article about the comfortability and difficulty of facing the reality of white privilege in her own life, and how it affects others. As whiteness is deeply embedded in social structures and norms, it can be difficult to locate and define – particularly for those who benefit from it. These cultural norms, values, and standards that are often presented as universal or superior (Guess, 2006). These norms define what is considered 'normal' or 'acceptable' in society, whilst marginalising and devaluing other cultural practices and identities (Guess, 2006).

Bonilla-Silva and Doane (2003) claim that whiteness is the embodiment of power through race, and, Frankenburg (1993) claims that whiteness is a combination of invisible cultural norms, structural and institutional advantages and the power and influence over socio-cultural perspectives. Harris (1993) states that "Whiteness defined the legal status of a person as either a slave or free. White identity conferred tangible and economically valuable benefits and was jealously guarded as a valued possession, allowed only to those who met a strict standard of proof" (p. 1726). Whiteness is a complex system that generates and maintains privilege and social power dynamics. Bonnett (1998) highlights the historical transformation of Whiteness in Europe, with a specific focus on Britain and the class system. He argued that Whiteness assumed a revered and idealised position primarily influenced by and tailored for the bourgeoisie (Bonnett, 1998).

Whiteness is a social construct that has shaped power dynamics and social hierarchies throughout history, it refers to the privileges, advantages, and societal of being white.

Whiteness, however, is not merely about skin colour but encompasses an array of racialised identities and intersections with social, economic, and political structures. Historically, whiteness has played a crucial role in the formation of racial hierarchies and the subjugation of non-white populations. Whiteness has been used to justify colonialism, slavery, and various forms of racial discrimination and oppression.

Richard Dyer (1997), highlighted a significant pattern observed among white individuals, wherein they tend to categorise individuals of non-white races or ethnicities based on their racial or ethnic backgrounds. However, this classification did not extend to their own racial group, as they perceive fellow white individuals simply as people without attributing the same racial distinction (Dyer, 1997). This highlights a form of racial hierarchy and the different perceptions of racial identities, emphasising the normalisation of whiteness whilst othering individuals of non-white backgrounds.

Prominent theorist Sara Ahmed (2007), in her critical cultural analysis, posits that whiteness can be understood as an orientation that affords individuals privileged access to certain resources and opportunities. Ahmed (2007) argues that the historical processes of colonisation have given rise to societies wherein white individuals possess a greater capacity to secure and enjoy various advantages when compared to their non-white counterparts. In this way, there are deeply ingrained power dynamics that permeate social structures and institutions, and contribute to systemic inequities for people of colour. Colonisation has had a profound impact on societies worldwide, establishing hierarchies that maintain the dominance of white individuals. As such, certain opportunities and resources are more accessible to white individuals.

Whiteness in New Zealand

For one of my assignments in a level 200 paper, but in my first year, I wrote a report called "The Plight of the Uneducated". In it, I attempted to reframe the discourse concerning issues in education from being about Māori, to being about Pākehā. Pākehā were the uneducated. They were suffering, and worse off because of the failures of the education system. The education I was talking about was New Zealand History in particular. I claimed that the education system was letting Pākehā down, by not teaching our history in schools. Which was leading to racism that Māori experience and the perpetuation of colonisation.

I remember some feedback I got from it. I was asked something along the lines of "what about Māori? Would they not benefit too?" I was a little surprised. The whole point was to not talk about Māori, to frame Pākehā as the ones in need of support. Even then, I recognised the inability for whiteness to be framed as something that needed to be addressed. Even though I was claiming that racism was a direct result of Pākehā being unaware of this country's history, to a Pākehā, it was still Māori that needed to be fixed.

A year later, I wrote another report. This one, was in response to the announcements that the New Zealand Government would be introduced as a compulsory subject in all schools. The title of this report was "History versus History." In it, I examined a number of comments to online articles talking about the government's policy. My basic approach was to examine what percentage of comments mentioned the desire or concern for supposed "unbiased or truthful" education. Of the data I collected, 41% of comments made some mention of bias or truth. The other 59%, consisted of literally anything else. Within the 41% there appeared to

sub-groups. Those who queried whether it will be truthful, and those who claimed outright that it would not be.

There was no way to get any data about the demographics of the people who made the comments, but I was interested nonetheless at the consistency of people to be concerned with historical accuracy. Where was concern for historical accuracy before the announcement was made and there was no compulsory New Zealand History in schools? Why did these people, whoever they were, feel so threatened by New Zealand History as a subject? What were they afraid of school children learning? I have my suspicions, but they will remain as such unfortunately.

What it does show however, is even when slight changes are made to address white hegemony in education, there is heavy resistance. It was not surprising, but it was enlightening. When there was no education, there was no threat to social norms and expectations. The introduction of education brought about the potential for addressing these norms.

A number of studies have been undertaken in New Zealand concerning Whiteness; one in particular will be the focus of this section entitled *Pakeha identity and whiteness: What does it mean to be white?* (Gray et al., 2013). The social and historical dynamics of colonisation have exerted a profound influence on New Zealand society. White individuals have been issued with an array of unearned advantages and privileges that have provided them a level of ease and privilege not experienced by non-white individuals (Gray et al., 2013). These

advantages, are a result of the processes of colonisation, have contributed to the formation of a social hierarchy that disproportionately favours the dominant social group. Despite the clear disparities, members of the white majority often deny or disregard the profound impact of these advantages, perpetuating a cycle of systemic inequality (Gray et al, 2013). Consequently, white individuals in New Zealand find themselves secured within a social fabric that not only upholds and reinforces their cultural norms, but also perpetuates and consolidates their privileged status within said society. This normalisation of whiteness contributes to the perpetuation of systemic inequities, particularly for Māori. Furthermore, this normalisation implicitly devalues the experiences, perspectives, and contributions of non-white peoples, further entrenching social disparities and inhibiting meaningful progress toward equity and justice in New Zealand (Gray et al., 2013).

In *Pakeha identity and whiteness: What does it mean to be white?* (Gray et al., 2013), the authors examine the a number of people who self-identify as Pākehā. The participant's self-identification as Pākehā, was due to their sense of national belonging and their connection to New Zealand (Gray et al., 2013). The interviews revealed that a significant motivation for claiming a Pākehā identity was the participants' acknowledgment of their link to New Zealand and the rejection of the alternative label "New Zealand European" by all but two participants (Gray et al., 2013). Hepi (2008) claims that the preference for the term Pākehā hinges on its origin in *Te Reo* – aligning with the findings in Gray eta al's (2013) study.

The participants' preference for the term Pākehā over New Zealand European was rooted in their belief that the latter did not accurately represent their identity as New Zealanders. Despite acknowledging their European ancestry, participants argued that New Zealand European did not situate them within the country (Gray et al., 2013). The rejection of

European connection seems to be intertwined with the history of colonisation in New Zealand. Participants who identified with their British heritage sought to confront the colonial past and recognise the damage inflicted upon Māori as part of their journey towards embracing a Pākehā identity. For these individuals, understanding and acknowledging the harm caused by colonisation played a vital role in their decision to identify as Pākehā (Gray et al., 2013). The assertion that identifying as Pākehā signifies a connection with Māori was frequently observed in the transcripts and expressed in various ways (Gray et al., 2013). The term 'relationship' itself featured prominently in the data, implying a positive association (Gray et al., 2013). Furthermore, the language used in relation to the term Pākehā implied that it had been gifted by Māori. This idea reinforced the significance for these participants in regard to identifying themselves as Pākehā. Gray et al.s, research highlights the complexities and ongoing effects of European settlement in New Zealand. By differentiating themselves from Europeans, these Pākehā sought to establish an association with Māori (Gray et al., 2013).

More recently, the incorporation of elements of *Te Reo* and *Te āo* Māori into mainstream New Zealand society has become a means for Pākehā New Zealanders to distinguish themselves from individuals in other countries worldwide (Gray et al., 2013). Aspects of the Māori world, like the Haka, have taken on new meaning when included in mainstream New Zealand culture. The Haka is seen as a uniquely New Zealand cultural element, conveniently Māori enough to be special but not too Māori so as to be frowned upon.

Regarding whiteness however, the research highlighted an aversion to the term 'white' by the participants (Gray et al., 2013). A clear discomfort towards self-identifying as white began

emerging among the participants, as it was often associated with notions of White Supremacy and intolerance. One participant described the term as evoking a sense of revulsion, while another, expressed shock upon hearing herself labelled as such. For several other participants, being referred to as white by Māori would be regarded as an accusation. Although not all participants articulated strong opposition to the term, many still claimed there was a 'stigma' attached to it and voiced concerns about its potential derogatory usage. Some participants even argued that the term white held little meaning, yet acknowledged that their white identity granted them differential access to social power.

This contradictory stance recurred in multiple interview transcripts. Intriguingly, despite the clear intentions to distance themselves from whiteness, a review of the privilege-related data revealed the admission from all participants that being white in New Zealand conferred certain advantages to varying degrees (Gray et al., 2013). Nevertheless, the participants sought to disengage from revelations concerning their own personal advantages, instead bringing the discussion back towards systemic issues that Māori face or racism in general (Gray et al., 2013). Numerous participants discussed in detail the importance of acknowledging white privilege and expressed their motivation to engage in this research to delve further into the topic. The participants seemed unaware of the extent to which whiteness influenced their lives, while simultaneously acknowledging the existence of white privilege (Gray et al., 2013). Significantly, the participants' self-identification as Pākehā was an attempt to disassociate from their classification as white. In this way, the participants are trying to shift the notion of being Pākehā away from its roots in whiteness and white supremacy. This is an example of dysconcious racism. There is enough self-awareness to comprehend the links between being white and white supremacy, but not enough to awareness to comprehend that the issue is not necessarily that they are considered white, but

that Māori – and other ethnic minorities – are not. Shedding the moniker of white in favour of Pākehā does not remove the privilege they have by virtue of being white.

Conclusion

The concept of race has been influenced by religion, science, and notions of civility since the 1600s. People began categorising individuals based on ancestral and genetic differences. These categorisations were used to justify the dehumanisation and perpetrate atrocities. In contemporary understanding, race is regarded as a social construct influenced by ethnicity and political, institutional, and historic actors. Racism exists in various forms: personal, cultural, and institutional. Unfortunately, discussions concerning race are often misrepresented, hindering progress in addressing racial issues. It is imperative to acknowledge and dismantle the power dynamics perpetuated by whiteness and white privilege in order to address racism. However, whiteness often remains unexamined in conversations about race, with the focus primarily on non-white racial identities.

CRT and TribalCrit aim to analyse the mechanisms of white supremacy and work towards challenging racial power dynamics. CRT seeks to shed light on the marginalisation experienced by various racial and ethnic groups within academia and society. However, CRT faces challenges in addressing systemic racism, as traditional perspectives tend to view racism as individual acts of bias rather than embedded within structures and institutions. As such CRT emphasises the lived experiences of marginalised peoples and communities and provides space for their voices. Furthermore, CRT focuses the analysis on whiteness and examining intersecting forms of oppression, such as gender and class discrimination. CRT strives to dismantle systems of oppression and achieve racial equity. TribalCrit is an

extension of CRT that specifically focuses on the experiences of Indigenous peoples, it emerged as Indigenous scholars and academics began employing CRT to examine the Indigenous experience. TribalCrit is rooted in the diverse ways of knowing within Indigenous communities and acknowledges and values Indigenous knowledge. This is in order to provide insight and understanding into various aspects of Indigenous life, including: identity, connection to the land, spirituality, and community values. TribalCrit recognises that Indigenous ways of knowing differ among Indigenous groups and are constantly evolving. TribalCrit challenges dominant narratives by embracing the depth and diversity of Indigenous knowledge, and promotes a more inclusive and respectful approach to learning and research. It aims to address the historical and contemporary impacts of colonisation, shedding light on its inherent nature and deep entrenchment within societal structures and systems. Whiteness, as a social construct, has historically shaped power dynamics and social hierarchies. It encompasses privileges, advantages, and societal norms associated with being white, extending beyond mere skin colour and intersecting with social, economic, and political structures.

Whiteness has been used to justify colonisation, slavery, and racial discrimination and oppression. White privilege is an aspect of whiteness, that refers to the unearned advantages and benefits that white individuals receive based on their racial identity. These privileges occur in various aspects of life, from education, to employment, housing and the criminal justice system. Whiteness is deeply embedded in social structures and norms, making it challenging to pinpoint and define, particularly for those who benefit from it. Furthermore, whiteness is associated with presentation of white cultural norms as universal or superior, perpetuating and maintaining the discrimination of other culture's practices and identities. This has resulted in systemic inequities and hierarchies that favour white individuals. Some

white individuals in New Zealand choose to identify as Pākehā. Some of the participants in the study examined, claimed that the identity of 'Pākehā' was used as a connection with Māori and with New Zealand. There is also evidence that it is an attempt to distance themselves from the term 'white'. Participants frequently expressed discomfort with being labelled as white due to its associations with white supremacy and racism. Whilst they accepted the existence of white privilege, their focus was on the systemic issues faced by Māori rather than confronting their own advantages. Colonisation has been, and still is, an inherent aspect within New Zealand. Colonisation of New Zealand is responsible for establishing whiteness as a dominant.

I am quite fair complexioned for a Māori. My mother is brown, my father is white. I have often been reminded that having a lighter complexion does not make me not Māori. I am aware of this, and believe completely, that there is not one true way to be Māori. Nevertheless, my complexion is a physical representation of the social space I live in. It is not inherently good or bad, though I have struggled navigating it at times. Whilst I can navigate both white and Māori spaces; I feel, and have felt, that I belong to neither. In Māori spaces I am often the whitest, and in white spaces I am often the only Māori. This is something I have dealt with since I was a young child. However, I have only become competent enough to discuss it and understand, to an extent, recently. I am aware that this is in no way comparable to some of the material hardships that many face, and it is not intended to be a comparison – I am merely attempting to illustrate the nuanced circumstances I, and others like me, face.

These feelings have perhaps gotten worse I have consciously attempted to bridge that gap within myself, and some of the spaces I exist in. Taking New Zealand History as a subject in my final year at high school was probably the first time I really began to comprehend some of what I had experienced, felt and seen. Learning about the arrival of the Polynesian people, first European contact and the subsequent colonisation, and the Land Wars. I saw the way some of Māori students were reacting to this, I noticed the reactions of some of the white students. One of whom I had known since I was 11 at King's School. He came from a very wealthy, white family – he expressed things I never would've expected. I noticed the power in this. The nature of change in people when prompted in the right way.

When I decided to go to university, or should I say my wife decided I would go to university, it was to study law. My grades from school were not very good, so I was instructed to take four non-law papers in my first semester and achieve a B+ average. So I took two Māori and Indigenous Studies papers, a Social Policy paper and a Political Studies paper. These papers, particularly the Māori papers and the Social Policy paper, reignited the feeling I had when I took New Zealand History at school. I felt like I was starting to understand my place in all this, or perhaps becoming cognizant of it. Law no longer appealed to me. So I decided to change the course of my university study to a Bachelor of Social Sciences, Majoring in Social Policy and Māori and Indigenous Studies. In many ways, this study has increased my feelings of connection to my Māori side. I have so much more understanding, I learnt about the creation narrative, the Treaty/te Tiriti, contemporary issues and many events and happenings in between. I began to see a place for me in this, this was how I could be more Māori. So I did in a way, I became interested in these areas that I have discussed in this chapter. These ideas have shifted my ideas again as my struggles became less about being Māori, and more about what it is like to not be fully white. Feeling a certain way,

experiencing and seeing the things I saw, became understandable through these theories.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The Pākehā side of my family are loving, in their own way – generous, in their own way. I am fortunate to be a part of that family, they care about myself, my wife and children. There are also benefits that I receive from them that I am not able to from the Māori side of my family – predominantly in financial support and educational opportunities. The discussions had in Pākehā family also differ considerably compared to those in the Māori side of my family. When I am with my Pākehā family, we talk about politics or education, as well as what I assume can be seen as standard family stuff. With my Māori family, it is not the same. As I talked about earlier, I have lived a very different life from my cousins, through largely no fault of theirs and largely no effort of mine. My mother made some decisions when I was young that have influenced my life immensely, their parents made different decisions.

It is difficult to process what has become of my cousins. It is difficult to read about crime statistics, whilst one of my cousins is in jail. Or to read about education statistics, knowing that only I have attended university, when none of my 14 cousins have. It is difficult to watch a video about the standard of housing or overcrowding, whilst my cousin, her partner, their five kids (about to be six) and my aunty and her partner live in a two-bedroom flat. On the Pākehā side of my family, every family owns at least one home. On the Māori side of my family, only one of my cousins owns their own home. There are aspects of their daily experience that would be harder than just about anything I have experienced. It is even more difficult, knowing all of that, yet still looking around at my life, and wanting more. I feel guilty. Greedy and ungrateful. I have so much more, and thanks to my education I have the capacity to gain even more privilege. It is difficult to reconcile that when there are people who I am related too, who have considerably less. It is even more difficult knowing this about

my family, and feeling this way about myself, whilst surrounded by nobody that understands what it is like.

There are not many Māori in my life. My wife is white, my best friend is white (he lives with us), his girlfriend is white, my closest friends are white except for one who is a black Canadian, most of my colleagues are white. I exist almost exclusively in white spaces. IN these white spaces more Te Reo is spoken than in any conversation I have had with my family in the name of the treaty and to work toward equality. White spaces where four of my white colleagues will ask me what 'mā te wā' means, and when I reply with 'see ya', they say 'no, what is the literal definition'. Like my friends from school they make me responsible for their knowledge and understanding of Māoridom. It leaves me speechless, I don't care. What does it matter? Later that night I get a phone call from my Nan and she tells me how bad my families lives are. She wishes they would just get jobs, and stop having kids they can't afford, and look after the kids they already have better. She wishes they would move out of cold, over -crowded homes in bad neighbourhoods. If they could just get a job, and hold on to them she says, things would change. Does she care about what 'mā te wā' literally means? Do my cousins? Time will tell perhaps. Are these two conversations about improving the lives of Māori? What does a few white academics discussing literal translations from Te Reo Māori to English achieve? I would argue nothing for Māori – for who then? What does my cousins getting jobs achieve? Does it stop their alcoholism, or propensity for abuse, or financial hardship? Perhaps? I know that neither are true fixes, but I also know that my cousins need money more than they need white people to know the literal translation of a few Māori words. Situations like this remind me about my story of second-hand clothes shops and cultural appropriation by the ruling classes.

The goalposts have shifted, they are always shifting. That is what hegemony does. Whiteness is hegemonic. Subtle shifts in society and culture, perception and perspective. Whiteness as hegemony is evident not just in institutions, but in behaviours. The discussions we have regarding the inclusion of Te Reo Māori in white institutions completely disregard the reality my cousins live in. Opening a meeting, where there are no Māori attending with a karakia, does not suddenly make the space accessible to Māori. But what it does, is allow the white people in those spaces to congratulate themselves for their anti-racist efforts. As hooks (1989) said, racism isn't about subjugating brown people, but about propping up white people. A lot of these efforts have a small foot hold in society because it allows white hegemony to evolve, persevere and prosper. There is no threat to white dominance in New Zealand by adding Te Reo Māori names on street signs or on the branding of universities. What group is benefitting from these changes? I have seen my life change because of the acceptance of whiteness as power in this society. Improved in some ways, regressed in others. I have little to no relationship with my cousins now, but have a strong relationship with the Pākehā side of the family. I am well educated, married and am hoping to buy a house shortly. I play golf, but am not involved in kapa haka and have no tā moko. None of the social policies I have studied have led to substantial improvement in my cousins' lives.

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the intersection of the theories of hegemony and whiteness in order to illustrate how whiteness is hegemonic. Building upon the literature reviews, the hegemonic nature of whiteness in society will be explored. After hegemonic whiteness is discussed, links will be drawn more explicitly to the anecdotes I have provided throughout the thesis.

Hegemonic Whiteness

Whiteness as a concept is concerned with the dominance of white values and norms within society and their entrenchment. It is absolutely and essentially inherent within Anglo-colonial societies such as New Zealand. This dominance is rooted in historical, institutional, and cultural structures that uphold and perpetuate white privilege and white supremacy. Whiteness is maintained through the adherence and acceptance of the status quo. Whiteness operates as a hegemonic force within society, exerting dominance and shaping power dynamics in various spheres that benefit white people and marginalise non-whites.

The quintessence of hegemony is

Whiteness as a hegemonic power intersects with the concept of hegemony broadly, as both highlight the intricate formation and organisation of power in society. Whiteness, as a hegemonic construct, operates through consent, where individuals willingly accept and conform to prevailing white norms, beliefs, practices, and worldview. This reinforces the existing social structures. This adherence is not solely based on moral responsibility, but also stems from an acceptance of the socio-political order. Regarding race, whiteness as hegemonic power perpetuates and maintains systemic inequities, through moulding and manipulating individuals' personal convictions and the presentation of social norms as natural and morally right.

Hegemony does not seek to dominate society outright, but rather to lead it. The dynamics between hegemony and normalisation vary across societies and contexts, and this influences the way in which hegemonic leadership occurs. Hegemony is also intimately intertwined with time and place. Perpetually constantly adjusting and manipulating these nuances to maintain

its power. It is not a fixed state but an ongoing process that is continually reconstructed and evolving. The identification of hegemony present perpetual challenges due to its ever-changing nature and its reliance on the interplay of power and consent within the social fabric.

The insidious nature of whiteness is hegemonic. As hegemony generates and maintains social norms, it is difficult to locate. In this way, so too is whiteness. Whiteness is normal within colonised contexts, and as such, is hegemonic. The nature of hegemonic whiteness within these contexts is hidden. Through the consent of individuals and groups to uphold various white values and ideas, the values and ideas themselves become synonymous with social expectations and standards. This results in the invisibility of those values and ideals. Simultaneously, this invisibility not only serves to disguise white hegemonic values, but also brings clearly into sight the systemic disregard of values and ideas from other racial groups.

Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory provide lenses through which the analysis of, and resistance to, hegemonic power of whiteness can occur. CRT focuses on the marginalisation experienced by various racial and ethnic groups. CRT posits that racism is not solely comprised of individual acts of bias – as many have tried to claim – but is actually deeply embedded within structures and institutions. TribalCrit, specifically examines the experiences of Indigenes. It recognises and promotes Indigenous knowledges and ways of being in order to address crucial aspects of the Indigenous experience. This includes spirituality, identity, connection to the land, and other unique values. By shedding light on the historical and contemporary impacts of colonisation, TribalCrit seeks to expose the nature of colonisation and its entrenchment within society and institutions.

Through the autoethnographic anecdotes, I sought to not only provide context to the literature, but to also elucidate some of the impacts of hegemonic whiteness.

My experiences with the police, being wrongly targeted as a young Māori boy playing with toy guns to witnessing the completely different treatment of my white friends, illustrate the influence of hegemonic whiteness within the criminal justice system. The disparate treatment and subsequent distrust, that I and others like me experience due to our race, are clear reminders of the systemic biases that continue to shape policing values.

As a relatively fair-complexioned Māori, it has been challenging for me to navigate social spaces where I feel like I don't fully belong to either Māori or white environments. Studying New Zealand History at school, proved to be a huge step for me coming to terms with who I was. Studying Social Policy and Māori and Indigenous Studies at university have furthered that self-perception. Aside from the self-identification, my university studies also shed light on the influence of hegemonic whiteness in society, and thus helped me to make sense of that experience. Which is particularly evident within the academy, when attempting to locate hegemonic whiteness within the educational structure. Even whilst the university is appearing to champion decolonising methodologies.

Interestingly, a similar phenomenon can be seen regarding other social areas and contexts. As discussed in my anecdote about mufti-day and the contemporary propensity for white people to go second-hand clothes shopping. The appropriation of a practice once associated with economically lower class people, such as Māori, highlights the link between hegemonic whiteness and the co-opting of marginalised experiences. Also, the evolving nature of hegemony can be seen here. As whiteness is hegemonic, then so to must whiteness evolve.

Furthermore, this can be seen in the questioning of the New Zealand History curriculum and perceptions of education more widely. I had suggested in a report that Pākehā, not Māori, were the group suffering due to the education system's choice not to teach New Zealand History. This lack of knowledge, I argued, resulted in racism towards Māori and the perpetuation of colonisation. However, I received feedback questioning the absence of educational issues Māori face from the discussion. This highlighted the inability to locate whiteness in discussion concerning racial issues. The introduction of education can disrupt social norms and expectations, that leads to defensive reactions from those who benefit from the status quo - thus challenges hegemonic whiteness. Unfortunately however, discussed earlier, the nature of hegemony is such that it subsumes challenges to its power.

This lack of knowledge of New Zealand history, can perhaps be seen in the anecdote I provided about the phone call with my friends. Perhaps if my friend had been exposed to some historical education, his perception of colonisation would have been different. This incident highlights the way in which hegemonic whiteness dismisses the experiences and knowledge of marginalised individuals. The hegemonic and white group in this instance, represented by my Pākehā friends, disregarded their position as the dominant group. This situation highlights the clear epistemic exploitation when a discussion occurs between disproportionately powerful groups, regarding the nature of oppression that the oppressed group faces. This also sheds light on the nature of hegemonic whiteness to evolve. Where this very same group had once framed me as a spokesperson for all Māori, they had now framed themselves as epistemic equals with their Māori spokesperson on Māori issues.

These encounters, I believe, reflect the need for the dismantling of oppressive structures that are created and maintained by hegemonic whiteness.

Significance to Policy

Political institutions and the subsidiary policy making processes are part of these structures. By examining the concept of hegemony within the context of whiteness, we can begin to understand how it operates as a complex system of power and consent; influencing values and ideologies and the policies they underpin. As stated earlier, although this research is in the field of Social Policy, policy is not the primary focus. The intention behind writing the thesis in this manner, about hegemony and whiteness, is to illustrate that hegemonic whiteness informs policy. As such, this section does not delve deeply into particular policies. The nature of hegemony and whiteness is such that it is inferred and implied within society, in the same way talking about those concepts in the way I have is to highlight that inference and implication as opposed to outright project it.

As mentioned in the introduction, there is an over-representation of Māori in New Zealand prisons. Drastic intervention in this area is greatly needed. However, discussions concerning incarceration rates are often focused individual actors and unconscious biases in the justice system (Department of Corrections, 2007). Supposed solutions are poorly funded, designed and delivered, focusing on addressing individual biases rather than altering processes and policies (Department of Corrections, 2007). As discussed throughout this thesis, hegemonic whiteness is inherent within anglo-colonial contexts. The issues of Māori incarceration rates is thus an issue with the socio-political structure. Blaming the biases of a few individuals, distracts from the breadth of hegemonic whiteness within political institutions.

The over policing of Māori, is just one way in which these incarceration numbers are met. Not only was this shown earlier regarding the photographing of young Māori boys, but according to the Department of Corrections (2020), Māori are over 5 times more likely to go through criminal proceedings, and 7 times more likely to go to jail than Pākehā. According to Hill (1986), the primary objective of the police is to uphold social control through state sanctioned force and coercion. Furthermore, any individual or group deviating from the prescribed behavioural norms may be subjected to police intervention and force; this is especially detrimental when the mere existence of a group challenges the state's established norms and structures (Hill, 1986).

As discussed earlier, although hegemony is primarily concerned with consent rather than force, hegemony does underpin political perspectives. Thus, the ideological underpinnings behind the policies that govern the police, are an example of hegemonic whiteness. Furthermore, as hegemony is perpetually evolving, so too is the connection to policy. In regard to policing in particular, Hill (1986) claims that if the forceful nature of policing is effective enough to subdue large threats to the desired social order – hegemonic whiteness – that the nature of policing will subtly evolve. This evolution occurs through the manner in which the general population will consent too gatekeeping and maintaining the social order themselves (Hill, 1986). In this way, the hegemonic whiteness that underpinned the initial policy making decisions that led to the police, has been subsumed by the general population, who in turn have normalised it.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Throughout the writing of this thesis, I felt lost many times. I struggled to write, I struggled to read. It was hard to focus on what I was trying to say in so many words. I knew what I thought, I believed in what I thought. It was just a challenge to articulate it in this manner. Even now, I don't know if I have achieved what I set out too. I think though, that is the nature of what I am attempting to illustrate in this research. I struggled to write this because it is such a large piece of work, that represents so many things. On one hand it is liberating, on the other it is shackling. In one way it is resistance, in another it is maintenance. Perhaps it is up to the reader decide which it is.

The primary purpose of this thesis was to demonstrate the ways in which racism manifests as an expression of whiteness, and to examine whiteness as a hegemonic construct. To do this, autoethnography was used as a research and writing method to identify and describe different manifestations of whiteness. By doing so the thesis made more visible the hegemonic nature of whiteness in New Zealand.

Whiteness has been used to justify colonisation, slavery, and racial discrimination and oppression. Whiteness is deeply embedded in social structures and norms, making it challenging to pinpoint and define, particularly for those who benefit from it. White privilege an aspect of whiteness, refers to the unearned advantages and benefits that white individuals receive based on their racial identity. These privileges occur in various aspects of life, from education, to employment, housing and the criminal justice system. Furthermore, whiteness is associated with presentation of white cultural norms as universal or superior, perpetuating and maintaining the discrimination of other culture's practices and identities. This has

resulted in systemic inequities and hierarchies that favour white individuals.

Some white individuals in New Zealand choose to identify as Pākehā. Some of the participants in the study examined, claimed that the identity of 'Pākehā' was used as a connection with Māori and with New Zealand. There is also evidence that it is an attempt to distance themselves from the term 'white'. Participants frequently expressed discomfort with being labelled as white due to its associations with white supremacy and racism. Whilst they accepted the existence of white privilege, their focus was on the systemic issues faced by Māori rather than confronting their own advantages. Colonisation has been, and still is, an inherent aspect within New Zealand. Colonisation of New Zealand is responsible for establishing whiteness as dominant.

The thesis also sought to discuss hegemony; as a function of power, and how it needs to be identified and addressed in terms of addressing racial discrimination and inequality. Gramsci introduced a redefined understanding of hegemony as a concept of power based on consent. Hegemony is more than just manipulation of ideologies or cultural dominance, and is not solely concerned with economic or coercive state control. Instead, it refers to the dominance of a particular social group, and their ideas and values, over society. This dominance is maintained exerted through many institutions such as the church and schools. According to Gramsci, individuals willingly embrace and adhere to these norms, because benefits accrue for them if they do.

Gramsci acknowledged that hegemony did coexist with social and cultural opposition. Hegemony does not seek domination of society, but rather leads it. The dynamic between hegemony and domination is diverse across societies and contexts, necessitating a nuanced understanding of each society's specific social context. Hegemony is inherently linked with time and place, constantly adjusting to maintain its power. As such, it is an ongoing process that continually reconstructs and evolves.

Chapters 3, 4 and 5 describe and discuss the interrelationships between racism and whiteness, as well as whiteness and hegemony. To achieve this, the thesis engaged with international academic research on Whiteness, Critical Race Theory, Tribal Critical Race Theory, and Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

While significant research has been conducted on the topic of Whiteness in certain parts of the world, particularly in the United States, the scholarship in New Zealand is relatively limited – as such, this research also aimed to explore Whiteness within the New Zealand context.

I applied these arguments to a Aotearoa New Zealand context by through an autoethnographic approach by taking a storytelling position in the introduction to each chapter. I also took this stance to address research from an Indigenous perspective and to push back on western conceptions of research that position the researchers separate from the research and those being researched. Through my personal stories, I demonstrate some of the nuanced ways in which I have experienced hegemonic whiteness, and how those experiences

have led to my thought. From schooling, to family and friends, my narratives seek to elucidate the pervasive nature of whiteness. My life and my experiences have been constructed through the normalised lens of whiteness therefore it is fitting that my experiences that are part of but also contrast with whiteness form the background to reflect on the theories discussed in my thesis. By doing so my voice of the writer was allowed to come through strongly, which I argue improves the quality of discussion concerning an issue such as Whiteness contextually.

The overarching argument of the thesis is that whiteness functions as a hegemonic force within New Zealand society. The challenges faced by Māori and other non-white groups can be attributed to the hegemony of whiteness in social, cultural, and institutional spaces. Conversely, white individuals benefit from privileges afforded to them by these very power structures, as they align with their values and norms. Maintaining the hegemony of whiteness relies on the normalisation of its influence. This perpetuates the marginalisation experienced by minority racial groups. This thesis emphasises the need to shift the focus of racial discussions towards whiteness. By addressing the hegemonic power structures that exclude and disadvantage minority groups, significant progress can be made in challenging the racial issues they face.

Future Research Directions

There is a lot of potential for further research in this area. I intend to do more in the future. A wide-reaching study, that examines whiteness in New Zealand may lend more credence to addressing some of the issues alluded too. Not just for Māori, addressing hegemonic

whiteness in New Zealand could shed light on the lived experience of many non-white peoples. The inclusion of non-white researchers and participants would be necessary for this. Furthermore, having some white researchers/participants involved may produce unforeseen perspectives on whiteness in their own lives. There is also the possibility of engaging in Collaborative Autoethnography. Individual accounts of the same situations, may offer some incredible and unforeseen perspectives on what experiences themselves.

Furthermore, one of the implications within whiteness as hegemony, is the capacity for hegemony to evolve. There was mention to some of the ways in which I have seen certain values and norms evolve over time, but a more comprehensive study of this would be great. Examining if power is actually changing, or if whiteness as hegemony is just subsuming some aspects of *te āo* Māori within it. My initial thought here, would be that power is not changing, but it is always nice to confirm that you are correct.

Limitations of the Thesis

Although intentional, the autoethnographic scope of this study is limiting. Using my own experiences as a part of the research was great for allowing some deeper thought about my experiences. I highly doubt that I would do it again though. It has been stressful, and there have been some emotional times. The nature in which I have engaged in autoethnography is also limiting, I have not talked about many of the good things in my life. Perhaps this as an issue with autoethnography more broadly. An issue that may not occur with more empirical research.

Regarding policy, there could have been much more development in that area. Again, although it was intentional not to engage deeply. Policy does however play a huge part in society, be it resisting or supporting social norms and values and more research is needed in to reflect on the concrete ways policy-making can be challenged to take hegemonic whiteness into account.

References

Adams, T. E., Holman, J. S., & Ellis, C. (2014). *Autoethnography*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Anderson, P. (2017). *The antinomies of Antonio Gramsci.* Verso.

Anderson, L. (2010). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *35*(4), 373–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449

Berenstain, N. (2016). Epistemic exploitation. *Ergo*, *3*(22), 569-590. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ergo/12405314.0003.022?view=text;rgn=main

Bishop, M. (2021). 'Don't tell me what to do' encountering colonialism in the academy and pushing back with indigenous autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *34*(5), 367-378.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). New racism, color-blind racism, and the future of whiteness in America. In A.W Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 271–284). Routledge.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, *37*(5), 425-446.

Brown, K. & Jackson, D. (2013). The history and conceptual elements of critical race theory. In A. Lynne & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 9-22). Routledge.

Buey, F. F., & Gray, N. S. (2014). *Reading Gramsci*. BRILL.

Burgio, A. (2020). Gramsci, historian of Modernity. In F. Jameson & R. Dainotto (Eds.), *Gramsci in the world* (pp. 38-59). Duke University Press

Butz, & Besio, K. (2009). Autoethnography. *Geography Compass*, *3*(5), 1660–1674. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00279.x

Cardwell, H. (2022, January 12). Police to no longer photograph youth unless in custody, barrister concerned arrests of Māori could increase. *RNZ. https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/459415/police-to-no-longer-photograph-youth-unless-in-custody-barrister-concerned-arrests-of-maori-could-increase*

Cammett, J, M. (1967). *Antonio Gramsci and the origins of Italian communism.* Stanford University Press.

Carey, M. (2018). *The Transformative Process of Indigenous Autoethnography: (Re)Connecting with Kaupapa Māori.* Sage Research Methods Cases in Sociology. Sage Publications Ltd.

Chang, H., Hernandez, K.-A. C., & Ngunjiri, F. W. (2016). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315432137

Crehan, K. (2018). Antonio Gramsci: Towards an ethnographic marxism. *Anuac, 7*(2), 133-150. https://doi.org/10.7340/anuac2239-625X-3453

Crossley, N. (2005). *Key concepts in social critical theory.* Sage.

Dainotto, R. M., & Jameson, F. (2020). *Gramsci in the World*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv14t48sk

Davy, K. (1995). Outing whiteness: A feminist/lesbian project. *Theatre Journal, 47,* 189-205.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). NYU Press.

Department of Corrections. (2020). *Corrections Volumes: 2019-2020*. https://www.corrections.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/41191/Corrections_Volumes_Report_2019-2020.pdf

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. Routledge.

Femia, J. V. (1981). *Gramsci's political thought: Hegemony, consciousness, and the revolutionary process*. Oxford University Press.

Flagg, B.J. (1998). *Was blind, but now I see: White race consciousness and the law*. New York University Press.

Frankenberg R (1993). *The social construction of whiteness: White women, race matters.* University of Minnesota Press

Fresu, G. (2022). *Antonio Gramsci: An intellectual biography*. Springer International Publishing AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15610-6

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, critical race theory, and the primacy of racism: race, class, gender, and disability in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(3), 277-287.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education.* Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1975). *Prison notebooks* (J. A. Buttigieg & A. Calari, Trans.). Columbia University Press.

Gramsci, A. (2007). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith, Trans.). Lawrence and Wishart.

Gray, C., Jaber, N., & Anglem, J. (2013). Pakeha identity and whiteness: What does it mean to be white?. *Sites: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies*, *10*(2), 82–106. https://doi.org/10.11157/sites-vol10iss2id223

Gray-Sharp, K. (2021). *My responsibility in the face of mass extinction* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato]. Research Commons. https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/14209/thesis.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y

Guess, T. J. (2006). The social construction of whiteness: Racism by intent, racism by consequence. *Critical Sociology*, *32*(4), 649–673. https://doi.org/10.1163/156916306779155199

Hall, S. (2016). Domination and hegemony. In J. D. Slack & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Cultural studies 1983: A theoretical history* (pp. 155-179). Duke University Press.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review, 106*(8), 1707–1791. https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787

Hermes, M. (1999). Research methods as a situated response: Toward a First Nations' methodology. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is…race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 83-100). Westview Press.

Hepi, M. (2008). *Pakeha identity and Maori language and culture: Bicultural identity and language in New Zealand.* VDM Verlag Dr. Muller.

Hill, D. J. (2010). A brief commentary on the Hegelian-Marxist origins of Gramsci's 'philosophy of praxis'. In P. Mayo (Ed.), *Gramsci and educational thought* (pp. 5-20). Wiley-Blackwell.

Hill, R. S. (1986). *Policing the Colonial Frontier: Part 1*. Government Printer.

Hokowhitu, B. (2009). Indigenous existentialism and the body. *Cultural Studies Review, 15*(2), 101-118.

Holst. J. D. (2010). The revolutionary part in Gramsci's pre-prison educational and political theory and practice. In P. Mayo (Ed.), *Gramsci and educational thought* (pp. 38-56). Wiley-Blackwell.

Holst, J. D., & Pizzolato, N. (Eds.). (2017). *Antonio Gramsci: A pedagogy to change the world* (Vol. 5). Springer.

Hooks, B. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black.* South End Press.

Horford, S. D., & Grosland, T. J. (2013). Badges of inferiority: The racialization of achievement in U.S education. In A. Lynne & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 153-166). Routledge.

Hunn, J. K. (1961). *Report on Department of Māori Affairs*. Government Printer

Hyde, C. (1995). The meanings of whiteness. *Qualitative Sociology, 18*(1), 80s.

Ignatiev, N., & Garvey, J. (1996). *Race traitor* (Eds.). Routledge.

Ives, P. (2004). *Language and Hegemony in Gramsci.* Pluto Press.

Jackson, M. (1988). *Māori and the criminal justice System.* https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/108675NCJRS.pdf

Jackson, R. L., & McKinney, J. G. (Eds.). (2021). *Self+Culture+Writing: Autoethnography for/as Writing Studies*. University Press of Colorado.

Johnson, L. L. (2017). The racial hauntings of one black male professor and the disturbance of the self(ves): Self-actualization and racial storytelling as pedagogical practices. *Journal of Literacy Research 49*(4), 476-502.

Jones, S. (2006). *Antonio Gramsci.* Routledge.

Ministry of Justice. (n.d.) *National action plan against racism.* https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/national-action-plan-against-racism/

Kreps, D. (2015). *Gramsci and Foucault: A reassessment*. Ashgate.

Lovejoy, A. O. (1971). *The great chain of being : A study of the history of an idea.* https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz

Mahoney, M. R. (1995). Segregation, whiteness, and transformation. U*niversity of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *143*(5), 1659–1684. https://doi.org/10.2307/3312488

Marks, J. (2013). Great chain of being. In P. L. Mason (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of race and racism* (2nd ed.). Gale.

Mayo, P. (2010a). Antonio Gramsci and his relevance to the education of adults. In P. Mayo (Ed.), *Gramsci and educational thought* (pp. 21-37). Wiley-Blackwell.

Mayo, P. (2010b). Introduction: Anotnio Gramsci and educational thought. In P. Mayo (Ed.), *Gramsci and educational thought* (pp. 1-4). Wiley-Blackwell.

McAllister, T. (2021, May 28). 50 reasons there are no Māori in your science department. *E-tangata.* https://e-tangata.co.nz/reflections/50-reasons-there-are-no-maori-in-your-science-department/

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. working paper No. 189.* Wellesley College.

Mika, C. (2015a). Counter-colonial and philosophical claims: an indigenous observation of western philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*(11), 1136-1142.

Mika, C. (2015b). The co-existence of self and thing through Ira: A Māori phenomenology. *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology, 2*(1), 93-112.

Mills, C. W. (2015). Global white ignorance. In M. Gross & L. Mcgoey (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of ignorance studies* (p. 217-227). Routledge.

Ministry for Culture and Heritage. (2021). *The dawn raids: causes, impacts and legacy.* https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/dawn-raids

Morrison, T. (1993). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Vintage.

Nakayama, T., & Krizek, L. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81*, 291-309.

Nnawulezi, N., Case, K. A., & Settles, I. (2020). Ambivalent White Racial Consciousness: Examining Intersectional Reflection and Complexity in Practitioner Graduate Training. Women & therapy, 43(3-4), 365–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2020.1729476

Orkin, M., & Joubin, A.A. (2019). *Race* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi-org.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/10.4324/9781315696232

Peregrine, P. N. (2013). Racial hierarchy. In P. L. Mason (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of race and racism* (2nd ed.). Gale.

Rains, F. V. (2003). To greet the dawn with open eyes: American Indians, white privilege and the power of residual guilt in the social studies. In G. LadsonBillings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 199-227). Information Age Publishing.

Rangihau, J., Manuel, E., Hall, D., Brennan, H., Boag, P., Reedy, T., & Grant, J. (1988). PUAO-TE-ATA-TU. Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/archive/1988-puaoteatatu.pdf

Roediger, D. (1994). *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness.* Verso.

Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies* (2nd ed.). Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.

Solorzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano Scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121–136.

Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., Pearson, D., & Sedgwick, C. (1984). *Tauiwi: Racism and ethnicity in New Zealand.* The Dunmore Press Limited.

Stats NZ. (2019). *New Zealand's population reflects growing diversity.* https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/new-zealands-population-reflects-growing-diversity

Takezawa, Y. I., Smedley, A., & Wade, P. (2023). race. https://www.britannica.com/topic/race-human

Thomas, R. (2022, September 8). Police took illegal photos, fingerprints of young Māori, report finds. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/129813783/police-took-illegal-photos-fingerprints-of-young-mori-report-finds

Torfing, J. (1999). *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek.* Wiley-Blackwell.

UMass Dartmouth. (2014, February 12). *Racism Without Racists - Eduardo Bonilla-Silva* [Video]. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ca242jyoRX4&ab_channel=UMassDartmouth

Van Dijk, T. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Sage.

Wellman, D. (1993). *Portraits of White Racism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Williams, R. A. (1997). Vampires anonymous and critical race practice, 95 Mich. L. Rev. 741. Reprinted in R. Delgado and J. Stefancic (Eds.), (2001) *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (2nd ed.) (pp. 6-14). Temple University Press.

Wilson, J. (2017). *Neoliberalism*. Taylor & Francis Group.

Whitinui, P. (2014). Indigenous autoethnography: Engaging, and experiencing "self" as a native method of inquiry. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 43*(4), 456-487.

Williams, N. (2021). *Autoethnography: A Decolonizing Research Methodological Approach.* Sage Research Methods Cases. Sage Publishers Ltd.

Wilson, W. A., & Yellow Bird, M. (Eds.). (2005). *For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook.* School of American Research Press.

Writer, J. H. (2008). Unmasking, exposing, and confronting: Critical race theory, tribal critical race theory and multicultural education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 10*(2). https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v10i2.137

Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). Telling the real tale of the hunt: Toward a race conscious sociology of racial stratification. In T. Zuberi & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White logic, white methods: Racism and methodology* (pp. 329–342). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.