Introduction

This chapter explores Kaupapa Māori forms of autoethnography for critical research in Māori/Indigenous education and related social domains. Autoethnography is “born of the ‘crisis in representation’ [and reflects] discontentment with traditional research practices” (Houston, 2007, p. 45). This stance links it to critical theory, post-modernist and post-structuralist philosophies, and recent research approaches, including narrative research, writing as a method of inquiry, and post-qualitative inquiry (Denzin, 2014; Hughes & Pennington, 2017; Richardson, 2001). This chapter suggests that autoethnographic methods share ground with Kaupapa Māori research methodology (Pihama et al., 2002; Walker et al., 2006). Autoethnography offers benefits as a method of choice for Kaupapa Māori researchers (and Indigenous researchers more generally), especially for studying topics related to identity, and for researchers who are immersed and/or expert in the topics of their research. The point is that Kaupapa Māori research methodology is concerned primarily with the paradigm and ethics of research – it sets up the philosophical basis and provides guidance for how to approach the field, but does not specify any particular approach in terms of methods of data collection.

Intent on bringing voice to their communities, Māori and Indigenous researchers in education have so far focused mainly on qualitative interview research methodologies, along with smaller numbers of other ‘traditional’ qualitative research methodologies, i.e. small-scale surveys, observation or case studies. This pattern is consistent with education research in general, which is dominated by interview research. There is no doubt that interviews are valuable for Māori/Indigenous research, given their face-to-face nature and the emphasis on experiences. But the dominance of ‘interview research’ crowds out the claims of other possible research approaches. The empirical busywork of qualitative interview research conceals its implicit background allegiances to phenomenology, humanism, and other Western theoretical and philosophical bases. A significant proportion of Māori/Indigenous researchers are immersed in the educational scenarios and topics they are investigating. In such cases, autoethnography is worth considering as an alternative form of methodology, offering a different approach to data collection and analysis that can supplement or replace interviews, surveys or observations (Chang, 2016). In this way autoethnographic methods could add to existing research toolboxes of Māori and Indigenous researchers. Autoethnography has been criticised and opposed,
however, by an attitude that such methods are not ‘scientific’. But this argument is dubious, since the whole premise of qualitative research is non-scientific. Autoethnography is one form of qualitative research to consider when the primary researcher is embedded and experienced in the context of their research question. It facilitates the efficient collection of other forms of data (i.e. other than interview transcripts) and constitutes a powerful approach for investigating Māori identities and ideas, as shown by the examples below. Autoethnographic elements can combine well in a research project with other methodologies, including other post-qualitative methods such as policy, philosophical, literature or critical discourse analysis, or empirical methods such as interview or survey. Nancy Taber (2010) argued for the benefits of combining institutional ethnography together with autoethnography and narrative.

As a research approach, autoethnography has existed in the literature for about 30 years, but is still considered marginal as a methodology. While the number of published books and articles written either about autoethnography or using autoethnography is growing rapidly, a journal of autoethnography has only existed since 2020 (Adams & Herrmann, 2020). The paragraphs below link autoethnography in five ways: (1) as part of the ‘auto-turn’ in research, (2) to narrative research, (3) to post-qualitative inquiry, (4) to writing [as] a method of inquiry (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2018), and (5) to decolonising methodologies (Smith, 2012).

(1) **Auto-turn:** Probably the key characteristic of autoethnography is an attitude of starting from the life of the researcher themselves, embedded in their topic, as a source of data (Denzin, 2014; Ellis & Bochner, 2000). The auto-turn emerges from the ‘crisis of representation’ which brings attention to the positionality of the author, or the ‘politics of position’ (Jackson, 1991, p. 134). It is standard in published qualitative research to include a positioning statement, or some acknowledgement of the researcher’s link to the topic being studied. To declare one’s personal investment in one’s research topic is seen as an ethical practice consistent with the norms of qualitative research. Autoethnography extrapolates that principle to exploit as much as possible the researcher’s own experiences relating to the question being investigated. To capitalise on the researcher’s background in the context of the question adds ‘power’ to the research findings, while also simultaneously ‘weakening’ the research methodology according to norms of science and objectivity. Scare quotes are needed for these words denoting research ‘quality’ since their meanings in context utterly depend on presupposed agreements, which methodologies such as autoethnography put under a new microscope. Autoethnography is the flag-bearer of the ‘auto-turn’ in research methodology, as epistemology turns inwards, away from the Archimedean point of presumed objectivity.

(2) **Narrative research:** Autoethnography research is necessarily written in narrative genres – how else could we write about our experiences? – so it could reasonably be considered a type of narrative research. Capitalising on the narrative writing mode demands using the devices of narrative genres to construct a text that confronts the reader with the complexity and emotional content of the situation being investigated. Arthur Bochner (1997) illustrates the power of autoethnography to convey emotion and affect when he writes about his father’s unexpected death, the collision between his personal and professional worlds it caused, and the learnings and insights that were catalysed. Autoethnography provides useful ways of illuminating the emotional or affective aspects of situations within our social and professional lives, which are seldom amenable to more traditional, empirical research methods. It has been useful for documenting issues, including: the impact at personal levels of larger changes in universities (Sparkes, 2007); the range of responses to the nexus between sport and nationalism (Bruce, 2014); the traumatic experiences of the transgender
individual (Booth & Spencer, 2021), etc. Autoethnography is best utilised when the topic being studied is emotionally impactful, and of which the researcher has personal experience.

(3) **Post-qualitative inquiry:** Autoethnography fits under the umbrella of post-qualitative inquiry (St. Pierre, 2018), which looks past the residual scientism in qualitative research methodology. Post-qualitative research takes account of 21st-century developments in science, philosophy and methodology. Elizabeth St. Pierre describes how she ‘encountered the incommensurabilities’ between poststructuralist theories and qualitative methods as she wrote her doctoral dissertation (St. Pierre, 2018, p. 603), which prompted her to develop the concept of ‘post-qualitative inquiry.’ Autoethnography lends itself to being used in combination with other non-empirical methods, such as philosophical, policy, literature, or critical discourse analysis in order to build up the ‘layers’ of a post-qualitative inquiry (Rath, 2012).

(4) **Writing as a method of inquiry:** Autoethnography is fully cognisant of the commitment required to write texts that readers (students, teachers, researchers and community members) want to read, in line with a confession by Laurel Richardson that she found most qualitative research ‘boring’ to read (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2018, p. 818). Autoethnographic texts result from a process of careful reflection on one’s experiences and one’s reading (Adams et al., 2014), and thus are highly reflexive. Autoethnography provides an opportunity for intense creative introspection and is closely linked to action research and reflective practice. In these ways, the ‘data collection’ part of autoethnography can bear similarity with a notion of ‘self-interview.’ The emphasis on reflexive writing makes autoethnography a useful approach for researching complex Māori identities and ideas. As demonstrated below, I draw on personal examples to show how autoethnography works together with writing as a Māori method of inquiry (Stewart, 2021) in exploring complex topics of Māori identity (Stewart & Stewart-Harawira, 2020).

(5) **Decolonising research methodologies:** The main point of this chapter is to argue that autoethnography has a place in Kaupapa Māori research, which is a local Aotearoa New Zealand form of decolonising research methodology. A similar argument is made for autoethnography as a research methodology in psychology by Trinidadian-American scholar Norissa Williams (2021). Williams focuses on the potential of autoethnography as a decolonising research approach, of relevance to “marginalized communities” (Williams, 2021, p. 2). Psychology as a discipline is closely related to education, so it makes sense that autoethnography would offer similar benefits for Māori and Indigenous researchers in both fields. Psychology research, as found, for example, in education, is heavily influenced by (arguably illegitimate) notions of scientific status, which autoethnography flagrantly breaches as a matter of course. Williams argues that autoethnography provides a means for researchers to speak powerfully against the systems of (White) power that are implicit in ‘traditional’, i.e. scientific (or scientistic) research methodologies. Williams points out that autoethnography “doesn’t just tell a story” but also includes substantive analysis “of personal experience to understand cultural experience” (p. 6). Williams recounts her personal and family experiences of cultural clashes and mental illness to explain why she turned away from traditional psychological methods and towards autoethnography:

These personal circumstances charged my desire to come to understand cultural differences in the experience and manifestation of mental illness, cross cultural differences in causal attributions for mental illness; cultural rituals and healing practices, and cross cultural differences in help seeking behaviors. I wanted to know more. It seemed appropriate to start from within.

*Williams, 2021, p. 5*
In terms of *how* to go about recording personal experiences, Williams notes "[t]here is no one way to collect data for an autoethnography" (Williams, 2021, p. 6). Autoethnography is not a methodology that follows a tight process and script. This is because in writing autoethnography, researchers have available to them all the devices of creative writing, which means each researcher has agency to find their own writing voice; their own way to document and examine their experiences. In keeping with the genre, the next section provides an account of my own experiences with autoethnographic research methods.

**Unexpected journey: scientific method to Māori autoethnography**

My interest in autoethnography is based on my own personal trajectory rather than as the result of any strategic decision. I first learned about research by studying science as a school leaver, enrolling in a Bachelor of Science and continuing on to complete an MSc in Chemistry, consisting of seven papers plus a thesis. In undertaking Master's research in Chemistry in 1980, I found that the theories, methods and data pertaining to my study were clear, unambiguous, and distinct from each other. Methodology concerned decisions about which chemical substances to react together and why, under what conditions, and how to assess the reaction progress and products. The literature review was a relatively simple summary of previously published papers on similar reactions. I don't recall much attention being paid to the writing of the thesis: it mostly equated to ‘writing up’ the conditions and results of the chemical reactions conducted as experimental laboratory work. There was no mention of paradigm, ethics, politics or philosophy in my BSc/MSc studies.

Apart from a one-year graduate diploma in teaching, I first studied Education at the doctoral level beginning in 2001, using my then 20-year-old MSc to support my enrolment in a Doctor of Education (EdD), studying part-time as a distance student. My return to doctoral study was catalysed by my unusual practical experience as a teacher of Pūtaiao or Māori-medium school science, and I enrolled with pre-formed understandings of key research concepts such as theory, data, findings and methodology. The EdD pathway is beneficial for students with qualifying degrees from other disciplines due to its scaffolded provisional period, typically comprising four part-time semesters of study, which cover the introduction, methodology and literature review elements of a doctoral thesis, and the writing of the full research proposal for confirmation as a doctoral thesis candidate. With my lecturer’s help, I submitted an essay I wrote during this period to an international journal (Stewart, 2005). When the reviews came back, I was surprised to see my essay referred to as ‘research’ – a disjunction caused by the clash between my former science-based ideas of research, on the one hand, and the nature of theoretical educational research, on the other.

Eventually, after gaining more experience in educational research, I came to see that qualitative educational researchers tend to occupy one of two camps: (1) those who DO consider a literature review to be research in its own right, and (2) those who do NOT; and that the difference relates to distinct ways of thinking about education, knowledge and research, all tied up with how to think about methodology and writing. These two camps relate to the way the ‘world of writing has been divided into two separate kinds: literary and scientific’ (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2018, p. 819). Researchers in the first camp view all forms of writing as potentially contributing to advancing understanding about education, while those in the second camp equate ‘research’ with the process of collecting data (conducting interviews is frequently referred to as ‘the research’ in postgraduate dissertations) that is then ‘analysed’ to produce ‘new knowledge’. The scare quotes show my scepticism towards the claims made by this thinking, stuck in the pseudo-scientific mode. A researcher (like me) coming to
qualitative research from a previous training in science is confronted by the ‘pseudo-science’ trappings found throughout traditional qualitative research – both in form, such as numbering everything, and in crude ideas such as the fallacious view that a small-scale survey study counts as ‘quantitative’ research, or that using two sources of information equates to ‘triangulation’. The attitudes towards research and writing found in the first camp are linked to greater interest in the philosophy and theory of education. Those in the second camp are often explicitly motivated by the need for a wider range of views and voices to be represented in national educational discourse. The second camp is more likely to privilege ‘scientific’ modes of writing as being valid in research.

Qualitative research finds application across a wide swath of scholarly fields, some of which are more heavily influenced by science (such as health sciences) and others less so (such as creative writing and the arts). The world of research overall is heavily dependent on science for accepted criteria and standards of knowledge creation. It is ironic that while the world of working science has long ago moved on from a naïve realist approach to a ‘lockstep method’ the mythical beast of ‘scientific method’ still continues to hold residual sway in social science fields of research, including education. It seems likely that using qualitative research methods in fields closer to science (e.g. health sciences) induces more anxiety about ‘scientific rigour’ than for researchers further from science, such as in the arts. Interview research may be said, for example, to require a minimum of (say) 15 interviews to be considered ‘rigorous’; and the use of coding software for thematic analysis of interview data, while made much of in methodology sections, is more scientistic than scientific.

It is all too easy to create reified binaries whereby interview research (of the appropriate details) is seen as ‘rigorous’ and autoethnography and other post-qualitative methodologies are seen as ‘non-scientific’. Autoethnography makes sense if one applies relevant ethical principles and processes. Appropriate methodologies arise from: (1) the details of the research question; and (2) the details of the researcher’s connection to the research context and topic. More Māori researchers could – and perhaps should – consider autoethnography as a legitimate methodology for undertaking Kaupapa Māori research. The next section argues this case using examples from the research literature.

Kaupapa Māori research and autoethnography

There is a useful affinity between critical indigenous theory, including Kaupapa Māori theory, and the ‘post’ traditions (postmodernism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, posthumanism). It therefore makes sense that post-qualitative methods of inquiry, including autoethnography, should be useful for Kaupapa Māori and other critical Indigenous researchers, as this chapter argues. Reflexive study of the culture of Kaupapa Māori research serves Māori interests and politics, given that Kaupapa Māori research is, by definition, politically motivated and activist. Post-qualitative inquiry serves Kaupapa Māori because it interrogates claims to truth and power, which is a politically activist stance and process.

Writing autoethnography allows space for using te reo Māori (the Māori language) in written research outputs (e.g. see Whitinui, 2014). This is a key point for scholars who follow the principles of Kaupapa Māori research, one of which is privileging Māori language, culture and thought at all stages of research. There is a growing level of support in Aotearoa New Zealand for including te reo Māori as an official national language in all forms of publicly funded discourse, including the science journals published by Royal Society Te Apārangi (www.royalsociety.org.nz/). There has been a recent explosion in bilingual and
Māori-medium publishing across many genres, including academic journals and books. Of course, the borrowing of Māori words, phrases and concepts is a unique characteristic of the New Zealand form of English. The number of books on Māori topics is immense and ever-growing, and te reo Māori has always been included to various degrees within this vigorous corpus. The pressure towards biculturalism necessarily includes bilingualism, since from a Māori perspective, there is no possibility of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand without te reo Māori (Stewart, 2019).

The concept of *Indigenous Autoethnography* has been found in Indigenous Australasia for at least 14 years (Bainbridge, 2007), with Jennifer Houston (2007) addressing Indigenous Australian researchers and advocating they consider autoethnography as a research methodology. Houston uses the pronoun ‘our’ in phrases such as ‘our ancestors’ so declaring her position as an insider-researcher, i.e. identifying as Indigenous Australian. Apart from such subtle hints of positionality, this 2007 article is written in strictly academic language, drawing on the first edition of *Decolonizing methodologies* (Smith, 1999), and revealing nothing about the author other than her institution details. Paul Whitinui (2014) published an extended journal article on Indigenous autoethnography in which he interwove a personal expression of self-identity with a theorisation of the links between stories+writing in research, and political aims of Māori research. In a contrasting writing style to that of Houston (2007), Whitinui (2014) includes significant elements of Māori language and culture, bringing forward the author’s Māori identity into the writing of the text in (at least) three ways: in section titles throughout the paper; in a page-long two-column greeting and introduction using traditional oratory language forms (p. 457); and in the concepts included in the paper’s discussions.

Values such as *whakawhanaungatanga* (positive relationships), *tama toa* (being strong in times of adversity), *manaakitanga* (looking after others), *papa kāinga* (positive home environment), *nohoanga tangata* (community connectedness), *whakaaro tahi* (interactions), *tohungatanga* (relevant skills and expertise), *whānau* (family connectedness), *wairua* (spiritual connectedness), *hinengaro* (positive thoughts and feelings), *tinana* (physical capability and well-being), *mātauranga* (relevant knowledge), and *ehoa mā* (positive friends) were all around me, but not within, because my primary focus while growing up was on playing sport.

(Whitinui, 2014, p. 464; emphases in original)

Similarly, a recent article by Michelle Bishop (2021) puts her Indigenous Australian positioning upfront from the first sentence: “I am a Gamilaroi woman belonging to the country now known as Australia” (p. 367). She states:

I utilise Indigenous autoethnography as a cultural imperative to ‘walk my talk’, embedding an autoethnographic dataset of reflection, poetry, emotion, and subjective blurring in response to my experiences of colonialism in the academy.

(Bishop, 2021, p. 367)

These three examples all share aspects in common with the premise and presentation of this chapter. There is also a strong emergent strand of Pacific autoethnography in educational research in Aotearoa New Zealand (Fa’avae, 2018; Iosefo, 2018; Matapo, 2018). The step this chapter takes is specifically to connect autoethnography with Kaupapa Māori (Hoskins & Jones, 2017).
Kaupapa Māori research: is related to ‘being Māori’; is connected to Māori philosophy and principles; takes for granted the legitimacy of Māori, the importance of Māori language and culture; and is concerned with ‘the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well being’ (Smith, 2012, p. 187). Autoethnography is an approach that allows the researcher to express ‘being Māori’ in writing their research, and, by rejecting the residual and distorted influences of science on ideas about research, enables the researcher to take up Māori philosophy and principles more explicitly, as part of a critical, politicised approach to, and motivation for, research. For these reasons I argue that Kaupapa Māori and autoethnography work well together: positing a Kaupapa Māori approach to autoethnography that I call ‘Kaupapa Māori autoethnography’. The next section below focuses in more detail on a specific example from my own research of using Kaupapa Māori autoethnography.

Applying autoethnography to research on Māori identities

The complexity of contemporary Māori identities can most powerfully be presented to a reader through narratives or stories (King, 2003). The kinds of stories we can tell in autoethnographic research will vary according to circumstance, but include:

- autobiographical narratives;
- re-telling personal experiences as a form of data collection;
- re-working interview data into ‘ethnographic fiction’ stories;
- re-telling traditional ethnic narratives about the world, the human being, knowledge and learning;
- constructing collective histories;
- writing short stories that provoke us to think about education in a new way; etc.

I used personal narratives in an article I co-authored with my Māori friend and colleague Makere (Stewart & Stewart-Harawira, 2020), to explore the question of recovering lost Māori identities, and how accepted notions of who ‘counts’ as Māori have shifted over time. These shifts reflect changes in the intercultural relationship between Māori (Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa) and Pākehā (settler New Zealanders, particularly those of British origins), which take place over time, in response to larger social and economic changes. Inter-ethnic liaisons and marriages have been common throughout the history of the Māori–Pākehā relationship, but the acceptance of such unions has changed over time, from both Pākehā and Māori perspectives, as have the identity choices available to their descendants. In earlier times, the identity choices available were stark: until 1951, the Māori population was counted in a separate census, and, until 1926, those identified as half-caste were assigned on the basis of lifestyle to either the Māori or European population.

Since then, Māori identity has moved well past expecting a person to choose only Māori things, as in material and symbolic culture (clothing, foods, language, etc), in order to be accepted by self and others as Māori, since fully traditional Māori ways of life long ago became untenable under colonised conditions. In the contemporary milieu, a minimal claim to Māori ethnicity depends on being able to identify whakapapa (genealogical links), i.e. the primordial aspect of ethnicity, whereas the situational aspects relating to way of life are not seen as definitive. The category of who is accepted as Māori has greatly expanded in the past
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few generations, and now includes an enormous range of people, on a continuum of identity from those who know they have a Māori ancestor but are otherwise Pākehā, to those who have grown up speaking and living as Māori and could never ‘pass’ as Pākehā. The changing nature of Māori identity over the generations demonstrates what it means to say that ethnicity is relational – dynamic, sensitive to social context, not fixed within the individual person, as implied by the fallacious pseudo-biological concept of ‘race’ or the proto-genetic ‘fractions’ model of Māori identity.

The project that led to the publication of this article began with an authentic personal story of loss of identity, in which my friend had been subject to a rumour that she had invented her claim to be Māori through whakapapa (ancestry). Her experience was similar to my mother’s, and in the article we each included a named narrative of lost and recovered Māori identity from our own history, written in the first person. I recalled as a child being told a patriarchal, racist, pseudo-scientific, family myth: that the ‘Māori blood’ of one ancestress in my mother’s otherwise colonial English family had been blamed for a tendency towards ‘mental illness in the women of the family’. Makere shared a few snippets of her long, difficult journey of recovering the knowledge of her whakapapa and finding people who had known her maternal grandfather as Māori.

Literature that inspired us in taking this approach to exploring this important topic of complex and recovering Māori identities came from a Māori women’s journal Te Pua published 1992–4 (Harris, 1996). Jon Warren (1994) wrote about having one Māori grandparent: identifying as Māori, going to a hostel for Māori girls, but being white-skinned: “always, there was this preoccupation with white” (p. 28). Warren recalls feeling confused about her identity: “The truth was, I didn’t know who I was. But there was always someone willing to tell me” (p. 28). Reina Whaitiri (1992) recounts a more typical experience of racism, as one of only two Māori girls attending her private boarding school. She was nicknamed “Hone Heke” by fellow students as a racist caricature, and was often chosen to represent the school as a “token gesture” (p. 10) when, for example, the school was welcoming important visitors. Fiona Cram (1994) writes about being raised as white, “looking at my skin, looking at my parents’ skin, and believing I was white” (p. 21). “Who are all these Māori kids’ Dad?” “They’re your cousins.” “But I’m white aren’t I?” (p. 21). Cram documents her “steep learning curve” in acquiring enough knowledge to be accepted as Māori (p. 23). “I know about being a ‘born-again’ Māori. Meant as an insult but proudly accepted as the truth. A whakapapa that needs some work, lots of questions to raise again” (Cram, 1994, p. 23).

To write about the writing of the article is to appreciate how stories can be told about stories being told, and on and on in endless narrative cycles. The narrative is an innate human form of transmitting and remembering complex arrays of information and history. Other women’s stories were also woven into the article, including that of Rachel Dolezal, who passed herself off as Black despite having no Black ancestry, and Rebecca Tuvel (2017), who included Dolezal in her controversial article likening ‘transracialism’ to ‘transgenderism’. Also mentioned was the scandal caused by photographs showing Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau as a young man wearing ‘blackface’ makeup on at least two occasions. The methodology of our article wove together personal and other narratives with critical literature work and scholarly commentary on the contextualised question of loss and recovery of Māori identities. This article demonstrates how autoethnography can add power to a small-scale study in ways that align with the principles of Kaupapa Māori.
Conclusion

The term “autoethnography” centrally denotes an acceptance of the potential and benefit of allowing the life of the researcher to enter as a source of data into qualitative (and post-qualitative) educational research. Autoethnography, along with the theoretical ‘posts’ and other recent methodologies, has emerged as a result of the ‘crisis of representation’ in research and theory, which destabilised both the authority of the text and the autonomy of the author. In qualitative research, it greatly increased the importance of positionality, i.e. the relationship between the researcher and the research. Autoethnography is an outstanding example of an approach that aspires to complete the mission of qualitative research by stepping fully out of the shadows cast by science over educational research, in particular questions about truth and the reliability of findings.

Kaupapa Māori originated as a theory associated with an Indigenous community-driven form of education in Aotearoa, and has over several decades grown into a widespread social and intellectual movement. Kaupapa Māori acts as a lens that can be placed over a research approach like autoethnography because, although it guides research paradigm and ethics, it does not specify data collection methods. Putting the two together, Kaupapa Māori autoethnography is a label for an approach to research that harnesses the power of both parent traditions, for Māori purposes, by and with Māori people. It seems reasonable to expect to see more of it in the near future. Tēnā rā tātou katoa (Greetings to all).

Glossary

All Māori words are translated in brackets on first appearance. This list gives Māori words used more than once. Meanings are as used in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>Māori name for New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa</td>
<td>Base, topic, philosophy, cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>European New Zealanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tē reo Māori</td>
<td>The Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Genealogy, family tree, relationality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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