The interpretative resources of Aotearoa New Zealand journalists reporting on Māori

Donald Matheson

This paper explores the interpretative resources which news and features journalists in Aotearoa New Zealand draw on in making sense of their reporting on Māori people and themes. As many commentators and scholars have noted, often in blunt terms, the news media in Aotearoa New Zealand fail, by a range of criteria of good journalism, in their reporting of Māori individuals, society and culture. In particular, a very limited range of themes and topoi is drawn upon in their coverage. That limited range is, moreover, one familiar to scholars of ethnic prejudice in many western cultures. I detail some of those criticisms shortly, but the paper builds on rather than details existing findings. Based on detailed interviews with seven newspaper and magazine journalists, its argument is instead that, while the journalists were sometimes aware of limitations and shortcomings in their reporting of what is usually called 'Māori affairs' or 'race relations', they drew on a limited repertoire in talking about what was wrong with the coverage or what might be done differently. Their interpretative resources to reflect on that reporting were tightly circumscribed. The paper concludes with some thoughts on the implications of its argument for journalism education.

Context

The interviews carried out for this paper took place in the particular place and time of Aotearoa New Zealand in early 2005. That context needs some discussion, as it shaped both the interviews and the analysis undertaken below. The year 2004 saw matters of land, ethnicity and nationhood actively and deliberately politicised in what could be described as a backlash against the decolonisation process in Aotearoa New Zealand. Iwi or regional Māori institutions have been expanding steadily since the 1980s, particularly in education, broadcasting and health. Some iwi have also been growing richer, as land, fishing rights and other resources are given in partial recompense for historical injustices. In January 2004, National Party leader, and leader of the opposition, Don Brash called for an end to what he called 'racial separatism' in the country's administration, which he argued treated Māori differently in such areas as health and education and had led to a 'culture

of grievance' among Māori (Brash 2004). His personal poll ratings and his party's ratings soared in the speech's wake and, in a knee-jerk response, the Labour-led Government appointed a review unit to weed out any such 'special treatment' in its programmes. The speech led also to heated debate in the news media over the extent of special treatment.

Soon after, and in the eyes of some commentators (for example, Johansson 2004), part of the same political moment, the Government pursued with renewed vigour legislation that clarified ownership of the country's foreshore and its in-shore seabed, vesting it primarily in the Crown and denying traditional customary – in practical effect, iwi – rights. It rejected arguments from the Māori Land Court, the Waitangi Tribunal and iwi themselves that land rights should be left to the courts to decide, and contributed to a climate of prejudiced argument that Māori were seeking to deny New Zealanders their birth-right of access to beaches (Butt 2004). As a direct result of that legislation passing in April 2004, a significant number of Māori politicians sought new routes of action through the founding of the Māori Party and a hikoi on Parliament, one of the largest protest marches the country has seen since the Depression. These events had an impact upon journalism as well. They led to a slew of news coverage in which the understanding of Māori as a dependent and secondary culture within New Zealand could no longer remain simply an unstated but shared resource for making sense of the news. It was instead explicitly stated by Brash and by voices raised in his support, and was therefore open to challenge by others. At the same time, a radical Māori politics of difference and self-determination became visible within, rather than entirely outside, the legitimated political institutions.

This historical moment thus thrust journalism to the forefront of debates over land, identity and culture, a position for which, critical media scholars tend to agree, it was not well prepared. Aotearoa New Zealand's news media have struggled to reflect – let alone lead – the longer term political and cultural changes of which the Orewa speech, the Foreshore and Seabed Bill and the formation of the Māori Party were part. In a major study of the main television station's news programmes from 1984 to 1995, researchers found that 62 percent of the sources for news thematised around Māori were Pākehā, and only 13 per cent Māori (McGregor and Comrie 1995), suggesting a news media speaking about Māori to a dominant culture in which Māori have little stake. A recent update to the study largely confirms the figures (Comrie and Fountaine 2005). Wilson (1990) accuses journalists of handling Māori news worse than any other aspect of reporting, because they did not understand Māori perspectives. Saunders (1996: 167), a journalist reflecting on his colleagues' reporting of Māori affairs, accuses the media of failing to counter a sense of division between Māori and

Pākehā: 'Journalists possess the power and have a unique opportunity to improve the mood and tenor of race relations, but have failed.' Rankine and McCreanor (2004: 23) trace the differential treatment given to Pākehā and Māori leaders of a health project, in which joint work between a whanau and a Pākehā-led medical team to study the genetics of illness was represented as white doctors saving sick indigenous people. They conclude: 'This is colonial coverage – it functions to reinforce and reproduce the subordinate position of Māori and their position of "other" to the norm of modern Pākehā society.' There is little evidence of biculturalism in news agendas, but rather a focus – consistent over time – on Māori as problems, criminal, radical, dangerous, exotic, deviant; that is, as a racialised 'other' in all the many manifestations of that status.

The media's repertoires of prejudice

One major approach in this critique of Aotearoa New Zealand's racialised reporting has been discourse analysis, much of it building on Wetherell and Potter's (1992) major study of discourses of racism in this country. I too follow their argument that race and racism can be usefully understood as a set of interpretative resources embedded in particular speech situations. Racism is thought of less in terms of a field of meaning (Hall 1997), in which binaries of 'us' and 'them', 'civilised' and 'primitive', 'rational' and 'irrational', and the like, line up in ideological structures so as to produce subjectivities and knowledges. They propose instead that racist discourse, including such binaries but also many other rhetorical practices, is much more elastic, deployed within various modes of talking and thinking to establish dominance and to make sense of existing social structures. The theoretical distinction is important for analysis, as it directs study towards everyday, situated talk as sites of racism as much as towards the grand discourse and actions of the powerful.

Wetherell and Potter focus on a number of 'interpretative repertoires' that they find regularly deployed in Pākehā talk about others (Wetherell and Potter 1992: 115). A key repertoire comprises language categorising people in ethnic terms such as 'Māori' or 'Pākehā', and placing them differently with respect to other categories such as being part of the nation or being different. Another repertoire positions the dominant Pākehā society as having 'normal', 'rational', 'scientific' influence, and positions different perspectives as correspondingly exotic or abnormal, and sometimes radical, activist irritants. Another involves tools of argument or topoi which have the power to account for or dismiss historic Māori grievances over land. These include:

Nobody should be compelled.
Everybody should be treated equally.
You cannot turn the clock back.
Present generations cannot be blamed for the mistakes of past generations.

Such readily available and socially accepted discursive moves are, importantly, 'rhetorically self-sufficient'. That is, they close down argument by holding the status of 'what we all know'. In doing so, they both deny racism and invert the accusation of prejudice onto the critic who raises the racialising nature of the talk (see also van Dijk 1999). Together these and related repertoires empower Pakeha in relation to racialised others, including Māori.

Talking to journalists about this

This paper reports on in-depth semi-structured interviews with six Aotearoa New Zealand journalists, and a brief interview with a seventh, all practising news or features reporters in the print media who wrote regularly about Māori individuals, groups and issues. Unfortunately, practical difficulties and some journalists' unwillingness meant no political reporters were interviewed, although they reported often on the most dramatic parts of the debates in 2004 over Brash's Orewa speech, the seabed and foreshore legislation and the birth of the Māori Party. The interviews were conducted between December 2004 and June 2005. The questions asked the journalists to reflect on their reporting of Māori in the political context noted above.

Talking to journalists about their role in the coverage makes the picture described above of inadequate reporting based in repertoires of prejudice become more complicated. Almost all were aware of inadequacies in news coverage of Māori and were aware of the politicised nature of reporting which did things differently. Indeed, they saw their reporting as an important intervention in public debate, placing, for example, Brash's January 2004 statements about the need to end 'special treatment' for Māori under considerable scrutiny. One of my respondents went as far as to say that he thought 'the Aotearoa New Zealand media covered themselves in glory' in the months after Brash's speech (resp.3) because they asked – for a time – quite probing questions. Most of my respondents also described themselves as unhappy with much coverage of 'race relations'. They almost all described themselves as 'liberal' or 'left-leaning'. They used self-descriptions such as 'feeling frustrated' about the difficulty in exploring the complex cultural differences within journalistic constraints. One 'agonised over which way to angle' a story on Tariana Turia,

a Māori politician whom readers would only know from the news as one of the 'radical irritants' that Potter and Wetherell (1992) describe (resp. 2). The phrase 'I was conscious' is common in the interviews, suggesting that, even before my interview, they spent some time in a discourse of critical reflection. The only journalist interviewed who identified partly as Māori spoke of her colleagues' support against editorial prejudice towards her. A number also spoke of the power of journalism among people with little immediate contact with minorities. They were, on the whole, reflective, critical, concerned to be non-racist and dissatisfied.

There is some evidence here, then, that dominant journalistic constructions of 'Māori affairs' are replicated in spite of the attitude of a number of the key journalists involved in that coverage. The problem with news coverage is not simply that journalism is 'structured in dominance' (Hall 1980), allowing debate only within a dominant consensus among authorised voices and so tending 'faithfully and impartially to reproduce symbolically the existing structure of power in society's institutional order' (Hall et al. 1978: 58). Thus Henry and Tator's (2002: 225-6) critique of 1990s Canadian journalism, to take one recent analysis, does not quite apply. Henry and Tator found that the problems of a racialised coverage are unacknowledged and invisible: 'racialised discourse works silently within the cognitive make-up of individual journalists and editors, and within the collective culture and professional norms and values of media organizations' (225-6). The situation in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand is not quite one of unacknowledged pervasive racism.

What, then, is going on here? There are two points to be made at the outset. Firstly, this paper reports on interviews with seven journalists who cover 'Māori affairs' regularly. Other journalists might of course say other things, and those other reporters, subeditors and editors may have quite an effect on the final published texts. Secondly, the interview context I constructed, asking respondents to think critically and justify themselves to a no doubt left-wing academic, will have had some effect. But I would argue more is going on here than that. It is certainly a mistake to regard journalists as non-reflexive, as simply practitioners of a tacit and situated 'knowing-how', with little theorizing 'knowing-that'. As scholars of journalism's culture have noted, its practitioners build interpretative frameworks around what they do (Zelizer 1993). They are thus reflexive, in Giddens' (1991: 54) sense of sorting events in their professional practice into 'an ongoing "story" about the self' of the journalist. Journalism certainly relies upon much tacit knowledge about such matters as newsworthiness and good writing (see, for example, Adam 1989), and is certainly thin

on explicit explanatory accounts of its practices. But there is, nonetheless, a rich vein of talk within the practice about what journalism is, what its role in society is and what makes for good journalism, discussions in which these journalists are participating through their talk. I therefore want to explore here the nature of that reflexivity, to tease out how Aotearoa New Zealand journalists who focus on matters of ethnicity and minorities draw upon collective resources to reflect on their work. This argument presumes that there are enough commonalities in their statements to talk about the journalists' responses as by and large shared. I will also argue that there is evidence that this collective interpretative repertoire is narrow and circumscribed, so much so, in fact, that Aotearoa New Zealand journalists find it difficult to see beyond dissatisfaction towards other ways of reporting. The analysis of journalistic self-understanding engages with the 'story about the self' which journalists construct. In doing so, it provides an avenue for critique to contribute to growth in the practice.

Cultural difference and liberal journalism

All the journalists, even the one who made no claim to be liberal or left-leaning, were concerned that Māori perspectives could not be adequately understood by a journalism situated entirely within the dominant culture. They thus recognized, at a fundamental level, cultural difference. They spoke about the need to educate their readers, to 'cue them in' to different ways of thinking (resp. 2), to explain Māori concepts and words and to challenge negative images of Māori individuals. One spoke of the problems in a story about a man who made use of state funding to get a moko for himself: 'That [story] was quite offensive because we didn't explain how valued getting a full body tattoo is to that culture' (resp. 6). The journalists acknowledged, then, that there were significant cultural differences; they accepted that it was part of their job to foster cross-cultural understanding within the country; and they commented that Aotearoa New Zealand journalism did not do a good job in fostering such inter-cultural understanding. They were also sometimes quite politicised in the way they discussed this. The respondent who critiqued the moko story called her organisation's use of the plural form 'Māoris' rather than 'Māori', against the advice of scholars of the Māori language, 'bad' and a recent reversal of that style decision as a sign that 'they improved during the year'. Another called her employer's agreement to use Māori language terms in a story 'momentous' because it was acknowledgement that all New Zealanders should have or should gain some knowledge of Māori culture: 'they were saying, "If you live in New Zealand and you don't know what a marae is, you should, so get your dictionary out".' (resp. 5)

Bridging cultural difference, however, was formulated largely as a matter of increasing people's knowledge of key concepts and words. It was thus made compatible with liberal ideals of journalism as providing the public with factual information, and compatible too with journalistic notions of objectivity that displace responsibility for meaning onto the sources and onto audiences. In other words, the power of language to construct versions of the world and to call people into understanding themselves in line with those versions was not thought through in any clarity. The role of culture in shaping self and understanding of others was not made explicit. Consequently, reality remained a self-evident matter, a matter of facts speaking for themselves (Glasser 1996). Thus the respondents' understanding of cultural difference was rather thin. Within journalism, called by some 'the strongest bastion of positivism' remaining within western culture (Gans 1979), this is understandable – it allows the tensions between the identity politics which underpin the idea that knowledge differs across cultural groups and the positivism which underpins the key journalistic ideas that the world can be described objectively to be elided away.

In this discursive move, understanding the history of Aotearoa New Zealand, for example, is a simple matter of facts. Thus one journalist said that 'one training I think any journalist expecting to work in New Zealand should make sure they have is a damn good understanding of New Zealand history' (resp. 3). When it was pointed out that debates over 'special treatment' for Māori and over the foreshore and seabed debate involved competing histories of colonization (and much else), he replied:

> *Yes, that's an issue. On the one hand I want editors to take a stand and say it's pretty clear that we can put that one to rest [that the Treaty of Waitangi has not been honoured and needs to be] but I've a feeling that we did that but realised that a lot of our readers weren't ready to give up that argument yet. (resp. 3)*

What appears to me fairly clearly as a matter of ideology, the differently distributed, and contested, power of groups to define reality, is phrased here as a matter of giving readers the resources to catch up with the journalist's thinking. As a result, the journalist himself is only tangentially implicated in the cultural politics he is writing about, and can stand outside the space of debate, establishing facts and reporting the arguments. It thus made sense to this same journalist to see a very critical story about Brash's claims – one that struck me as motivated by an alternative version of history – as 'trying to be detached but asking a challenging question'.

Consequently, all but one respondent assumed that they as journalists and their audiences could negotiate cultural differences with relative ease. Only respondent 5 (who identified as part-Māori) was able to speak in any depth about the cultural situatedness of the reporter. At one point she said:

> *There are a lot of people who still don't understand the very Māori concepts behind the foreshore and seabed debate and even my boyfriend, who is very liberal, well travelled, and extremely bright, has said to me: 'I just don't understand what they want the beaches for?' This is right at the core of it all, a lot of people who are writing about these things, where it is up to you to inform the public about what this is about, don't understand it themselves, because it is a concept that doesn't translate into English or into the European way of life. (resp. 5)*

She spoke also about her personal experience of racism, including at work. Her interview stood out from the others because of her lived, deeply felt, understanding of prejudice as limited knowledge of how others think and as the power of some ways of thinking over others.

The other respondents recognised that they spoke from a particular culture, but saw that as no more serious than other problems of knowledge that they negotiated daily. One drew on the common journalistic trope that a lack of specialist knowledge was sometimes an asset because 'I wasn't assuming that the audience knew.' The potential problem was not great, and was described as a matter of being 'on the back foot' in interviewing Māori:

> *I just tried to be true to their…not distort what they were telling me so I kept close to their intended meaning […] It's the same if I'm doing something about a business field I know nothing about. (resp. 2)*

Another said that 'you just have to be willing to listen' and that 'if you're polite and listen – both those things are quite a universal language' (resp. 3). Journalism, in other words, needs to be little more than balanced and sensitive. The notion that racialising assumptions appear not just in one story about a moko but throughout a journalism that speaks about a subordinated culture to a dominant culture, in that dominant culture's language, using its interpretative resources, was not available to these respondents. The news was on the whole 'quite measured', said one, pointing as evidence to a case where the racist comments of 'a crazy farmer' had been edited out by senior colleagues (resp. 6). Although there was

criticism of the news, none (leaving aside the journalist who identified as Māori) saw their and their colleagues' position within one culture as a significant aspect of their stories of self.

Although dealt with in these ways, a sense of dissatisfaction persists in the interview responses, suggesting that the tension between a recognition of cultural difference and an acceptance that journalism should report facts and opinions in an objective fashion is not resolved. Respondent 6 speaks almost in two voices:

> *We've run perspective pieces for and against [Māori claims on] the foreshore and seabed, and they let me do a big feature explaining it. It wasn't sympathetic but I didn't write it like a lot of stories were, about Māori wanting to take the beaches. So they gave it a really good run. I think they were pretty good. I found it difficult more because of my own individual feelings about the whole thing. I did feel we were focusing on some things that we wouldn't have if it weren't [name of iwi]. (resp. 6)*

On the one hand she accepts the journalism she was involved in producing was fair – neither sympathetic nor prejudiced – but on the other she feels different criteria held for Māori stories. In the face of apparently fair coverage she appears not to be able to articulate concerns about the racialised coverage. She is, it should be emphasised, quite critical, concluding that the outlet is as balanced as one could expect of one aimed at a white readership, but she lacks ways of talking about this, or lacks ways that have the power of journalism's liberal discourse. She falls back on her personal sense of identity – 'my own personal feelings about the whole thing' – rather than her identity as a journalist as the site of her concern.

'I'm very conscious'…: Talking about their lack of knowledge

This reflection within parts of journalism cannot be seen in isolation. The statements discussed above are also statements made to an academic researcher within a society where identity has become political. Thus the statements can, at the same time as they are discussed as accountable in terms of journalistic culture, also be discussed as accountable in terms of wider debates. In particular a fear of doing things wrongly in a 'politically correct' society is discernible in some of the responses, and is prominent at times to a worrying degree. The respondents reveal a self-monitoring that is perhaps more about avoiding the opprobrium that comes with the accusation of being prejudiced than about finding ways to

make connections between cultures that have different ways of perceiving the world. For one respondent, this worry was a major point:

> *I would say that most of our newsroom, and myself included, are generally – what's the word – overly cautious because there is that fear of offence. Yeah, I think so, I'm especially conscious [of that]. (resp. 4)*

She talks of her lack of knowledge about Māori language, society and culture and of some minor reporting mistakes she has made as a result of those gaps in knowledge. She suggests some training in Māori practices and words as a solution to this 'slight paranoia' that she feels. Others talk similarly, remarking on their limited personal experience of the country's other cultures, particularly Māori.

What is striking, and what makes this way of talking particularly problematic, is that these comments arise in the context of the daily practicalities of dealing with sources, focusing on negotiating with a prickly iwi kaiwhakahaere or getting a quotation right. 'I was conscious of how politically fraught it was', says one (resp. 2). This discomfort is not, I would argue, separable from the recognition that European-based cultures have great power to define other cultures in terms of their difference to the west, but the discomfort is quite strongly expressed at times in terms of an external force. The discourse provides no tools to think about whether the perceived offence is valid, and indeed can easily become a sense of embattlement in the face of the external pressure, even censorship. Thus this kind of reflection, although it is intertwined with reflections on journalism's inadequacies, emphasises getting by in what one called 'such a politically correct' country. Matters such as power inequities in society or the whiteness of what's called 'public debate' remain opaque.

Criticising newsroom culture

Only one respondent, a senior figure in his organisation, directly criticised the whiteness of the workplace in explaining the limitations of news on non-white ethnic groups. For him, the news agenda and the quality of reporting would not change until a prejudiced group of older male journalists left (resp. 7). The others, apart from the one respondent who did not describe herself as left-leaning or liberal, all placed some distance between themselves and their colleagues in relation to this topic, talking rarely of 'we' and speaking of 'the newsroom' in the third person. But they did not emphasise the workplace's role in perpetuating ethnic prejudice and most felt able to write around any constraints it placed on them. Respondent 2, for example, described her outlet and its readership as conservative, but said:

With feature articles we all acknowledge that certain kinds of political value judgements come through, and I would probably be on the more liberal end of the range at [name of publication], but I've never felt restricted. I'm conscious that I'm not going to be preaching to the converted. I might be able to change some thinking […] If you say it in the [publication] style you can do that. (resp. 2)

She gave as an example of her ability to change people's thinking her deliberate use of 'conservative' Māori voices, who would be more convincing to her editors and readers, to make a positive comment about the 'radical' Māori Tariana Turia. She therefore thinks of the constraints provided on public debate by the dominant culture's constructions of Māori (and she is conscious of this) as something she can write around. She thinks in terms of the individual instance of reporting, and interprets her room to manoeuvre as freedom.

Others also criticised their colleagues, but in quite limited (and arguably overly generous) terms. One talked of how a senior colleague removed background paragraphs from stories which explained aspects in which the Māori worldview differed from the Pākehā, but described that firstly as something done only to Māori affairs stories and later something that had occasionally been done to background paragraphs in her stories on non-Māori topics as well (resp. 6). Another described how a series of articles she proposed on what it means to be Māori today was cut down by colleagues into a single article on racism against all ethnicities in the city. Although she was angry, she talked of the decision as a practical one, of her editors' concern at losing her for a number of months while she wrote the series and of the space it would take up, and to an extent as a lack of vision (resp. 5). She pulled up short of making criticism that being Māori is not simply a subset of a larger category of non-whites suffering racism. The journalists' interpretative repertoire to account for newsroom decisions focuses on the practical – the lack of resources to cover issues in depth, the range of audience interests they need to meet, and the lack of time. Again, underlying issues to do with the position of the newsroom within one culture are left unspoken.

It is, I think, significant, that respondent 5 then went on to talk in more personal terms about her experience of racism later in the interview. Revisiting the editorial decision in that context, she was able to reinterpret it in terms of race. She referred also to a conversation she had had with a Māori bureaucrat who said that only people from non-white ethnicities could ever understand what it felt like to have a police car slow down and follow them as they walked along the street. 'And that really resonated with me, and I guess that is what I felt I was up against' (resp. 5). It was at a moment of thinking about her life experience,

when she stepped outside a journalistic identity, that the structural and pervasive nature of racism in the workplace was something she could articulate. At other times pragmatic accounts that are not about ethnicity are drawn on.

Conclusion

I would not want to be critical of these journalists. Given the pressures on them, particularly of time, their reflections show depth of insight, concern to produce good journalism and a sense of the political implications of their work. But that reflection appears to take them only so far in rethinking the racialised coverage. They are able to ask critical questions of the speeches of a right-wing politician, but less able to see their own practices as part of white dominance. What I have sought to show is that the interpretative resources which these journalists have available to them are not developed enough to do much about Aotearoa New Zealand journalism's failures in covering Māori politics and culture.

How, then, might these matters be addressed? I do not think it is a matter of awareness raising about biculturalism or demands for greater sensitivity. Although one respondent said she had not thought about these matters much and was grateful for the opportunity the interview gave her, she and others were already quite aware of the limitations of the coverage of Māori and others labeled as non-white. Where they lacked critical tools was in thinking through the tension between the powerful 'God-terms' of journalism such as facts and objectivity (Zelizer 2004) and the task of bridging across cultural differences. They tended also to focus on the particular case and lacked the bigger picture of prejudice as embedded in relations between cultural groups that are rooted in colonialism. The respondents were not able to talk – or were not comfortable with talking – about prejudice as a matter of dominance and power. And, apart from one journalist who identified partly as Māori, they had little sense of how deeply embedded white privilege is in everyday life and basic cultural assumptions.

More Māori journalists might help address these problems (although see Stuart 2002), as would a greater emphasis from news companies on meeting the needs of their non-white readers. The rise of Māori-run media perhaps provides an impetus for progress in both those areas. In concluding this paper, however, I wish to emphasise the importance of journalism education in providing journalists with the tools to analyse the representations they produce, so they can develop more complex ideas about criteria such as fairness and balance, think more deeply about the frameworks of understanding that a news story

invokes and understand the link between being able to talk in certain ways and wielding power. This is perhaps not such a tall order, for the journalists I spoke to seemed sometimes close to such concepts but just not able to articulate them. The situation is not, then, akin to that in Australia, where polemical voices from cultural studies and an untheorised journalism studies (primarily represented by John Hartley and Keith Windschuttle respectively) have polarized debate. Journalism training at the top polytechnic and university schools already, I understand, takes journalism students part-way down such a track. This is an avenue for further research. I would also argue that journalism education could learn much from nursing education which, under the slightly unwieldy label of 'cultural safety', focuses on students' own cultural identity. For it is striking that the only respondent with a rich sense of cultural difference and of the structural prejudice in journalism culture was the one who had to negotiate both Māori and Pākehā culture. As Wepa (2003) puts it, cultural safety asks the professional to do the job from a position of having reflected on her or his own cultural identity and the impact that has on her or his practice. The relationship of the nurse with the patient is of course quite different to that of the journalist with her or his multiple stakeholders, the source, the audience and public debate. The balance of power is much more complex. Moreover, this is not something academics can or should seek to provide journalists, both because journalism's independence is precious and because professional practices are not easily changed from the outside. What critique can perhaps provide journalists, though, is some tools to assist in developing more reporting that is able to participate more fully in contemporary cultural politics.

References

Adam G S 1989 Journalism knowledge and journalism practice: The problems of curriculum and research in university schools of journalism *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14 (2) 70-80

Brash D 2004 Orewa speech: Nationhood National Party of New Zealand 27 January available at http://www.national.org.nz/speech_article.aspx?ArticleID=1614 [accessed 10 Sept 2006]

Butt D 2004 The 5-minute foreshore and seabed: A Pakeha perspective and summary Dannybutt.net 4 May available at: http://www.dannybutt.net/foreshore.html [accessed 11 Sept 2006]

Comrie M and Fountaine S 2005 Who is making the news? Paper presented at ANZCA 2005 conference 4-7 July Christchurch NZ

Glasser T L 1996 “Journalism’s glassy essence”. Preface to a special section on “The language of news” *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 73 784-86

Giddens A 1991 *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age* Cambridge Polity

Hall S 1980 Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance In *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism* Paris UNESCO

Hall S 1997 The work of representation In S Hall (ed) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* London Sage

Hall S Critcher C Jefferson T Clarke J and Roberts B 1978 *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* London Macmillan

Henry F and Tator C 2002 *Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English Canadian Press* Toronto University of Toronto Press

Johansson J 2004 Orewa and the Rhetoric of Illusion *Political Science* 56 (2) 101-19

McGregor J and Comrie M 1995 *Balance and Fairness in Broadcast News* Wellington Broadcasting Standards Authority and New Zealand on Air

Wetherell M and Potter J 1992 *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation* New York Columbia University Press

Rankine J and McCreanor T 2004 Colonial coverage: media reporting of a bicultural health research partnership *Journalism* 5 (1) 5-29

Saunders J 1996 Skin deep: The news media’s failure to cover Maori politics In J McGregor (ed) *Dangerous Democracy: News Media Politics in New Zealand* pp166-80 Palmerston North Dunmore Press

Stuart I 2002 Maori and mainstream: Towards bicultural reporting *Pacific Journalism Review* 8 42-58

van Dijk T 1999 'Discourse and the denial of racism' in A Jaworski and N Coupland (eds) *The Discourse Reader* pp 541-58 London Routledge

Wepa D 2003 An exploration of the experiences of cultural safety educators in New Zealand: An action research approach *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 14 (4) 339-48

Wilson G 1990 New Zealand journalists: Only partly professional In P Spoonley and W Hirsh (eds) *Between the Lines: Racism and the New Zealand Media* Auckland Heinemann Reed

Zelizer Barbie 1993 Journalists as interpretive communities *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 10 (2) 219-37