

# SOCIAL IDENTITY RESPONSES TO COLONISATION



JOHN REID AND MATTHEW ROUT

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN: Unpublished

## ***Social identity responses to colonization***

The process of colonization in settler colonies gives rise to a range of complex social identity issues as the settler and indigenous cultures clash, come together, and merge. This paper explores this phenomenon among self-identifying tribal members of Ngāi Tahu – a tribe of Māori indigenous to Te Waipounamu (the South Island of New Zealand). In particular it traces the impacts of colonization on social identity across generations, demonstrating that in response to the political, economic, and social policies of the settler state a range of social identities have emerged among Ngāi Tahu. We demonstrate how these social identities have shifted across generations, how they change as individuals develop over their lifespan, and how they emerge based on an individual's situation.

However, before exploring these phenomena within the results section of this paper, it is first necessary to provide some theoretical structure and terminology to support discussion. To develop this structure we first explain what we mean by social identity, and explain social identity theory. We then explore literature from the fields of indigenous studies, postcolonial studies, and applied psychology, each of which provides insight regarding the social identity responses of indigenous people to colonization. We conclude from this literature that there is a spectrum of identity responses that fit within four main categories. We refer to these as the Social Identity Responses to Colonization (SIRC). Drawing further upon the literature we also show how these identity responses are dynamic and may shift generationally, developmentally, and interactionally, depending upon political, economic, or social context.

### ***Social identity***

Social identity is a component of an individual's self-concept that comes from their perception of group membership(s) (Tajfel, 1981). Members of a group sharing a common

social identity form an in-group, while all others are the out-group. The markers of in-group status – which can range from language to looks, ancestry to beliefs – and the dynamics between and in- and out-groups are critical in the formation of social groups. In his seminal work on social identity theory (SIT), Tajfel (1981) outlines some key aspects of social identity: individuals strive for a positive social identity; positive social identities are largely determined by in-group/out-group dynamics; and, if their identity is perceived negatively members will either try to leave or make it more positive.

Rather than a single ‘social identity’ everyone has a dynamic set of social identities, including nationality, ethnicity, culture, religion, class, gender etc. (Tajfel, 1981). These are not equally important or even always all salient, as social identity is not a static, singular, or simple concept but rather is dynamic. For example, while there is a ‘Māori’ identity, many Māori also have a tribal identity – though these are not necessarily distinct and different. Furthermore, Māori may identify with national, regional, religious, and gender identities, amongst many others. Also, contemporary Māori ‘social identity’ can be considered as both an ‘ethnic identity’ and a ‘cultural identity’. The umbrella term ‘social identity’ (sometimes shortened to ‘identity’) will be used to refer to the Māori/tribal ethno-cultural identity, with the acknowledgement that this is an imprecise descriptor and that even the divide between Māori/tribal identity is complex. Also, where relevant ‘culture’ will be used instead of ‘identity’, referring to the cultural knowledge/markers necessary to associate with an identity.

### ***Social identity responses to colonization***

The first key concept needed to understand the social identity responses of indigenous people to colonization is the colonial narrative. The colonial narrative encompasses the discursive constructs used by colonizers to justify colonization. Indigenous people may internalize these

constructs, which changes the way they view their social identity (Bhabha, 1983; Fanon, 1967; Hogan, 2000; Meredith, 1998). The colonial narrative establishes a hierarchy, portraying western society as culturally superior – creating simple categories to differentiate societies according to their stage of evolution, from ‘primitive’ through to ‘modern’ (Bhabha, 1983; Bhabha, 1994). The colonial narrative obscures similarities between people from different cultures and turns nuanced, complex, variegated, and dynamic social identities into simplistic, fixed, contrasting caricatures (Hogan, 2000).

In the early stages of European colonization the colonial narrative cast indigenous people as primitive, communal, mystical, and irrational, which inferred they were unable to govern themselves or utilize their land, justifying invasion and colonial settlement (Bhabha 1994; Hogan 2000). The narrative further encouraged ‘civilizing missions’, enacted through state policies, which sought to assimilate indigenous people through the eradication of language and tradition, replacing the pre-contact indigenous identity with a pseudo-settler identity (Hill 2004). Such civilizing missions were dovetailed with policies designed to divorce indigenous people from their resources, undermining economic autonomy and demanding assimilation out of economic and political necessity. In the later stages of colonization, and to the present day, the colonial narrative has shifted to portray indigenous people as developing, with the underlying implication of being less developed than the settler society.

Although the colonial narrative has evolved, its underlying effect is to create a negative association with the indigenous social identity and, in turn, instill a sense of shame for being indigenous. This shame is further fueled by the economic and social problems found among indigenous communities in settler states. The colonial narrative associates these problems as an inherent quality of being indigenous (i.e. under-developed), rather than as being an

inevitable outcome of colonization undermining a culture's political, economic, and social institutions (Smith, 1999). According to Tajfel (1981) an individual faced with the dilemma of possessing a shame-inducing social identity will be to dissociate with their in-group and identify with a new in-group. Alternatively, they will seek to create a positive social identity for their in-group. Either way, they have a fundamental need to belong to a positive social identity.

Within the field of postcolonial studies and psychology such responses to shame-inducing social identities have been identified among indigenous and marginalized people (Bhabha, 1994; Hogan, 2000; Berry, 1997). Generally speaking, these responses may be summarized into four categories, which have been articulated in the field of indigenous studies by Greaves, Houkamau, and Sibley (2015), within postcolonial studies by Hogan (2000), and in acculturation psychology by Berry (1997). The first response is to associate with the settler identity, which we refer to as the *acculturation response*. This response most commonly emerges during the civilizing mission period of colonization when there are strong state-led political, economic, and social coercive pressures to assimilate. The second response is to reject both settler and indigenous identities and associate with one not based on culture or ethnicity – for example a religion. We refer to this as the *disaffection response*. The third response, which we refer to as the *protection response*, is to reject the settler identity and associate with a positive indigenous identity. This response often emerges when it is realized that the indigenous social identity is under significant threat, and is associated with the rise of indigenous sovereignty and cultural revival movements that create political resistance and counter narratives to the colonial narrative. The final response is to build a hybrid identity that blends both settler and indigenous identities, which we refer to the *fusion response*. This response may be understood in relation to the postcolonial reality of many indigenous people

being the product of cross-cultural upbringings associated with intermarriage and of daily life navigating through two cultural worlds.

Although these four provide an analytical frame for describing and thinking about identity responses to colonization there is another layer of complexity that has been identified, both in postcolonial studies by Hogan (2000) and indigenous studies by Greaves et al. (2015). This entails the level of reflexivity with which an individual, or group, associates with the indigenous and/or settler social identities. That is, the extent to which the social identity associations are rigid and closed, or open and flexible. As outlined, the colonial narrative rigidly differentiates between the indigenous and settler social identities, due to its Manichean representations that obscure similarities and posit the cultures as opposites. Consequently, the internalization of the colonial narrative, will result in individuals, or groups, establishing a rigid polarity between indigenous and settler social identities. In terms of an acculturation response this polarity, as its most extreme, will result in the settler culture becoming viewed as overwhelmingly positive, and the indigenous social identity as overwhelmingly negative. In terms of the protection response, the polarity is reversed. With the disaffection response, both the settler and indigenous cultures are viewed negatively. Given the loss of openness and flexibility to engage across social identities the fusion response cannot occur, as reflexivity is lost.

To add another layer of theoretical complexity, this situation can result in the development of ‘split self’ (Good, Hyde, Pinto, & Good, 2008). It has been noted that indigenous people are not able to fully assimilate because much of their culture is embedded within practices and unconscious patterns of behavior. Consequently, the process of assimilation means that they must deny the part of themselves they identify as indigenous. This process has been explored

by Fanon (1967), and built upon by both Bhabha (1994) and Nandy (1998), amongst others. Good et al. (2008, p. 12), referencing Nandy, explain that colonization often results in ‘a split self in which one element is repressed or denied’ through ‘the internalisation of colonial disregard for local cultures and values’, which can cause ‘self-hatred’. In addition, Hogan (2000) has identified how this split self can result in individuals and groups cycling through different social identity responses. For example, the assimilation response suppresses the indigenous identity, which may cause an individual or groups to move to a protection response to release this identity.

It needs to be noted that the theoretical constructs outlined, encapsulated by SIRC and the supporting notions of reflexivity and split self, are not prescriptive concepts but illustrative. They are intended to assist with understanding how indigenous individuals, families, and communities, based upon situation, historical context, and life pathways may respond to colonization. In this paper these concepts are contextualized within the narratives of Ngāi Tahu whānau (families and networks of families) describing the impacts of colonization on their identity. These narratives demonstrate that the SIRC employed shift generationally based upon changes in New Zealand government policy and wider society and growing Maori political assertiveness. Furthermore, the SIRC shift developmentally over an individual’s lifespan, based upon the manner in which they were raised, and how the colonial environment shifts throughout their life. There is also a third component, the interactional, where one’s social identity response is shaped by another individual’s identity response, which shows how in-group/out-group dynamics play a crucial role in shaping responses.

## ***Method***

The data used came from the Ngāi Tahu Research Centre Whenua Project, which has been designed to explore the impacts of colonization on Ngāi Tahu whānau to find culturally-relevant solutions to support Māori health and wellbeing. The project recorded 80 participant narratives, focused on the cultural, social, and economic impacts of colonization on them, their families, and communities. A Ngāi Tahu community researcher was employed to facilitate participant story-telling through unstructured prompts and questions. The study was constructed around eight whanau, with 7 to 12 participants per whanau interviewed. Between three and four generations of each family were interviewed in each whanau with the age of participants varying from 20 to 86 years, enabling generational differences concerning the impacts of colonization to be discerned.

The project was informed by Kaupapa Māori research methodology, which emerged through the works of Māori scholars including Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1997), Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Russell Bishop (1995), and Leonie Pihama (2010). Kaupapa Māori emphasizes processes that respect and give voice to indigenous knowledge systems (e.g., turangawaewae [homeplace] thinking) and that place control of the research process collectively in the hands of Māori participants (Smith, 1999). To operationalize this philosophy, the project embedded the research in Ngāi Tahu communities and families. An initial hui (gathering) was organized with Ngāi Tahu tribal leaders, elders, health and welfare professionals, project team members, and tribal members to discuss project goals and parameters. Over 150 participants attended the hui, providing feedback that shaped project processes and objectives. Progress against research objectives were reported back to the Ngāi Tahu tribal council. A well-known tribal leader and health specialist was then selected to: identify whanau interested in participating in the project; organize interviews and story-telling processes; and work with whanau to iteratively review research findings. Personal story-telling, or purakau, was a



useful as it helped participants discuss the trauma of colonization (Lee, 2005). It is also part of a common cultural practice of *Ako* within Māori culture, in which storytelling is used to support learning processes (Lee, 2005).

## ***Results***

These results are presented using a historical framework, which provides a means understand the emergence of SIRC within context contexts. This framework breaks the colonial history of Ngāi Tahu and Māori into four divisions, which provide a degree of clarity and comprehension in regards to understanding identity responses at different points in history. There are four particular periods that can be identified: inundation (1840-1890); isolation (1890-1940); integration (1940-1980); and invigoration (1980-present). We will examine these final three for the various identity responses, with the first simply providing context, because our participant's recollections only span these three periods. With regard to this, often the recollections span several generations so the use of the periods is somewhat fuzzy and statements have been placed in the period that is felt best fits. Finally, the narratives have been edited for clarity, brevity, and anonymity.

### ***Inundation – 1840-1890***

New Zealand became a settler state in 1840 following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, when what Belich (2001) calls 'progressive colonization' began. The period from 1840-1890 can be broadly categorized as one of inundation – geographically, demographically, and institutionally. 99.9% of Ngāi Tahu territory was in Crown possession by 1863 – only 23 years after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi – and many were moved to one of the eighteen reserves set up under various deeds (Ministry of Justice, 1991). Around half a million settlers arrived during this period, seeing Māori go from being the majority populace

to being outnumbered ten to one by the settlers (Pool & Kukutai, 2011). The settler state also grew in power, coming to dominate Māori life. Ngāi Tahu experienced dramatic change in this period, and intermarriage with settlers was a common way of coping with this change. This meant that while some Ngāi Tahu remained wholly ethnically and culturally Māori, there was early ethnic and cultural hybridity occurring as well (Wanhalla, 2004).

### ***Isolation – 1890-1940***

The period of 1890-1940 is classified as isolation largely because while the political and economic amalgamation of the inundation period continued there was a physical segregation between Pākehā (European New Zealanders) and Ngāi Tahu, who were mostly living either on the eighteen reserves or in one of the many mainly Māori settlements. Some Ngāi Tahu lived more closely enmeshed with settler society but these are considered the exception rather than the rule. Most of our narratives begin near the end of the isolation period, when the forces on Māori to join the settler economy were growing and the period of isolation was coming to an end. Many participants emphasized how these forces and the influence of the colonial narrative provoked the acculturation response, which, as will be demonstrated, has a strong developmental component. The crucial vector of acculturation pressure during the isolation period was government-run schooling, where te reo (Maori language) was banned, Māori culture denigrated, and Pākehā culture was celebrated. Being exposed to the colonial narrative at school had an obvious impact:

‘But [grandmother] used to tell us that they weren’t allowed to speak Māori at school and they weren’t allowed to do this and they were taught that the Pākehā way was better...

So she embedded that I think in her kids...’ [Female, 57]

However, while school was an important in the acculturation response, often serving as a reinforcer, across the narratives we found that it was often a conscious choice by parents that

was the leading acculturation force. This is apparent in the following statement, by a participant who grew up in a largely Māori settlement near the end of the isolation period:

‘[When we were born dad] said to Mum, “What do you want your kids brought up, how do you want your kids brought up? Do you want them brought up as Māoris or Pākehās?” And he said, “Before you say anything there’s nothing for them as Māoris,” he said, “There never will be.” We were brought up as Europeans... I never ever wanted anything else... And yes I don’t know where the hell we would have got to if it had been Māoris. We weren’t allowed to talk Māori at school; you got hit over the bloody fingers with the cane. And they never taught Māori at home, only if they didn’t want us to know anything.’ [Female, 85]

Similarly, another participant explained:

‘... mum... said that pop and nana have been told that there was no future for Māori so they must bring their children up as European because that was the way of the future so they did... Mum did say that nana and pop both spoke Māori, they were both fluent, but only spoke it when they didn’t want the kids to know something... It would seem that our parents’ generation were the first link if you like to Western, everything in a Western way if you know what I mean. They were told and brought up as European.’ [Female, 56]

There was an enormous pressure for children to be brought up ‘as Europeans’ at the end of the isolation period, with the justification being ‘there’s nothing for them as Māoris’, there is ‘no future for Māori’. The developmental aspect is apparent, it was the parents who believed that the only way their children could thrive was to bring them up ‘Pākehā’ – the material weight of poverty and the psychological pressure of the colonial narrative clear in these decisions. Thus, many of the participants born in the isolation period were acculturated by their parents, and as can be seen from the above the views of the two identities were often fairly rigid and binary, with Māori framed as backward and Pākehā as the future.

Despite indigenous parents attempting to raise their children Pakeha, it does not appear assimilation was always possible. As outlined in the theory section, much of culture is embedded within practices and unconscious patterns of behavior, consequently many key

elements of indigenous identity are passed on despite attempts to acculturate. Consequently, rather than being brought up as ‘Pākehā’, many in this generation had a mixture of two conflicting identities instilled, with the Māori identity deemed inferior and the Pākehā identity superior. Thus, while children in pre-contact Māori society were absorbing a *single holistic identity*, those being acculturated were exposed to *two antagonistic identities* – the split self. Providing insight into this, one participant told us:

‘[My grandmother and siblings] were raised as Europeans, so effectively their knowledge of [our rohe’s] history, the older whakapapa, is lost ‘cause it wasn’t handed down. So effectively they almost ceased being Māori.... they still actually know a lot because while they were raised as Europeans, their parents were Māori and still engaged in Māori activities: karakia [chant], the marae [meeting house], tangi. So they weren’t taught a lot but they observed a lot.’ [Male, 32]

This statement illustrates one of the fundamental contradictions for many Ngāi Tahu – being raised as Pākehā while living in Māori communities. Another participant offered further understanding of this situation when replying to a question about tikanga (the Māori way of doing things):

‘Which wasn’t a word that we ever used. You didn’t know that were tikanga, we just; all we really knew was you were allowed to do that; you weren’t allowed to do that sort of thing. And I was always one to ask, “Why?” Well they didn’t tell you why did they? Well a lot of the time they didn’t tell you why.’ [Female, 70]

This statement communicates how the Māori identity became something both denied but present, practiced but not acknowledged. The same situation was apparent in the following participant’s quote:

‘... I think it started the generation above us; they’d lost on it. But because they were sticklers on kaupapa Māori (Māori protocols), we were just brought up Māori eh, we didn’t know we were brought up Māori. So a lot of the tikanga that was old, that they had, they’d retained, was installed in us. We didn’t have the language though. And we didn’t have the whakapapa (genealogy).’ [Male, 55]

Consequently, the acculturation response often did not instill a ‘Pākehā identity’ but rather created two identities – a silent indigenous social identity and a social identity that provided

facility with Pākehā culture. This hybrid identity was also apparent in the following participant's statement:

'Dad came off as an ignorant Māori but I think underneath it all he had a lot more. He was real staunch Māori values and things but I think he had things happen in his life time growing up that he didn't want to be associated with being Māori...he told me that he got caned at school for speaking Māori.' [Female, 52]

In addition, this quote illustrates the shame that was associated with the Māori identity, and in turn the silencing of that identity in response. While the issues caused by this hybrid identity emerged in this period we found they were more common in the integration period as individuals were forced into a situation that exacerbated the contradictions.

### ***Integration – 1940-1980***

From the 1940s, there was a significant demographic shift in the Ngāi Tahu populace, specifically many moved to Pākehā cities, towns, and settlements for work (Hill, 2004). Not only did this make the material inequalities more obvious but it also meant that many whānau became immersed in a racist environment, becoming a poor minority living in the settler-dominated institutions whose sudden proximity hardened settler's racist beliefs. This often reinforced the acculturation response. This participant, who grew up in a largely Pākehā town, explains:

'... the neighbors walked past our place saying, "That poor [woman] and that older girl living with all those Māoris." Not all the neighbors of course. But that's the social environment that we were in and mum and dad knew we were and they believed they were protecting us by making us less different by allowing us to integrate; and in fact not integrate, to assimilate into Pākehā society which we did largely.' [Female, 61]

But while integration often helped reinforce the acculturation response, the exposure to the racist environment and the paradox of not being able to completely disassociate from an ethnically-based identity, particularly for those who 'looked Māori', also meant that the integration period saw the contradictions inherent in the acculturated response manifest in a

more extreme way. This participant, who moved from a largely Pākehā settlement during this period, reveals how these contradictions impacted identity:

‘We struck all kinds of interesting stuff, boy. They crossed the road when they saw us coming. They called us strange names, half caste and quarter caste... And the thing is my Māori family were all shot down. They’d shut off. It was too hard to try and navigate that stuff. It was shut down Jack. They had shut down...I felt I’d lived in a straightjacket; that something that was in me couldn’t exist too much. Something that made up a good part of my life couldn’t exist too much... By the time I’m 14, I’m screwed up and mixed up. I’ve had enough of school. I love the nuns at the first bit. Second bit I’m starting to get pretty titchy and I can see that Māori, there’s something I want there and they ain’t giving me. There’s something I gotta have there. I’m hungry for this stuff and I’m searching the newspapers for names of Māori. I search everything for Māori, where are we?... I left home first 14; I’m gone. I gotta sort something for myself thanks. I’d die of boredom here because nobody’s saying anything. We’re just keeping the show together. There’s something in me that... the search engine’s running. Google ain’t nothing on this thing when it’s living inside you. I gotta find what the hell is going on because I don’t like this... There are certain things that we don’t know about, that kind of darkness of not knowing, knowing a tiny bit and knowing that you need the whole picture but you have only got that much...’ [Female, 62]

The sudden exposure to intensive racism for this participant highlighted and made clear the silent indigenous identity, and a driving need to recover this identity and heal. Like her, many participants expressed the sense of ‘darkness’ or of ‘gaps’, which we believe describe the silenced Māori identity caused by the acculturation response. The results of this research suggest that the hybrid identity is unstable. As well as causing shame, anger, and confusion, amongst many other problems, it can ultimately provoke another identity response, disaffection, which occurs when individuals are unable to positively associate with either the Māori or Pākehā identity. Consequently, they suffer from the painful psychological repercussions of not having a social identity to relate to (Hook, 2005) and some may associate with an alternative social identity (e.g. gang identity) (Taonui, 2010). As one participant who grew up in this period told us:

‘...there was a conflict [between my Māori and Pākehā sides] but today there’s not a conflict; I don’t see conflict between them, but I did once upon a time... So that was my life and I guess although I was down in that dark world... And so I went down this wild track. I was in places; I got to places where I’d think what am I doing here, you know with regards to gang situations and seen things that was pretty horrible stuff and was part of pretty horrible stuff.’ [Male, 50]

It is no coincidence that Māori gangs became increasingly common in this period (Gilbert 2013), they provided a positive social identity for the disaffected who felt no association with either the Māori or Pākehā identity. This internal conflict between Māori and Pākehā identities that the acculturated individuals experience can create a ‘doubly alienating’ cognitive dissonance as the denigration and forced dissociation from the Māori identity and the inability to positively associate with the Pākehā identity create psychological stress. This same dissonance can be seen in the following participant’s narrative where she explains that while some of her relations were brought up European they ‘never followed the Pākehā tikanga’, resulting in a sense of disconnection:

‘It would seem that our parent’s generation were the first link if you like to Western, everything in a Western way if you know what I mean. They were told and brought up as European. They knew that there was no way forward for Māori because their parents had told them that. I don’t know about the younger ones; but the older ones were betrayed but they never followed that tikanga either. So there was a lot of, I guess for them it started to disconnect.’ [Female, 56]

The paradoxes of this hybrid identity and the suffering of the split self were magnified during the integration period as acculturated individuals were forced into a situation where they were often unable to positively associate with either identity. Because many Ngāi Tahu were of mixed ethnicity, there was a wide range of possible levels of acceptance or rejection during integration, which often played a role in identity response. While many would continue to suffer from the negative consequences of acculturation and disaffection the next period would also see two other responses come to the fore, as a new generation grew up in an environment more welcoming to the Māori identity.

### ***Invigoration – 1980-Present Day***

The final period, from 1980 to present day, is classified as one of invigoration as it is marked by the Māori political, economic, and cultural renaissance (Belich, 2001). During this period full immersion and bilingual schools, as well as a Māori television station, saw te reo become increasingly common. Also in this period Ngāi Tahu successfully applied to the Waitangi Tribunal for compensation for Treaty breaches. Thus, while Ngāi Tahu remain overrepresented in negative statistics and institutional and personal racism remain, there is also a renewed pride in the Ngāi Tahu identity.

The issues of acculturation and disaffection were still present in this period. In a revealing quote that shows the generational, developmental, and interactional aspects of SIRC, one participant, in her middle age, outlined the impacts of acculturation on three generations:

‘I think that’s because tāua [grandmother] was kind of she had to become Pākehā to survive. She had to fit into the Pākehā world to survive so her roots were kind of left behind... I feel very actually quite disjointed from where I come from... I feel disconnected in terms of when I got to whānau hui [gatherings] out there I know I belong there but I don’t feel I belong there. Like all the ones that were kind of raised around that area they all know each other and there’s more of a connection and I feel like I’m sort of more of an intruder and a bit of an outsider... My father was completely alienated from all things Māori to the point where I wasn’t even allowed to speak to Māori people; to a point where he was almost racist really... One day, when my daughter was doing kapahaka [Māori performing art]... we went out and I took my dad out to watch, and all the people out there greeted him like someone back from the dead. All the whanau came up to him and made a huge fuss over him and hongied [touched noses and forehead] him... I watched my father and I knew he was feeling it... Then after, he started to try and get [my daughter] to sing Māori songs to him and speak Māori to him. I knew that something had awoken inside of him. [Female, 53]

The rigid associations with social identity and the way the negative consequences ricochet both generationally and developmentally are clear in the above. Across the generations we



see the grandparent having to acculturate into the Pakeha world to survive, then her son rigidly rejecting the Māori identity during the integration period and encouraging his daughter to do so also. This, in turn, led to his daughter losing her sense of identity, and becoming disaffected, but ensuring that her own daughter connected back with the indigenous identity (through kapahaka) given the conditions in the invigoration period. Meanwhile her own father felt that he could reconnect with his indigenous identity through his granddaughter, and through the positive in-group interactions he had with other Māori. The participant herself appears to be somewhat disaffected, explaining ‘I feel like I’m sort of more of an intruder and a bit of an outsider’. A similar response was noted in this participant, who is third generation acculturated:

‘Looking back on my childhood I knew I was Māori from quite a young age, but I didn’t know where I came from... there was always an element missing I felt. I didn’t really know what it was but there was just sort of that feeling that there wasn’t something there personally. As I went through life I didn’t really connect with my Māori side... my decision to sort of get into Māori came late in life, after some traumatic experiences where I needed to try and find a new direction in life... the identity trauma that’s there, it’s apparent and that has come from that disconnection... we have these almost identity crises because there’s a connection to something that we don’t understand... you have that trauma from identity crisis, an identity crisis basically where you know you’re something but you don’t know what.’ [Male, 32]

As the participant explains, ‘there was always an element missing... there’s a connection to something we don’t understand’, this is the suppressed Māori identity caused by the acculturation response initiated by previous generations in reaction to settler state policies, which seems to have manifested as disaffection in this generation. Certainly, subsequent generation’s facility with the Pākehā identity grew, but as was apparent from the narratives while being culturally Pākehā and ethnically Māori was enough for some for others the paradoxical ‘gap’ of this situation left them disaffected.

The invigoration of Māori culture, based upon significant political efforts among Māori, saw the protection response become increasingly common as the identity had greater positive associations. As Tajfel (1981, p. 256) explains, one means of overcoming a negative social identity is “to change one’s interpretations of the attributes of the group so that its unwelcome features (e.g., low status) are either justified or made acceptable through reinterpretation”, where often reinterpretation will “only acquire meaning in relation to, or in comparison with other groups”. For indigenous peoples, this often means the colonial narrative binary is inverted (Hogan, 2000). This inverted binary is expressed in the following quote where the participant is associating negative characteristics he believes tribal council members possess with ‘Pākehā traits’ which he directly contrasts with positive ‘Māori traits’:

‘I actually think they’re very Pākehā actually; it’s with their head, they don’t come from their heart. They come from up here. They’ve got serious issues with trust.’ [Male, 55]

Acculturation can lead to protection, as this individual grew up in an acculturated environment, stating (as outlined previously) ‘we were just brought up Māori eh, we didn’t know we were brought up Māori,’ but has since gone on to work on cultural revitalization projects for a hapu (band) organization. Considering this, it is unsurprising that he responds protectively – in response to acculturation there is often an impetus to embrace ‘authentic’ indigenous identity (Hogan, 2000). However, while these rigid delineations protect the reservoirs of indigenous identity they create another problem: a division between ‘authentic’ indigenous identities modelled on pre-contact culture, and ‘inauthentic’ indigenous identities that demonstrate features of the settler identity. This rigid delineation fails to capture the complexity of the postcolonial situation – where indigenous people, through assimilation and intermarriage adopt and internalize many ideas and markers of the settler culture. Consequently, those who have insufficient facility with their indigenous identity may not be fully accepted into the indigenous in-group because of lack knowledge of tradition and absence of core identity markers. This is expressed in the following quote, where ‘Māoriness’

is associated with certain markers, when a participant was asked if someone they had talked about was Māori :

‘No. Well he is actually Ngāi Tahu... but he’s never been around a lot of that. He knows he’s Ngāi Tahu but it kind of stops there.’ [Female, 50]

These individuals who identify with the indigenous identity but are not accepted often feel alienated, as outlined in the following quote, which demonstrate how some now find themselves alienated from the indigenous in-group due to perceptions of lack of knowledge, or physical markers:

‘I feel it. I wanted to be in the concert party but could never because I look so fair and take after my [Pākehā] mother. I’m fair as fair you see...and you could see that people...sometimes I see they’re just a little bit offhand in their treatment... It’s almost like an unconscious thing.’ [Female, 43]

The protection response also illustrates the interactional component of SIRC, the associations and disassociations are often strongest when discussing relations with others as it is a response that seeks to differentiate the in-group from the out-group by making rigid and narrow delineations of the in-group, with this participant excluded because she does not ‘look Māori’. Also, this shows the impacts of mixed ethnicity on identity, with individuals who identify as Māori being rejected by the protective in-group due to their appearance. Lack of other identity markers can also cause rejection, when being asked if she spoke te reo one participant told us:

‘... something that really annoys me and gets up my nose is that I get judged by Māori people for not being Māori enough. “So do you speak Māori?” “No, I don’t speak Māori but I do other stuff that defines me as a Māori. It’s not just speaking Māori”.’ [Female, 40]

Her answer is not only revealing in that it shows how those who do not display the key identity markers can be alienated by the in-group for ‘not being Māori enough’ but also because her own conception of what defines her as Māori is far more flexible. This flexibility is core component of the fusion response, which is when an individual is able to form

adaptable associations with both the Māori identity and the Pākehā identity. This fits with Tajfel's (1981, p. 256) understanding that an "individual will tend to remain a member of a group and seek membership of new groups if these groups have some contribution to make to the positive aspects of the individual's social identity" and that individuals will reinterpret social identities to make them positive. However, the hybridity of this response, where the two identities may be fused, reveals a specifically postcolonial slant, one most famously outlined by Bhabha (1994). The next participant demonstrates a very flexible and positive association with different postcolonial identities, even creating a fused social identity signifier: 'New Zealand Māori'. She is describing her experiences of living in a Pākehā dominated region, then moving to a Māori dominated region, and how she could move between social identities based on where she was located.

'I'd have to say I am New Zealand Māori...I have a Pākehā side to me that comes from the region [Christchurch]...That whole Māori environment [in Gisborne]... everyone was Māori... I started...thinking, 'I'm not like [them]. I'm different!' And so that's why I sort of owned my Pākehā side because everyone down in the South Island and Christchurch was Pākehā and that was the norm for me. So there was my New Zealand Māori side, there was my Christian side...and then my cultural side... [Female, 36]

This next quote also provides an interesting symbolic example of fusion. Here the participant is discussing a whanau tattoo that they are designing incorporating both traditional indigenous elements of tā moko (traditional tattoo), with symbols that encapsulate their Pākehā ancestor – a captain of a whaling ship. In essence, this involves the whānau fusing their Māori and Pākehā social identities into a new hybridized form, one 'that's us'. That is, one that provides a positive fusion because it overcomes the divisions created by colonization.

"...we started talking about tā moko... and we want to come up with, we want to do something [that includes our Pākehā whaling ancestor and ancestry] and that's one thing we all said; 'cause a lot of people have got Ngāi Tahu tā moko have got the whale tail,

but that's sort of what everyone's got now. So we want to come up with something that we can pass around to the whole whānau so we can see and be like, "Yeah; well, that's us." [Male, 26]

This response demonstrates a positive association with both identities. However, it should be noted, that these examples of fusion do not necessarily involve an even fusion of both. Many participants demonstrated a primary facility and affinity with their indigenous social identity, but one that transcends the damage inflicted upon it by colonization. For example, when asked about whether she used 'traditional Māori practices' when muttonbirding this participant told us:

'That's the thing. It's 'cause we do it. That's what makes it Māori...' [Female, 40]  
Her understanding of what constitutes 'Māori' is not limited by the 'backwards' traditionalistic delineations ascribed by the colonial narrative that have often meant any progress is equated with becoming less Māori, when really any living culture needs to be able to change and adapt.

Often the fusion identity response emerged out of the journey through acculturation and disaffection, as evident in the following narrative, where the participant explains that, 'it wasn't about being Māori and it wasn't about being born again' but rather about crafting her own identity, one that included her Christian faith and an acceptance of who she is and where she comes from:

'I'm looking for something and you still haven't got it either so I'm off... I went to Auckland. That began my life with te ao Māori in the north. So I did all of my growing up and Māori life in the north - lock stock and barrel opened up in the north... it wasn't about being Māori and it wasn't about being born again... When we got to Auckland, the kōhanga (Māori language revival) movement is starting to stand up. Māori broadcasting is due to arrive any minute... So I lived amongst Māori and I'm talking about those deep roots... And the Māori queen got hold of me and helped me understand something of what was in the basement of my life that runs through so many of our families and it will put you in a mental asylum unless you can get some support around you to hold still....

In the meantime, I'm working for [a Māori radio station] learning how to produce. Working with every Māori there is around in the hub of Māoridom there; what a gift. I was so frightened to even go and visit the studio one day when somebody had... I thought there are real Māori in there... So she's calling and saying, "You better come home." ... She had started a blinking fire. It took five months to get finished in Auckland, to get studies finished, money raised, house closed down, school sorted, and we were home here in the south... The most important thing for me is Christian faith and I knew the minute my feet got on this land down here that there was a hole inside of me and that was the place... whoever Christ was I didn't know but I knew he belonged there... Then I came to work for Ngāi Tahu. I knew inside me I had to come home to Ngāi Tahu... I'm only unwrapping that now and I'm not so sure about that... We all talk about navigating in the dark; that is where we all are... There are certain things that we don't [know] about, that kind of darkness of not knowing, knowing a tiny bit and knowing that you need the whole picture but you have only got that much... Here I am nearly thirty, forty years later and the rest of the story is just arriving so it is coming out of the dark and it is also finding the language when we have got a gap in our language. It is finding the gaps in our understanding and going into places.' [Female, 62]

The evidence suggests that certain individuals have demonstrated the capacity to overcome the identity conflicts that they have inherited through the colonization process. This is achieved by consciously overcoming the conflicts between the identities by fusing them into a functional, personalized identity, one that sees the darkness made light and the gaps filled in through an individualized process of self-reflexive discovery.

### ***Conclusion***

The four SIRC were present across the narratives and while our impressions are anecdotal rather than quantitative, the generational, developmental, and interactional aspects were very clear in shaping these responses. There are, however, two interrelated issues we want to address specifically in the conclusion as we see them as being the most revealing and pertinent to SIRC. Firstly, the hybrid identity created by the acculturation response. This is the critical fulcrum upon which SIRC rests, it is what differentiates it from mainstream SIT

and it is what can cause the response ‘cascade’ that we saw across the narratives. This amalgam identity is the converse of the fusion identity, it is a hybrid form which sets an individual up for potential identity crisis because of its unequal and inexact instillation. Certainly a number of participants who grew up acculturated did not experience an identity crisis and there are many ways the issues can be ameliorated. Still, this is an unstable identity for many as it is inherently antagonistic. To have Māori parents attempt to their raise children as Pakeha despite not having a strong affinity with the culture as they see no future for being Māori because the Pakeha culture has denigrated Māori culture all whilst exhibiting Māori behaviors which they will not discuss is, to put it simply, a toxic situation.

It is not surprising that the responses cascade, which is the second issue we want to discuss. Throughout the analysis the connections indicated between the acculturation, disaffection, protection, and fusion responses were portrayed as often following one another and it needs to be stated that there is no linear or consistent trajectory. While some people remain acculturated throughout their lives, with what seems like little issue, others may never move beyond disaffection; likewise, while some may go from the acculturated response to protection others will move through from disaffection to fusion. There are, it seems, no hard and fast rules, though there were some broad if largely circumstantial trends that were apparent in the narratives. For example, while it seemed possible for individuals to move from an acculturated response to a protective one with minimal disaffection, virtually all the individuals who had developed a fused identity had been disaffected at some point. It is this very disaffection, and the identity reflection and negotiation that it can generate, which seems essential to developing an adaptable and flexible response to the identity issues caused by colonization. The fusion response is, we believe, the most desirable for indigenous peoples living in settler states as it not only enables individuals to confidently ‘walk in two worlds’ it

also ensures that the indigenous in-group is more flexible and inclusive, helping to heal the wounds of colonization.



## ***References***

- Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise reforged: A history of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5-34.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1983). The other question... Homi K. Bhabha reconsiders the stereotype and colonial discourse. *Screen*, 24(6), 18-36.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. (1995). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. (doctoral dissertation) University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Good, M. J. D., Hyde, S. T., Pinto, S., & Good, B. J. (2008). *Postcolonial disorders*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Greaves, L. M., Houkamau, C., & Sibley, C. G. (2015). Māori identity signatures: A latent profile analysis of the types of Māori identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21(4), 541-549.
- Hill, R. S. (2004). *State authority, Indigenous Autonomy: Crown-Maori relations in New Zealand Aotearoa 1900-1950*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Hogan, P. C. (2000). *Colonialism & cultural identity*. Albany: University of New York Press.

- Hook, D. (2005). A critical psychology of the postcolonial. *Theory & Psychology*, 15(5), 475-503
- Lee, J. (2005). *Māori cultural regeneration: Purukau as pedagogy*. Paper presented at Centre for Research in Lifelong Learning International Conference. Stirling, Scotland.
- Meredith, P. (1998). *Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented to Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and Development Conference, Massey University.
- Ministry of Justice (1991). *Ngāi Tahu Land Report*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.
- Nandy, A. (1988). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Pihama, L. (2010). Kaupapa Māori theory: Transforming theory in Aotearoa. *He Pukenga Korero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 9 (2), 5-14.
- Pool, I. & Kukutai, T. (2011). Taupori Māori – Māori population change - Population changes, 1769–1840. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/taupori-maori-maori-population-change/page-1>
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Māori theory and praxis*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Smith L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taonui, R. (2010). Mana tamariki: Cultural alienation. *AlterNative*, 6(3), 187-202.

Wanhalla, A. (2004). *Transgressing boundaries: A history of the mixed descent families of Maitapapa, Taieri, 1830-1940*. (doctoral dissertation) University of Canterbury, Christchurch.