

# Perceptions of *Māori* Deaf Identity in New Zealand

Kirsten Smiler

Rachel Locker McKee

Victoria University of Wellington

Following the reframing of “Deaf” as a cultural and linguistic identity, ethnic minority members of Deaf communities are increasingly exploring their plural identities in relation to Deaf and hearing communities of affiliation. This article examines *Māori* Deaf people’s perceptions of identity, during a coinciding period of *Tino Rangatiratanga* (*Māori* cultural and political self-determination and empowerment)<sup>1</sup> and the emergence of Deaf empowerment. Interviews with 10 *Māori* Deaf participants reveal experiences of enculturation into *Māori* and Deaf communities and how they negotiate identity in these contexts. Consistent with the model of contextual identity in Deaf minority individuals of Foster and Kinuthia (2003), participants expressed fluid identities, in which *Māori* and Deaf aspects are both central but foregrounded differently in their interactions with hearing *Māori*, Deaf *Māori*, and the wider Deaf community. This New Zealand case study illustrates how changing sociopolitical conditions affect Deaf minority individuals’ opportunity to achieve and express identification with both Deaf-world and family heritage cultures.

The discourse of Deaf cultural identity has emphasized difference from hearing cultures, celebrating the commonalities of Deaf experience that engender a sense of affiliation across boundaries of race, ethnicity, nationality, and class (Humphries, 1996; Johnson, 1991; Wrigley, 1996). Notwithstanding the shared elements that powerfully shape Deaf lives everywhere and create this affinity, it has also been argued that defocusing on internal cultural and power differentials within heterogeneous Deaf communities encourages

the reproduction of wider societal inequalities (Ladd, 2003; Padden & Humphries, 2005) and risks “endogenous colonialism” (Wrigley, 1996, p. 7)—in which the powerful elite of Deaf communities assume authority to speak for all from a platform of “universal” experience. In addition to the potentially exclusionary impact, representations of a homogeneous community also obscure a deeper understanding of the diverse cultural experiences and processes in Deaf people’s lives, especially those which contribute to disadvantage and marginal identities (Humphries, 1993; Ladd, 2003; Parasnis, 1996; Woodward, 2002; Wrigley, 1996).

An emerging body of literature has documented how Deaf people from ethnic minority groups may frame themselves in terms of plural identities (Aramburo, 1989; Davis & Supalla, 1995; Dively, 2001; Foster & Kinuthia, 2003; Hairston & Smith, 1983; Herring-Wright, 1999; McKee, 2001; Paris & Wood, 2002). This article furthers an understanding of Deaf-world diversity by looking at how *Māori* Deaf<sup>2</sup> people’s perceptions of identity are shaped by their socialization into the Deaf-world and *Te Ao Māori* (*Māori* world), within New Zealand society. Tensions of identity and aspiration are inherent for this group, firstly, by virtue of their minority status within hearing and Deaf communities and, secondly, because contemporary *Māori* Deaf find themselves at the intersection of a significant period of *Māori* cultural and linguistic renaissance (in process since the 1970s) and the dawning of Deaf cultural consciousness from the late 1980s in New Zealand. Both these social movements have

Correspondence should be sent to Kirsten Smiler, Health Services Research Centre, Rutherford House, Victoria University of Wellington, P.O. Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand (e-mail: kirsten.smiler@vuw.ac.nz).

promoted their own language as a symbol of ethnic identity and as a vehicle for empowerment and political self-determination.

In this context, how do *Māori* Deaf perceive and express their identity in both *Māori* and Deaf communities, in which they have heritage membership rights? This paper presents the findings from a qualitative study<sup>3</sup> (Smiler, 2004)<sup>4</sup> that explored perceptions of cultural and linguistic identity of *Māori* Deaf people within the New Zealand Deaf community. This paper highlights the experiences of socialization and macro level factors that shaped identity and aspirations.

### The Sociohistorical Position of *Māori* Deaf

Although there is no reliable evidence to illuminate the experience of *Māori* Deaf in a tribal society prior to European colonization, it is likely that most would have been relatively isolated from each other, experiencing limited but functional participation, as in other preindustrial agrarian societies (Branson & Miller, 2002; Johnson, 1994). The advent of colonization, industrialization, and the accompanying construct of deafness as infirmity (Branson & Miller, 2002) was manifested in an oralist Deaf education system established in New Zealand in 1880. This remained the dominant paradigm in which Deaf have been positioned and described by both *Pākehā* (non-*Māori*) and *Māori* cultures in New Zealand (Durie et al. 1989; Forman, 2003; Monaghan, 1996).

The population of *Māori* Deaf people is difficult to determine. Calculations of New Zealand's signing Deaf community, which range between 4,500 and 7,700 (Dugdale, 2000; Statistics New Zealand, 2001), provide estimations of the New Zealand Deaf community as a homogenous group. It is widely speculated, however, that *Māori* are well overrepresented within the New Zealand Deaf community. Diagnostic data showed 49% of the children identified as Deaf or hearing impaired in 2002 were *Māori* (National Audiology Centre, 2002, p. 16), yet *Māori* comprise approximately 15% of the overall New Zealand population and *Māori* children (aged 0–14) approximately 25% of the child population (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). This speculation is supported by anecdotal evidence

within the community (Smiler, 2004) and Deaf social welfare figures (Dugdale, 2001).

Existing descriptions of the New Zealand Deaf community as a relatively homogenous entity, reflects a political imperative to promote awareness of “Deaf identity” and common goals in the first stages of Deaf self-advocacy (Dugdale, 2001, p. 208). The combined treatment of *Māori* and non-*Māori* Deaf also reflects their shared community origins in residential Deaf schools, where the collective of *Pākehā* and *Māori* children and their language, New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL), formed the basis of the New Zealand Deaf community (Allen, 1980; Aspden, de Vere, Hunt, Monaghan, & Pivac, 1992; Monaghan, 1996). *Māori* Deaf participation in the earliest decades of Deaf education was scant, but after the introduction of compulsory education through the 1877 Education Act and the increasing economic and social interaction between *Māori* and *Pākehā* communities from the early 1900s, *Māori* enrolment increased significantly (Aspden et al. 1992; Collins-Ahlgren, 1989; Monaghan, 1996). The residential Deaf school context was complex. On the one hand, this context afforded communication and affinity with Deaf peers, yet on the other, *Māori* Deaf students experienced more acute cultural disjuncture in institutions that lacked any reflection of their home culture.

Because Deaf communities exist within a dominant host society, the degree to which ethnic minority individuals struggle for voice within the Deaf-world reflects the state of ethnic relations and power structures of the wider society (Padden & Humphries, 2005). In New Zealand, *Māori* social demographics reflect a colonized history—Maori are disadvantaged in terms of socioeconomic, health, and education indicators. The more recent phase of *Tino Rangatiratanga* (self-determination and empowerment) seen over the past three decades though, has seen an unprecedented grassroots resurgence of cultural pride and competence. The New Zealand Government's recent recognition and commitment toward building political and bicultural partnerships with *Māori* as *tāngata whenua* (indigenous people) is becoming more heightened in New Zealand. This is evident in the establishment of formal processes to redress historical injustices, including loss of *Māori* natural resources, language,

and political autonomy. This process has resulted in redress through financial settlements, return of land and natural resources to Māori control, and financial support of Māori initiatives in language revitalization, education, health, and welfare sectors.

As is often true for Deaf in relation to movements of social change, Māori Deaf have been marginal participants in the agenda, activities, and benefits of the *Tino Rangatiratanga* (Māori self-determination and empowerment) movement. Only in the early 1990s did hearing Māori within the education and welfare sectors begin to understand the position of Māori Deaf. A 1995 report (AKO Ltd. 1995), following national consultation with Māori Deaf, concluded that

... Deaf Māori, because of their deafness, face not only the problems common to all who are Deaf, but also face isolation from their cultural heritage. Therefore, Deaf Māori suffer on two levels because of their dual status of being both Deaf and Māori. To be able to fully exercise their *tino rangatiratanga* [self-determination] there must be acknowledgement of this dual status and changes put in place to enable Deaf Māori to fulfill their aspirations in both the Māori and the Deaf communities where their two cultures will be recognized and validated. (AKO Ltd. 1995, p. 39)

Acknowledgment of NZSL and Deaf cultural identity from the late 1980s in New Zealand has provided a platform from which Māori Deaf people have become sufficiently empowered to explore and assert their Māori identity. At the same time, the *Tino Rangatiratanga* movement, which has included the revival of *Tē Reo Māori* (the Māori language), has created a useful precedent for the Deaf community's lobby to recognize NZSL as another indigenous language. In 2006, NZSL became an official language of New Zealand (New Zealand Sign Language Act 2006) in legislation that is modeled closely on the Māori Language Act of 1989.

Within the last decade, Māori participation in national Deaf politics has increased, for example, through regional Māori representation and the occupancy of president and management roles in the Deaf Association of New Zealand (Dugdale, 2001; Jaffe, 1992). In 1991, New Zealand's first "Deaf View" conference was held, and for this significant cultural event, a Māori

Deaf *kapa haka* group (performing arts group) was mentored by a hearing Māori person to perform a *haka pomhiri* (a type of traditional welcome) (Smith, personal communication, 2004). This was a significant event for Māori Deaf within the community—it provided a unique opportunity for expression and celebration of both Māori and Deaf identities within the Deaf community context and led to further learning about Māori culture and the formation of purposeful networks. This emergence of a Māori Deaf political consciousness is contemporaneous with the advancement of multiple-minority identity awareness in Deaf communities internationally (Ahmad, Darr, Jones, & Nisar, 1998; McKay-Cody, 1998/1999; Paris & Wood, 2002; Schein, 1995).

### Concepts of Māori Identity

Traditionally, Māori society was organized in terms of *imi* (tribe/s), *hapū* (subtribe/s), and *whānau* (extended families)—a series of nation-states demarcated by *whakapapa* (genealogy), by *rohe* (geographical boundaries) (Ballara, 1998), and by cultural boundaries such as dialects, values, and customs (Durie, 1997).

The advent of European colonization from 1840 onward, however, challenged this structure. During the colonization process, *imi* and *hapū* became outnumbered by *Pākehā*, who assumed political and cultural hegemony (Orange, 1987; Pool, 1991). In response, *imi* and *hapū* began to use the term *Māori*—meaning "usual" or "ordinary"—in contrast to *Pākehā* (non-Māori) (Belich, 1997). This new identity as "Māori" did not supersede a tribal identity; rather, it was used as a method of collectivizing and strengthening the position of *imi* and *hapū*, who as a result of a hostile colonial environment were becoming alienated from markers of identity, such as land and language. This demarcation of Māori and *Pākehā* also complimented the Western tradition of organizing peoples according to "race"—lending the term *Māori* as a racial classification. The erosion of traditional indicators of identity was further compounded by educational assimilation policies and major urban migration from the 1950s onward (Metge, 1995; Schwimmer, 1969; Walker, 1990).

This altered cultural landscape leaves debate over how modern Māori identity is constituted. Some

ascribe *Māori* identity solely to those who can trace their *whakapapa* (genealogy) to their *hapū* and/or *imi*, whereas others claim that knowledge of traditional language and customs are also essential markers of ethnic identity (Durie, 2001). Traditionally, cultural knowledge was transmitted through oral language in the context of collective activities, a process that presents barriers to deaf individuals. A century and a half of cultural contact means that many *Māori* struggle to sustain links with *imi* and *hapū* and to achieve identity in the traditional ways. Successful *Māori*-medium education from preschool through university level and new forms of artistic expression that promote *Māori* identity are burgeoning; yet identifying as a contemporary bicultural *Māori* can still be complex.

### Identity as Contextual

Contemporary models of identity posit that identity is not a fixed set of personal and social characteristics but is “a construction, a consequence of a process of interaction between people, institutions and practices” (Sarup, 1996, p. 11). As such, identity may shift with context and time; Stryker and Burke (2000, p. 186) suggest that, “persons have as many identities as distinct networks within which they occupy positions and play roles.” Achieving identity by taking on culturally recognized roles and participating in meaningful social interaction within the family culture is universally problematic for deaf children born to hearing families. These families generally struggle to “transmit [the] culture, the folkways, and language and identity” of their native culture to the deaf child (Schein, 1995, p. 106). Feelings of exclusion or difference within the family make it common for deaf people to seek a sense of “home” in Deaf, signing communities (Jacobs, 1974; Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996; Schein, 1995).

Deaf schools and community organizations are central sites of socialization into Deaf cultural identity (Lane et al. 1996; Padden & Humphries, 1988), yet the culture and customs of the ethnic majority are entrenched within these, presenting barriers to fully belonging to or maintaining a minority ethnic identity in the Deaf community (AKO Ltd., 1995; Anderson & Bowe, 1972; Aramburo, 1989; Davis & Supalla, 1995; Dively, 2001; Foster & Kinuthia, 2003; Gerner de

Garcia, 1995). Within the Deaf-world, an assumption often exists that ethnic minority members are culturally aligned primarily with the Deaf-world. Although this appears true, especially if sign language use is taken as the key indicator, it is not because they reject affiliation with an ethnic identity, but because they have had little opportunity to be socialized into it. Studies such as Cohen (1997), Dively (2001), and McKay-Cody (1998/1999) demonstrate that without Deaf, or at least signing role models of the same ethnic group, deaf children cannot learn the behaviors and boundaries required to adopt a role within the context of their family’s native culture. Accompanied by negative societal attitudes toward deafness and toward minority ethnicity, this potentially leads to identity confusion and negative self-image (Cohen, 1997; Davis & Supalla, 1995; Dively, 2001; Foster & Kinuthia, 2003; Redding, 1997).

Foster and Kinuthia (2003) developed an explanatory model to account for the ways that Deaf members of ethnic minority groups conceptualize and display multiple facets of their identity through social interaction; they posit that identity is constructed in terms of four factors: individual characteristics (e.g., gender, racial or ethnic heritage, language, and hearing loss), situational conditions, social conditions, and societal conditions.

The three external conditions (situational, social, and societal) are primarily contextual and are defined as follows: situational conditions—the physical locations in which the individual is socialized; social conditions—defined by social interactions and experiences of inclusion and exclusion, which determine the resulting affinity and identification with social groups; societal conditions—broad societal trends and patterns such as institutionalized discrimination and monoculturalism, stereotyping, socioeconomic status, and visibility of individual characteristics in popular culture, politics, and the economy. The conclusion of the empirical analysis of Deaf minority experiences of Foster and Kinuthia (2003, p. 279) is that “. . . the four factors act in combination, to produce a fluid, dynamic, sense of identity in which one or more of the individual characteristics is selected, mediated, and drawn out in a response to a particular situational, social or societal conditions.” This is a relevant template for

understanding Māori Deaf expressions of dynamic identity in this study.

## Research Method

### Epistemological and Cultural Considerations

Contemporary Māori scholars (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Te Awēkotuku, 1991; Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999) and Deaf Studies scholars (Baker-Shenk & Kyle, 1990; Ladd, 2003; Turner & Alker, 2003) have adopted the epistemological principles of feminist, indigenous, and disability studies: advocating emancipatory research that is grounded in participant communities' conceptual frameworks and legitimizes their knowledge (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). This study aimed to voice, albeit indirectly, Māori Deaf people's accounts of their experiences and to conceptualize findings about identity within a framework that reflects their worldview.<sup>5</sup> The use of interview as the research instrument and the method of recruiting participants were acceptable to Māori Deaf leaders, who were consulted early in the planning phase for the research. The New Zealand historian Michael King (2001, p. 167) advises that oral history research cannot be done "precipitately or coldly . . . it can only arise out of a relationship of ease and trust." Practicing the Māori preference for *kanohi kitea* or "showing one's face" is essential in both Māori and Deaf cultures (Lane et al. 1996; Moko-Mead, 2003) and was used to help create a relationship of ease and trust.

### Participants

Ten participants were recruited using a sampling technique that "selects rich cases strategically and purposefully" to suit the purpose and resources of the study (Patton, 1990, p. 234). The processes of recruiting participants and collecting data took account of Deaf-world logistics, such as the use of social networks to reach participants by an informal "snowballing" technique (Sarantakos, 1994, p. 139), flexibility in arrangements of time and place, and emphasis on rapport and process rather than outcomes. The study aimed to explore a range of self-perceptions of identity; however, the selection process inherently limited participant characteristics to those who demonstrated membership

of the Deaf community (by affiliation with Deaf social networks and use of NZSL) and regarded themselves as Māori. Other criteria considered for participant selection included achieving a balance (or range) of gender, age, urban/rural origin, school backgrounds, level of perceived "Māori Deaf community" affiliation, and level of perceived *Te Ao Māori* affiliation. Participant's affiliation to these groups was based on self-identification and verification by others with in-group status. These sampling criteria aimed to capture both variation and commonalities in the experiences of the target group. The interviews were semistructured, and participants were encouraged to elicit their experiences in terms of the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of Māori Deaf life experiences in terms of
  - whānau* relationships?
  - access to the languages of Māori, NZSL, and English?
  - education/schooling?
  - Deaf community involvement?
  - connection with other *hapū*, *imi*, and other Māori in general?
2. To what extent does being both Deaf and Māori impact on membership in *Te Ao Māori* and the Deaf world?
3. Do Māori Deaf see themselves as a "community" or distinct social network within the Deaf-world and how does this impact on the nature of their resulting identity?
4. What aspirations do Māori Deaf have as individuals and for the collective of Māori Deaf?

In the final analysis, only eight of the interviews were used as these most clearly articulated and sufficiently represented the range of experiences and issues. (Appendix A presents the backgrounds and characteristics of these eight participants.)

### Interviews

Participants were recruited and interviewed by Smiler, a Māori child of a deaf adult with proficiency in English, NZSL, and *Te Reo Māori* and personal ties to both Deaf and Māori cultures through her *Pākehā* Deaf mother and hearing Māori father. Rapport with

participants was helped by the interviewer's behavior and awareness of *Māori* and Deaf social protocols—this knowledge encouraged participants to share openly about their life experiences in both communities.

Videotaped interviews were translated from NZSL to written English. The translations were double checked and samples checked by McKee, an experienced, qualified NZSL/English interpreter, to minimize error or bias. N-Vivo, a qualitative software tool for inductive analysis of interview data, was used to code and analyze the transcripts, using a series of themes generated from the research questions and the data. Further recursive analysis of data within and across these themes forms the basis of this article. The quotes presented in this article are English translations from NZSL.

## Findings

*Māori* Deaf experiences and perceptions of identity showed both consistencies and variations in terms of societal conditions and personal circumstances that affected Deaf and *Māori* social affiliation. The following section will discuss three main topics: socialization experiences which are the foundation of identity, perceptions about achieving and managing plural identity, and aspirations.

### Socialization Experiences

Participants' accounts of socialization experiences within the Deaf-world and *Te Ao Māori* were complex. Experiences highlighted various levels of connection and dissonance within both worlds, both of which had limited understanding and appreciation of the other. Participants' connection to the Deaf-world as Deaf people echo common Deaf life narratives and will not be elaborated here; that is, for all participants, affinity with Deaf peers at school, the (unsanctioned) use of NZSL during early and young adult life, and common experiences of exclusion in hearing school and home environments were central to a strong sense of Deaf identity and enduring Deaf social networks. However, *Māori* Deaf also reported that a monocultural (hearing and *Pākehā* dominated) Deaf education system increased their physical and cultural alienation

from their home culture and to some extent raised feelings of difference within the wider Deaf peer group.

### Being Deaf in *Te Ao Māori*

*Māori* social domains are typically collectively oriented. For *Māori* Deaf participants, connection with *whānau* (extended family) was problematic in the usual ways for deaf people and sometimes particularly so in a community that was distanced from the goals and culture of the education system. Like most hearing families, *Māori* hearing families were generally ill equipped to socialize a deaf child; consequently, relationships in home and community settings were characterized by poor communication and limited participation, resulting in an uncertain sense of *Māori* identity and cultural affiliation. Although a deficit understanding of deafness and the acceptance of oralist goals were historically common, some parents drew on instinctive parenting techniques with positive effects, such as using home signs and encouraging inclusion in everyday activities.

In this context, *Māori* children are often socialized in groups, where learning occurs through watching, listening, and doing (Haig, 1997); some participants described instances where this experience was accommodating of deafness and enabled them to feel part of a *Māori* social world. "Anthony,"<sup>6</sup> for example, described how, when peeling potatoes for a *hangi* (a meal cooked in a earth oven), his *whānau* sat in a circle so that he could lip-read the conversation or watch what was happening, and "Joyce" described learning about traditional seafood gathering practices through participation in this activity.

To gauge an understanding of the depth of participants' knowledge of cultural traditions, they were each asked to describe the protocol of their *marae* (traditional meeting compound) at events such as *tangi* (funerals) and *powhiri* (ceremonial welcomes). Most could describe visible, procedural aspects of events, such as where people were positioned, ritual actions that took place, and practices around the gathering and preparation of food. Participants were, however, unfamiliar with the concepts that inform a *Māori* worldview and underlie traditional activities and rituals.

Usually this knowledge is transmitted orally, and implicitly. *Māori* have a saying, “*Me noho puku ngā tamaiti*,” meaning that children should sit silently and absorb information, until the meaning becomes clear through time and maturity (Haig, 1997, pp. 39–45). Asking for clarification of information, which is normal Deaf behavior, could be seen as breaching *Māori* norms; such behavior from children is often seen as inappropriate. Joyce, who did not ask questions, felt excluded at *whānau* (extended family) *hui* (gatherings) because information was never made explicit.

During my childhood my parents always went to the *marae* for *hui* (gatherings), *whānau* reunions etc, and at the *hui* they talked about lots of things that I was expected to learn from. . . . there was no interpreting—I had no idea what they were saying . . . I never thought to ask questions. I was ignorant and it just never occurred to me to ask questions! I’d just sit there and watch and not know what was happening.

Excluded from verbal information, some participants tried to make meaning from visual clues. For example, “Waimarama” recalled how she pieced together information about her genealogy from studying photographs of ancestors on the walls of the meeting house during hours of speeches and discussions. Some watched the body language and expressions of elders for cues on how to behave. Participants generally relied on family members with some basic NZSL or home signs to explain things, according to their ability and willingness. This created a sense of inferiority and dependency on hearing family that persisted into adult relationships. Stryker and Burke (2000, p. 183) suggest that identity is connected to the ability of a person to play an active role in their family or group. Due to a lack of explicit information in these collective and traditional domains, *Māori* Deaf participation was largely passive, and they felt unable to fully assume culturally expected roles and behaviors associated with being *Māori*.

Some participants noted a positive change in *whānau* attitudes and support because information about Deaf identity and NZSL has become more accessible. Some of the younger adults stated that

*whānau* had recently begun to learn NZSL and to acknowledge them and their Deaf friends as part of a distinct Deaf community and culture.

#### Being *Māori* in the Deaf-World

Padden (1980, p. 93) notes that the wider society surrounding Deaf communities influences their culture, language, and values. This was reflected in the perception of *Māori* Deaf about their position in the Deaf community. Most felt that deaf schools and some Deaf clubs are predominantly *Pākehā* places, unaccommodating of *Māori* ways. Schools, in particular, were described as culturally alien to many hearing *whānau*. Patrick described his father’s anxiety about sending him to a residential deaf school, saying

When I was five my father wanted me to be in a Māori school but there were none around at that time. . . . So, he reluctantly sent me to a Deaf school in Auckland. My parents tried to tell me when I went there that I had to behave like a *Pākehā* while I was there. . . . deaf school was a huge contrast! They had a very different culture there: it was Pakeha, hearing, and English speaking culture! But what could they do? That was the education system at that time.

In deaf education settings, *Māori* students had little opportunity to learn about *Māori* culture or from *Māori* role models, either hearing or Deaf. This was disorientating, especially for those whose families were strongly socially and linguistically *Māori*. Participants who went to deaf schools during the 1950s–1970s reported that a high proportion of pupils were *Māori* deaf, possibly due to epidemics. Despite the large *Māori* peer group, deaf school presented a *Pākehā* environment. Some participants had exposure to *Māori* cultural activities in mainstream schools but with the expectation that they would learn orally/aurally. Joyce, for example, remembers *Māori* action songs:

. . . . When I was little I went to a hearing primary school and they used to teach *kapa haka* (Māori performing arts) to the Māori kids. I used to join in and follow their actions with my eyes . . . but that was only for a little while. When I finished at

that school and went to deaf school in Christchurch they didn't teach us any Māori things at all.

This was a double bind for participants who, in deaf schools, knew they were *Māori* yet were physically and culturally distanced from the *Māori* world, whereas in mainstream schools they were externally identified as *Māori* but could not access *Māori* aspects of the curriculum that relied on aural/oral participation in spoken *Māori* and/or English.

Despite the monoculturalism, participants generally regarded deaf schools as a refuge, where being Deaf was a leveler and a bond. "Manaia" recalls that at school he saw his peers as Deaf and never registered ethnic differences. Only later in life when he met "mainstreamed/oral" *Māori* did he become aware of the possibility that ethnic identity might separate some Deaf from others or take on a different level of importance in different social contexts:

When I first started school I thought about only being Deaf. There were students who were Indian, Fijian, Samoan, or whatever. They were all different ethnicities but—we were all Deaf. So it was simple. But when my mum started to send me to my *marae* there were some Māori Deaf people there that behaved differently to the Deaf people I was used to, they were very strong in their Māori identity. These people behaved differently to people in the core Deaf community; they were more traditional, more Māori. Now that I think about it, it's probably because the core Deaf community all went to schools together and shared the same experiences. They are more united about the social, educational, political advancement of the Deaf community—but these other Māori Deaf people, they identified mainly as Māori.

Manaia commented that *Māori* Deaf who were socialized in the hearing *Māori* world identified exclusively as *Māori* and not as Deaf, whereas those *Māori* Deaf who were socialized in the Deaf-world and identified strongly as Deaf tended to be marginalized in terms of *Māori* social identity. This demonstrates how experiences of both exclusion/alienation and inclusion/affinity are complementary in shaping individuals' sense of identity in relation to contrasting groups.

One participant stated that the notion, "We are all one Deaf community," does not acknowledge diversity among Deaf people and that the predominance of *Pākehā* values in the wider Deaf community makes *Māori* Deaf reluctant to pursue or display *Māori* identity. He observed that limited *Māori* cultural knowledge contributed to many feeling uncertain of their *Māori* identity and thus representing themselves as simply Deaf:

Some Māori Deaf people have no confidence in who they are . . . but they are confident in the Deaf community, which makes people think that they identify with being Deaf first and foremost and being Māori comes second.

#### The Transmission of *Māori* Knowledge and Identity Within the Deaf Community

Within *Te Ao Māori* generally, older generations have a responsibility for preparing *rangatahi* (younger people) for the future by imparting cultural knowledge, and the *rangatahi* have a reciprocal responsibility for maintaining the traditions and integrity of their *tipuna* (ancestors). In the Deaf context, the potential transmission of cultural knowledge and identity between generations is hindered by the fact that most older *Māori* Deaf are not related by kin and generally experienced superficial enculturation themselves. The result is that many *Māori* Deaf possess little of the usual knowledge on which to form a sense of *Māori* identity according to traditional indicators such as knowing your *imi* name and boundaries:

Sometimes I talk to Māori Deaf people and ask them where they are from. And they say things like, "Oh I was born in Auckland" and I have to prompt them—"Yes, but where is your family from?" And they'll say "We've been living in the same house for years" so I say "Where's your grandmother from?" and they say "Oh I think she from Hamilton". So then I know that person is from Hamilton. But when I ask them, "What's your *imi*?" and they say, "*Imi*—what's an *imi*?" . . . It really amazes me that some people don't know where they're from!



Opinions varied on how this gap could be addressed. Some participants favored working with hearing Māori in teaching/mentoring roles, whereas others saw facilitated learning among Māori Deaf as the key to addressing knowledge gaps. *Whakapapa*, customs, and dialect are often specific to the *whānau*, *hapū*, and *imi* of the individual, and so some participants felt this type of information was best imparted by hearing Māori *whānau*. Others were cautious of involving hearing Māori who despite good intentions have little insight into the Deaf-world. Participants described, for example, how some hearing Māori involved in a recent adult education initiative believed they were giving Māori Deaf “access” by creating artificial signs to represent spoken Māori.

Most felt it imperative that Māori Deaf could access information specific to their *whānau*, *hapū*, and *imi*, by using Māori-speaking NZSL interpreters. One participant’s comments aptly summarized the sentiments of others:

... interpreters support Māori Deaf people by allowing them to access information about things Māori, like say at a *marae*, *hui* and also enabling Māori Deaf to understand *whakapapa* Māori.

Although interpreters increase their access to Māori settings, participants also expressed a preference to look to Deaf peers for information about *Tē Ao Māori*, learning in a manner that encompasses Māori and Deaf ways. There was a sense that Māori Deaf needed to build their own capacity to support and express Māori cultural awareness. A Māori Deaf leader described these goals:

We try to provide a place where we can come together to encourage members of the Māori Deaf community to be in leadership roles and to speak out and teach their own people about their own knowledge.

For future generations, they recommended teaching NZSL to *Whānau* members to increase exposure and inclusion in Māori domains during childhood.

### Managing Plural Identities

Acquiring and displaying plural identities as “Māori Deaf,” either within the Deaf-world or within *Tē Ao*

*Māori*, is contingent upon access to meaningful social and linguistic interaction with peers and role models in each. Possible identities in each world are also constrained by interpretations of “difference” assigned by others. Identity, according to Wrigley (1996, p. 56), “. . . is not a discovery; it is an achievement in an exchange of discursive economies. Some aspects of our identity are easier to achieve than others. Many are produced and assigned by the society we inhabit . . .” Māori Deaf experience is that due to disparate discourses around the social meanings of “Deaf,” of “Māori,” and the notion of “cultural identity” itself, they struggle to achieve, and to have acknowledged, an integrated sense of identity within both Deaf and Māori worlds.

Stress from competing claims to Deaf and ethnic identity has been observed in previous studies of minority Deaf (Ahmad et al. 1998; Aramburo, 1989; Dively, 2001; Foster and Kinuthia, 2003). This kind of stress could be especially salient for Deaf members of an ethnic minority group that is engaged in a process of cultural revitalization, as in the Māori situation. Participants described how they were often expected by either hearing Māori or by Deaf to “choose” a primary affiliation as either Māori or as Deaf, in solidarity with the agenda of each group. But they felt that these two identity characteristics were not separable and that framing it as a matter of choice or priority misunderstood their position. “Jade” recounted an incident that illustrated this quandary:

[A Māori hearing person] asked me if I thought I was Māori first or Deaf first? I thought to myself, “Hey no, that’s wrong. Why should I have to choose? I have foot in both worlds.” You know what I mean, you can’t split me in half. No, that’s wrong! When I’m with Deaf people I sign and I follow the Deaf way and when I’m with Māori I use *Tē Reo Māori*, or with Māori Deaf, I sign, that’s okay. So you can’t make a person choose. They all make the person whole. So I have a choice, like I can put one foot there or another foot there So I told him that he is always Māori, just like I am always Māori, but you can’t ask me to choose. That’s just not right!

These feelings echo Redding's (1997, p. 74) conclusion that "Deafness does not diminish membership in a racial, linguistic, or ethnic minority group."

### Biographical Influences on Identity Construction

As Foster and Kinuthia (2003) point out, the expression of identity characteristics is dynamically affected by changing situational, social, and historical factors over the lifespan. The intertwining of biographical and sociohistorical elements in the construction of a *Māori* Deaf identity was evident in this study. One participant, Patrick, had recorded an interview about his life 10 years previously, in which he described his primary identity (to a Deaf interviewer) as Deaf. In the following excerpt from that interview, he describes how his latent Deaf identity came to the fore during reimmersion into the Deaf community, after several years of "passing" in the hearing world:

This was the first time that I really shifted my identity and my feeling about myself to being Deaf first and *Māori* second. It was hard for my family to fully accept that I had this other culture I belonged to. That was a very stressful time, because I was trying to find my way and sort out who I was. I was learning more about being Deaf from the Deaf-world, and also starting to learn about *Māori* culture too. . . . Finally I came to accept myself as a person living in two worlds—Deaf and *Māori*. If I chose to be with *Māori* first, the problem would be communication with hearing people. So Deaf will always come first, and *Māori* second. I'm bicultural and that has given me new strength. (McKee, 2001, p. 172)

Holcomb (1997, pp. 90–92) suggests that the journey to achieving a balanced bicultural identity involves several stages: conformity, dissonance, resistance and immersion, introspection, and finally awareness. At this time, Patrick was questioning his earlier conformity to hearing world expectations and consolidating his Deaf identity—he was experiencing dissonance between the cultures of *Whānau* and the Deaf-world and entering a phase of resistance and immersion. Patrick became increasingly involved in the social and political activities of the Deaf community shortly after that interview.

In this 2004 study, Patrick revised his statement in the earlier interview about being "Deaf first" and described a more contextualized understanding of his identity; with *Māori* Deaf, he feels his primary identity is *Māori* Deaf, yet when he is with non-*Māori* Deaf, he shares the bond of being Deaf. This shift of self-perception and his increased emphasis on his *Māori* identity (also expressed through his political advocacy for *Māori* Deaf) reflects Patrick's opportunities to gain a deeper awareness of both *Te Ao Māori* and the Deaf-world, through formal and informal learning over the past decade. Patrick explicitly rejects the notion of primacy between facets of identity that are non-negotiable and equally important for social survival in various contexts:

. . . There is an increasing sense among *Māori* Deaf of a conflict—that they have to choose between either *Māori* or Deaf as their primary identity. . . . Some *Māori* Deaf are becoming more confident and they advocate for more *Māori* involvement within the Deaf community at *mānanga* (workshops) etc. Those people say, "I'm *Māori* first." That is fine . . . or if they say they are Deaf first that is fine also, because that is their choice. I know that for me it's about balance. In a Pākehā environment I behave like a Pākehā and if I'm in a *Māori* context I behave like a *Māori*. You can't say to me that I have to identify with one—to ask whether I'm *Māori* or Deaf is a stupid question. The Deaf community needs to be aware of that, as it is really insensitive to the *Māori* Deaf community. Lots of *Māori* Deaf feel and identify with being *Māori* but when they are with Pākehā Deaf they identify primarily with being Deaf—mostly to cover up because they aren't confident enough to say that they are *Māori* first because the other person is white . . . So they put a facade and "Oh yes . . . I'm Deaf" but then in the *Māori* community they say "Oh yes I'm *Māori* first." They keep quiet—they hold it in. When they gain confidence in themselves they start to value both of their identities.

Although all participants were strongly aligned with Deaf culture and social networks, they refrained from making statements of primary identification, and instead felt that some elements of their complex

identity were more central than others, according to context. Patrick's comments above illustrate the idea of "identity salience" (Stryker & Burke, 2000), which is summarized by Foster and Kinuthia (2003, p. 286) as, "The probability that an identity will be invoked across a variety of situations, or alternatively across persons in a given situation."

### Aspirations

Aspirations of a group often crystallize their insight into their historical journey, their current sense of "self" and the frame in which they imagine different future possibilities. For this reason, participants were asked explicitly about their hopes and goals as Māori Deaf. Personal aspirations focused on "catching up" on missed vocational and cultural learning opportunities, achievement in sport and community interests, and on raising children who were conversant in the languages and culture of both Deaf and Māori.

Collective aspirations included providing the next generation of Māori Deaf with a firmer basis for identity by providing meaningful exposure to Māori culture in school and home contexts—principally through the use of NZSL and Māori Deaf role models.

Immediate aspirations for the community centered around creating a cultural and physical space unique to Māori Deaf in which they could learn missed *Te Ao Māori* knowledge and develop a Māori identity that encompassed Māori and Deaf worldviews. In a Māori framework, this goal relates to the traditional concept of *turangamaewae*, which literally means "a place for the feet to stand" but metaphorically also means a physical, spiritual, and psychological "home":

*Turangamaewae* is basically the courtyard or home area of one's ancestors, where one feels she or he has the right to stand up and be counted. It is the footstool, the place where he or she belongs, where the roots are deep. From this *turangamaewae* a person can move into any given context, indeed the world, knowing that she or he is sure of her or his identity and is not afraid to make a stand. . . . The belief that a child must know from whence she or he came so that she or he will have greater control of her or his life. (Pere, 1991, p. 50)

A tangible manifestation of achieving a Māori Deaf *turangamaewae* is the development of *Ruamoko Marae* at Kelston Deaf Education Centre (KDEC) in 1992. A *marae* is traditionally the meeting place of a community where political, social, religious, and learning activities take place. *Ruamoko* was built from disused classrooms by Deaf and hearing Māori, as a Māori cultural space and resource for Deaf students at the school (Smith, personal communication, 2004).<sup>7</sup> Initially intended for use by Deaf children, the adult Māori Deaf network appropriated guardianship of *Ruamoko*, using it as a base for meetings and workshops with the objectives of fostering Māori and Deaf pride in Māori Deaf children and encouraging cultural awareness for Māori Deaf adults (Te Komiti o Ruamoko Marae, 2002). The symbolic value of *Ruamoko* (despite its small scale) is the realization of a cultural "territory" (cf. Lane et al. 1996) that incorporates and operates on Māori and Deaf traditions, values, and terms. It is fitting that the first *marae* be situated at a Deaf school, as the existence of the Māori Deaf collective originated in contact at the residential schools.

Cultural self-development activities described by participants focused less on achieving ongoing inclusion in hearing Māori culture and more on a desire to construct cultural, emotional, and spiritual markers of Māori identity within their own space, by adapting practices and languages that represent their identity and ways as Māori and as Deaf. The most politically involved participants have coined the label "*Ngāti Turi*" (the Deaf tribe) to represent their sense of indigenous identity. Their aspirations reflect a strong desire for self-determination in the process of forging a distinct Māori Deaf identity on their own terms; this goal raises potential tension in balancing a need for cultural connection (with hearing Māori) and a desire for Deaf autonomy of action and expression.

### Conclusions

The experiences of Māori Deaf align with the model of plural identity of Foster and Kinuthia (2003), in which various individual characteristics are mediated through social interaction and highlighted according to the features of the situation and the societal context. Most participants in this study resisted the idea of

a “primary” identity as Deaf or *Māori*. For them, Deaf and *Māori* are inseparable parts of self, and feelings and behaviors associated with each aspect are foregrounded differently in Deaf and *Māori* settings.

The status accorded to *Māori* and to Deaf cultures in New Zealand underlies the way in which *Māori* Deaf have constructed their identity in hearing and Deaf social environments. The exclusionary effects of deafness itself and oralist residential schools that reproduced institutionalized monoculturalism, have both worked to distance *Māori* Deaf from enculturation into *Te Ao Māori*, yet simultaneously provided a source of resistance and solidarity that fostered a sense of Deaf identity. Alienation from *Te Ao Māori* was experienced by all participants who expressed some uncertainty in their ability to participate in *Māori* domains. Participants expressed a motivation to change this situation for themselves and for future generations.

Recent consciousness of Deaf as a linguistic-cultural status creates the platform from which *Māori* Deaf have been able to connect with the empowering agenda of a *Māori* renaissance and to challenge the disability lens that frames them in both hearing cultures. Growth of self-advocacy skills and the availabil-

ity of interpreters to access cultural knowledge have facilitated this connection. Parallel agendas of cultural empowerment and self-determination in *Māori* and Deaf communities create sociopolitical conditions that buttress *Māori* Deaf confidence to assert their Maoritanga (*Māori identity*) within the Deaf-world and conversely to represent their Deafness as culture to the *Māori* world. In this environment, *Māori* Deaf leaders have begun to construct a distinctive identity they call *Ngāti Turi* or indigenous Deaf, which they express through new forms of cultural activity, association, and self-representation.

As yet, this process is of limited diffusion into the wider population of *Māori* Deaf and has generated some competing or confused claims to ethnic loyalty—for example, overestimations of shared experience by both *Māori* and Deaf communities and competing goals about the use of a minority language (te Reo Māori or NZSL?) as a marker of ethnicity. Nevertheless, overlaps in the experience and discourse of minority identity politics potentially offers some common metalanguage and symbols through which *Māori* Deaf can articulate their identity and aspirations to members of *Māori* and Deaf communities as they negotiate a unique place to stand in each world.

## Appendix A: Participant Profiles

Pseudonym, age,gender	<i>Iwi/hapū</i>	Residency in rural/urban areas	Parents	Siblings	Etiology of hearing loss	Language use in the <i>whānau</i>	Education	Sign language acquisition	Deaf community involvement
Waimarama, female, late 30s	Waimarama is a descendant of <i>Ngā Puhī</i> and is familiar with her <i>hapū</i> region	Lived in rural Northland until the age of 5. <i>Whānau</i> moved to Auckland so that she could attend KDEC as a day student. Waimarama maintains links to <i>whānau</i> in Northland	Two hearing parents. Father is <i>Māori</i> and speaks <i>Māori</i> and English. Mother is <i>Pākehā</i> and speaks only English. Neither knows NZSL	Eldest of three hearing siblings. Reported a close relationship with siblings because they know some basic NZSL.	Mother contracted German measles while pregnant. Waimarama was identified as Deaf when 9 months old by a local general practitioner	All <i>whānau</i> members communicate orally except siblings who have basic NZSL and one Deaf cousin who uses NZSL fluently. Children are fluent in NZSL and English and speak some <i>Māori</i>	Attended KDEC for her entire schooling years.	Waimarama learned NZSL as a child from Deaf peers at KDEC and later from adult peers in the Deaf community	Waimarama is socially active in the Deaf community, has a <i>Pākehā</i> Deaf husband, and uses NZSL as first language
Joyce, female, early 50s	Joyce is a descendant of <i>Rangitane</i> and <i>Ngāti Amarua</i> and is very familiar with her <i>hapū</i> region	Born and raised in a rural area in the South Island. Moved to Christchurch to attend van Asch (van Asch Deaf education centre) when about 13 years old. As an adult Joyce now lives in Wellington and maintains links with <i>whānau</i> in her <i>hapū rohe</i>	Both hearing, <i>Māori</i> , and spoke mostly English and a little <i>Māori</i> . Neither knew NZSL	Only Deaf child of six siblings. Joyce did not have a close relationship with siblings until adulthood because they did not know NZSL	Diagnosed as profoundly Deaf by family doctor when she was 19 months old. Joyce attributed this to possible measles	All <i>whānau</i> members communicate orally except one sister who recently began an NZSL course. Daughter is fluent signer of NZSL and English and can speak some <i>Māori</i>	Attended a rural hearing school until she was approximately 13 when she was sent to van Asch in Christchurch and later spent some time in a hearing high school	Acquired NZSL as a child from Deaf peers at van Asch and later from adult peers in the Deaf community	Socially active in the wider Deaf community, uses NZSL and is also a teacher of NZSL, has had both hearing and Deaf partners
Manaia, male, mid-20s	Manaia is a descendant of <i>Ngāti Mamiapoto</i> and can confidently recite his <i>whakapapa</i>	Born and raised in Auckland and recently moved to Hamilton to be closer to his <i>imi/hapū</i> and <i>whānau</i>	Both parents are hearing: father is <i>Pākehā</i> and speaks English; mother is <i>Māori</i> and speaks some <i>Māori</i> and basic NZSL	Second of three hearing children. Siblings have some basic ability in NZSL and use some home signs	Prelingually Deaf	Father speaks English, mother and siblings use basic NZSL and some home signs. Children and some Deaf <i>whānau</i> members use NZSL	Mainstreamed in Deaf units in Auckland and also attended KDEC high school	Acquired from Deaf peers at KDEC, Deaf unit, and Deaf community	Socially active in the Deaf community, uses NZSL as first language, has a Deaf partner, and teaches NZSL

## Appendix A: Continued

Pseudonym, age,gender	<i>Imi/hapū</i>	Residency in rural/ urban areas	Parents	Siblings	Etiology of hearing loss	Language use in the <i>whānau</i>	Education	Sign language acquisition	Deaf community involvement
Marie, female, mid-40s	Descendant of <i>Ngāti Maniapoto</i> and <i>Tē Rarawa</i> , Marie was familiar with <i>hapū</i> regions	Marie was brought up in Auckland where she has lived for the majority of her life. Has also lived in Australia. Keeps in contact with <i>whānau</i> rural Northland and Kawhia	Both parents were hearing, <i>Māori</i> , and spoke <i>Māori</i> and English, but not NZSL	Eldest child of three hearing children, with whom she has always maintained a positive relationship	Became Deaf at the age of 2 after surgical removal of a growth on her neck	All <i>whānau</i> members use spoken English. Marie did not use NZSL until she was an adult when she became a part of the Deaf community	Started school at KDEC for approximately 2–5 years and she was mainstreamed thereafter	Marie initially rejected the use of NZSL and was oral up into adulthood. Marie began acquiring NZSL from fellow Deaf peers as an adult when she became involved in the Deaf community	As child and young adult Marie had little to do with the Deaf community. However, she is currently active in the local Deaf community and uses NZSL with others who are Deaf
Peter, male, mid-40s	Descendant of <i>Ngāti Maniapoto</i> , Peter was articulate in expressing his knowledge of <i>waka, hapū,</i> <i>maunga, awa,</i> and <i>marae</i>	Brought up in a rural area nearby <i>whānau/hapū</i> up until he was 5 or 6 years old. Lived during the school term as a residential student at KDEC. As an adult, Peter lives in Auckland and visits his <i>whānau</i> and his <i>marae</i> on a regular basis	Both parents were hearing, <i>Māori</i> , and spoke <i>Māori</i> and English. Neither use NZSL	Peter was the only Deaf child of a large <i>whānau</i> . Relationships with siblings varied because of differences in age and because as a child Peter spent the majority of the year at KDEC	A family doctor identified Peter's deafness when he was approximately 2 years old. Peter does not mention the exact cause of his deafness	Most <i>whānau</i> members communicate orally in spoken English and some <i>Māori</i> . Recently his sister took up a night class in NZSL and can use basic NZSL. Peter has also taught NZSL to some of his nieces and nephews	Peter attended KDEC for his entire schooling years	Peter learned NZSL from his Deaf peers at KDEC, and then as an adult he learned NZSL from peers in the Deaf community	Actively involved in the Deaf community and a fluent user of NZSL

## Appendix A: Continued

Pseudonym, age,gender	<i>Iwi/hapū</i>	Residency in rural/ urban areas	Parents	Siblings	Etiology of hearing loss	Language use in the <i>whānau</i>	Education	Sign language acquisition	Deaf community involvement
Anthony, male, mid-20s	Descendant of <i>Te Arawa</i> . Anthony demonstrated that although he was familiar with <i>hapū</i> and <i>iwi rohe</i> he was only just learning about their names	Born and brought up in a small rural town until the age of 16. At 16 Anthony moved to Auckland to attend KDEC. As a young adult Anthony has also lived in Tokoroa, Rotorua, and Hamilton	Anthony was <i>whāngai</i> to his aunty and uncle for the earlier part of his life. As he got older he had more to do with his biological mother	Eldest child of five children and only Deaf person in <i>whānau</i> . Has an amicable relationship with siblings	Anthony reported that he was born hearing; however, after reoccurring complications with his ears he became profoundly Deaf	Most <i>whānau</i> members communicate orally in English. Siblings and mother used home signs and basic NZSL	Anthony attended a Deaf unit in a mainstream school until he was 16 and attended KDEC as a transition student	Anthony acquired NZSL from Deaf peers at a Deaf unit, KDEC, and the adult Deaf community	Anthony is now an active member of the Deaf community and participates frequently in the community's social and sporting events
Jade, female, early 40s	Descendant of <i>Ngā Puhi</i> . Jade was articulate in expressing <i>pepeha</i> and of her <i>whakakapa Māori</i>	Jade was born and spent her early childhood in South Auckland, yet also lived in rural Northland with her <i>whānau</i> as a teenager. As an adult Jade has lived in Auckland and Wellington	Both parents are hearing, <i>Māori</i> , spoke <i>Māori</i> and English, but do not know NZSL	Jade was the only Deaf child of five children. Jade was very close to her hearing siblings as she had daily contact with them during their childhood	Prelingually Deaf, Jade did not mention the cause of her hearing loss	All <i>whānau</i> use spoken English and spoken <i>Māori</i> . Uses NZSL in the home with her Deaf husband and her hearing children. Children use NZSL and speak <i>Tē Reo Māori</i> and English	Jade attended KDEC from when she was 4 and stayed there for approximately 2 or 3 years. She was then placed in a Deaf unit. Jade was also mainstreamed at a high school in a rural area	Learned some NZSL at Deaf school and Deaf units, yet as a young adult rejected the use of NZSL. Jade did not start using NZSL again until she began acquiring it from Deaf peers as an adult	Jade was primarily involved in the hearing world until later on in her adult life when she was reintroduced to the Deaf community. Jade is now actively involved in the Deaf community, is married to a Deaf man, and participates actively in the Deaf community

## Appendix A: Continued

Pseudonym, age,gender	<i>Iwi/hapū</i>	Residency in rural/ urban areas	Parents	Siblings	Etiology of hearing loss	Language use in the <i>whānau</i>	Education	Sign language acquisition	Deaf community involvement
Patrick, male, early 40s	Descendant of <i>Ngāti Paoa</i> and <i>Ngāti</i> <i>Whānaunga</i> , Patrick is c onfident in expressing his <i>pepeha</i> and <i>whakapapa</i> <i>Māori</i>	Born in Tokoroa, attended KDEC in Auckland as a residential student. Patrick attended Melville High School in Hamilton. Patrick visited his grandparent's farm in Kaiaua on regular basis and as a young adult Patrick lived in Rotorua, Tokoroa, and Kaiaua. In the early 1990s, Patrick moved back to Auckland where he has lived since	Both parents are <i>Māori</i> , hearing, and speak <i>Māori</i> and English; neither used NZSL	Patrick has approximately five sisters and is the only Deaf person in his <i>whānau</i>	Patrick became profoundly Deaf through meningitis when he was 2	Spoken <i>Māori</i> and English were used in the home until Patrick was 5. After attending KDEC, Patrick's parents emphasized the acquisition of spoken English. All <i>whānau</i> members communicate orally in spoken <i>Māori</i> and English. <i>Whānau</i> members do not use NZSL	Patrick attended KDEC until he was about 11 or 12 years old when he was placed in a Deaf unit. Patrick attended a hearing high school	Patrick acquired NZSL from other Deaf children at KDEC and later adult peers in the Deaf community	Patrick is a politically active member of the Deaf community. In particular, he has been very influential in his advocacy and leadership roles concerning <i>Māori</i> Deaf



## Appendix B: Glossary of Māori Words

<i>Haka powhiri</i>	A type of ceremonial welcome used when welcoming visitors onto a <i>marae</i> compound
<i>Hangi</i>	A meal cooked in an earth oven
<i>Hapū</i>	Subtribe
<i>Hapū Rohe</i>	Subtribal boundaries or area
<i>Hui</i>	Meeting
<i>Iwi</i>	Tribe
<i>Iwi Rohe</i>	Tribal area
<i>Kanohi kitea</i>	Showing your face/familiar face (meaning to be present and to be seen by others)
<i>Kanohi ki te kanohi</i>	Face to face
<i>Kapa Haka</i>	Māori performing arts, includes action songs and traditional ways of singing and dancing
<i>Kaumātua</i>	Elder/s
<i>Māori</i>	Indigenous New Zealander
<i>Māoritanga</i>	Māori identity
<i>Marae</i>	A traditional enclosure that usually consists of a <i>marae atea</i> (courtyard) and a <i>wharetipuna/wharenui</i> (ancestral meeting house) that is used for social and political activities of an <i>imi</i> or <i>hapū</i> . Most <i>imi</i> or <i>hapū</i> have at least one <i>marae</i> complex that they use for these activities
<i>Ngati Turi</i>	A term coined by the Māori Deaf community which could be loosely translated to mean “the Deaf tribe.” This term is mostly used however with reference to the Māori Deaf community in New Zealand
<i>Pākehā</i>	Non-Māori New Zealander (usually of European descent)
<i>Pepeha</i>	Proverbial sayings, which often refer to the identity or genealogy of a group
<i>Powhiri</i>	Traditional welcome ceremony usually performed when welcoming people onto <i>marae</i>
<i>Rangatahi</i>	Younger generation or young person
<i>Rohe</i>	Region
<i>Ruamoko</i>	God of earthquakes or personification of earthquakes
<i>Tāngata Whenua</i>	Literally means people of the land but can be roughly translated to mean indigenous peoples
<i>Tāngi</i>	Cry/lament or short for <i>tangihanga</i> : a ceremonial farewell for the dead
<i>Tē Ao Māori</i>	The Māori world
<i>Tē Reo Māori</i>	The Māori language
<i>Tikanga</i>	Principles
<i>Tikanga Māori</i>	Māori principles
<i>Tipuna</i>	Ancestor/s
<i>Tūrangamaemae</i>	Literally means a place to stand, yet suggests the traditional area that you are from
<i>Whakapapa</i>	Heritage or genealogy
<i>Whānau</i>	Family, usually encompasses extended <i>whānau</i>

## Notes

1. A glossary of Māori words appears in Appendix B.  
 2. The decision whether to describe this group as “Māori Deaf” or “Deaf Māori” is an unavoidably politicized one. According to the English syntax of an adjective premodifying a noun, the phrase *Māori Deaf* implies that Deaf is the category of referents and *Māori* is a descriptor, which we understand to be a Deaf-centric perspective. From a hearing-centric perspective, the description is usually phrased in reverse—Deaf *Māori*—connoting a *Māori* person who has the secondary characteristic of deafness. At the risk of pre-empting or contradicting discussion of potentially competing identities, we will use the term *Māori Deaf*, in keeping with the phrasing typically used by *Māori Deaf* themselves (eg, on a 2005 flyer for the “2nd National Māori Deaf Hui [conference]”).

3. This research was funded by the New Zealand Health Research Council and the Philipa and Mornyn Williams scholarship.

4. Kirsten is a descendant of Tē Aitanga a Mahaki, Rongowhakaata and Tē Whakatohea.

5. The study this paper is based on (Smiler, 2004) includes fuller narrative accounts of participants’ life experiences, which are illuminating but too lengthy to include in an article.

6. “Anthony” is a pseudonym. All participants in this study (except for Patrick) were given pseudonyms to protect their identity.

7. The naming of *Ruamoko* incorporated Māori and Deaf cultural precepts: In *Tē Ao Māori*, *Ruamoko* is the personification or god of earthquakes, the frustrated, unborn child of Papatūānuku (earth mother) who manifests frustration over being unborn through geothermal activity such as volcanic eruptions and earthquakes. In NZSL, the sign for *Ruamoko* is the same as earthquake. *Māori Deaf* explain that they chose this name

because Deaf people stamp on the floor creating vibrations to communicate with others. The image also captures their feeling of being frustrated as outsiders in society and suggests the latent political awakening rumbling in the Deaf-world.

## References

- Ahmad, W., Darr, A., Jones, L., & Nisar, G. (1998). *Deafness and ethnicity: Services, policy and politics*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Allen, A. B. (1980). They hear with the eye: A centennial history of the Summer School for Deaf Children, Wellington: Schools Publication Branch, Department of Education, Wellington, New Zealand.
- AKO Ltd. (1995). *Tautoko tāngata turi (support deaf Māori): A report for the Deaf Association of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri and the Auckland Deaf Association.
- Anderson, G. B., & Bowe F. G. (1972). Racism within the deaf community. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 117, 617–619.
- Aramburo, A. J. (1989). Sociolinguistic aspects of the black deaf community. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of the deaf community* (pp. 103–119). New York: Academic Press.
- Aspden, P., de Vere, J., Hunt, J., Monaghan, L., Pivac, L. (1992). Celebrating 50 years of Deaf Schools in Auckland 1942–1992. Auckland: Kelston Deaf Education Centre.
- Baker-Shenk, C., & J. G. Kyle. (1990). Research with deaf people: Issues and conflicts. *Disability, Handicap & Society*, 5, 65–75.
- Ballara, A. (1998). Iwi: the dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from C. 1769 to C. 1945. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Belich, J. (1997). Myth, race and identity in New Zealand. *The New Zealand Journal of History*, 31, 1.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: The Dunmore Press Ltd.
- Branson, J., & Miller, D. (2002). *Damned for their difference: The cultural construction of deaf people as disabled—A sociological history*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Cohen, O. P. (1997). Giving all children a chance: Advantages of an antiracist approach to education for deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 142, 80–82.
- Collins-Ahlgren, M. (1989). Aspects of New Zealand Sign Language. Unpublished PhD thesis (Linguistics). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Davis, J., & Supalla, S. (1995). Language use in a Navajo family. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of the deaf community* (pp. 77–106). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Dively, V. L. (2001). Contemporary native deaf experience: Overdue smoke rising. In L. Bragg (Ed.), *Deaf world: A historical reader and primary source book* (pp. 390–405). New York: New York University Press.
- Dugdale, P. (2001). *Talking hands, listening eyes: The history of the Deaf Association of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: The Deaf Association of New Zealand.
- Dugdale, P. O. (2000). *Being deaf in New Zealand: A case study of the Wellington deaf community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Durie, A. (1997). Te aka matua: Keeping Māori identity. In P. Te Whaiti, M. McCarthy, & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiatea: Māori wellbeing and development* (pp. 142–162). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. H., Black, T., Coddington, K., Douglas, G. S., Kay, S., Eisdell-Moore, P. W., et al. (1989). *Whakarongomai: Maori hearing impairment—Report of the review team to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Māori Affairs.
- Forman, W. (2003). Short communication: Māori and the deaf. *He Pūkenga Korero*, 7, 55–59.
- Foster, S., & Kinuthia, W. (2003). Deaf persons of Asian American, Hispanic American, and African American backgrounds: A study of intraindividual diversity and identity. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 8, 271–290.
- Gerner de Garcia, B. (1995). Communication and language use in Spanish speaking families with deaf children. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of the deaf community* (pp. 221–252). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Haig, I. (1997). Titiro Moko! Whakarongo Moko! In P. Te Whaiti, M. McCarthy, & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiatea: Māori wellbeing and development* (pp. 39–45). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Hairston, E., & Smith, L. (1983). *Black and Deaf in America*. Silver Spring, MD: TJ Publishers.
- Herring-Wright, M. (1999). *Sounds like Home: Growing up Black and Deaf in the South*. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Holcomb, T. (1997). The development of a deaf bicultural identity. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 142, 89–93.
- Humphries, T. (1993). Deaf culture and cultures. In K. M. Christensen, & G. L. Delgado (Eds.), *Multicultural issues in deafness* (pp. 3–15). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Humphries, T. (1996). Of deaf-mutes: The strange, and the modern deaf self. In L. Bragg (Ed.), *Deaf world: A historical reader and primary source book* (pp. 348–364). New York: New York University Press.
- Jacobs, L. (1974). *A deaf adult speaks out*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet College Press.
- Jaffe, R. (1992). *Towards the creation of a consumer-based organisation: A review of the New Zealand Association of the Deaf*. Auckland, New Zealand: Deaf Association of New Zealand.
- Johnson, R. (1991). Sign language, culture and community in a traditional Yucatec Maya village. *Sign Language Studies*, 73, 461–474.
- Johnson, R. E. (1994). Sign language and the concept of deafness in traditional Yucatec Myan village. In C. Erting, R. E. Johnson, D. L. Smith, & B. L. Snider (Eds.), *The deaf way: Perspectives from the international conference on deaf culture* (pp. 103–109). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- King, M. (2001). Māori oral history. In M. King (Ed.), *Tread softly—For you tread on my life: New and collected writings of Michael King* (pp. 161–186). Auckland, New Zealand: Cape Catley Ltd.

- Ladd, P. (2003). *Understanding deaf culture: In search of deafhood*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R. J., & Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the DEAF-WORLD*. San Diego, CA: DawnSign Press.
- McKay-Cody, M. (1998/1999). *The well-hidden people in deaf and native communities. A deaf American monograph series*. Silver Spring, MD: NAD Publications.
- McKee, R. (2001). *People of the eye: Stones from the Deaf World*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Moko-Mead, H. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Monaghan, L. F. (1996). *Signing, oralism and the development of the New Zealand deaf community: An ethnology and history of language ideologies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- National Audiology Centre. (2002). New Zealand deafness notification data: January–December 2002. Auckland District Health Board.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Padden, C. (1980). The deaf community and the culture of deaf people. In C. Baker & R. Battison (Eds.), *Sign language and the deaf community: Essays in honour of William Stokoe* (pp. 89–103). Washington, DC: National Association of the Deaf.
- Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (1988). *Deaf in America: voices from a culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (2005). *Inside deaf culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parasnis, I. (1996). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paris, D. G., & Wood, S. K. (2002). *Step into the circle: The heartbeat of American Indian, Alaska Native, and first nations deaf communities*. Salem, OR: AGO Publications.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pere, R. (1991). *Tē Wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Gisborne: Ao Ake Global Learning New Zealand Limited.
- Pool, I. (1991). *Tē imi Māori: New Zealand population—Past, present and projected*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Ramazanoglu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist methodology: Challenges and choices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Redding, R. L. (1997). Changing times, changing society: Implications for professionals in deaf education. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 142, 83–85.
- Sarantakos, S. (1994). *Social research*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Sarup, M. (1996). *Identity, culture and the post-modern world*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schein, J. D. (1995). *At home among strangers: Exploring the deaf community in the United States*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Schwimmer, E. (1969). *The Maori people in the nineteen-sixties: A symposium*. Auckland, New Zealand: B. & J. Paul.
- Smiler, K. (2004) *Māori deaf: Perceptions of cultural and linguistic identity of Māori members of the New Zealand deaf community*. Unpublished master's thesis (Applied Linguistics), Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2001). *New Zealand disability survey snapshot 6: Sensory disabilities*. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand.
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 14.
- Te Awakotuku, N. (1991). *He Tikanga Whakaaro: Research ethics in the Māori community*. A discussion paper. Manatu Māori: Wellington.
- Te Komiti o Ruamoko Marae. (2002). Certificate of Incorporation of Te Komiti o Ruamoko Marae Incorporation. Registrar of Incorporated Societies.
- Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonisation methodologies: Research & indigenous peoples*. Otago, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Turner, G., & Alker, D. (2003). Partnership in British sign language research and policy development. *Deaf Worlds*, 19, 47–65.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books (NZ) Ltd.
- Woodward, J. (2002). Sign languages and deaf identities in Thailand and Vietnam. In L. Monaghan, C. Schmaling, K. Nakamura, & G. Turner (Eds.), *Many ways to be deaf: International variation in deaf communities* (pp. 283–301). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Wrigley, O. (1996). *The politics of deafness*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Received February 8, 2006; revisions received August 29, 2006; accepted September 11, 2006.