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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the narratives of three Samoan women and their vā praxis in the context of a recently created arts centre in Poutasi, a nu’u (village) on the southern coast of Upolu, Samoa. Adopting Wendt’s (1996) argument that the vā changes along with relationships and contexts, I examine how these women negotiate their vā fealoaloa’i (social space) as they collaborate in the newly created spaces of an indigenous micro-enterprise for woman at the centre of their rural village.

The thesis canvases the forms of collaboration and social structure the women have created for themselves, as well as the disparities and challenges women face in Samoan rural society generally, as one of the most vulnerable populations. How do they negotiate new ways of operating, between an arts centre model and the fa’amatai system (translation)? How do they collectively teu le vā (nurture the vā), and how do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures? Which role does fa’amatai play in the facilitation of the centre? How do diasporic notions of the vā change the social spaces in the arts centre?

Through Talanoa, interviews, participatory observation and visual documentation, the study identifies and analyses factors influencing the negotiations of vā fealoaloa’i (social spaces), differences between various notions of vā held by the participants, and their practices of negotiating their vā fa’asinomaga (identity) within the context of their village. Su’ifefilo (Silipa 2008, Refiti 2015) provides a Samoan indigenous framework threading together the women’s multi-facetted narratives with the data, co-constructed in talanoa and obtained through participatory observation. Thus, the thesis also contributes to the discourse of indigenous research methods and the discussions of vā in Samoa and the New Zealand diaspora.

The women’s experiences, practices and narratives show what vā can be in the customary practices, on the one hand, and in the context of a micro-enterprise, on the other. From my own understanding of diasporic and academic interpretations of the vā, I suggest themes by
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which these women negotiate new spaces, hierarchies and boundaries, to facilitate different hierarchical structures, specifically for their interactions at the arts centre.

KEYWORDS: vā fa’asinomaga, vā fealoaloai, fa’asinomaga, socio-spatial blurred boundaries
1. AMATAGA | INTRODUCTION

1.1. UIGA AUTŪ: BACKGROUND

This research was conceived during discussions following my volunteer work with the NGO Poutasi Development Trust (PDT) in my capacity as an academic lecturer in 2012, which I discuss in Chapter 1. My main concern is with women’s welfare and education which I explore in this thesis in what this means in terms of the praxis of vā. Specifically, I examine a relational vā of individuals relating to the social spaces and significant buildings and spaces in the village. This vā constantly evolves in my observations and impacts on the identity of indigenous Samoan women in the context of the village and also of those Samoan women in the diaspora.

The exploratory research is centred around a small participatory study of women’s negotiated identities which take place in the art centre located in Poutasi on Upolu. Poutasi is developing as a village and plays an important part in the development of economic sustainability for the Falealili region that suffered severe losses from the 2009 Tsunami.

In 2015, the women participants of this research, as part of an NGO located in Poutasi, launched this initiative to provide financial opportunities for women in the village and the district. This was a response to the declining numbers in the village population, on the one hand, and, on the other, the marked increase in tourism has made this development feasible.

I therefore explore how the transformation of vā from the perspective of the work lives and narratives of those women, who facilitate and operate a micro-enterprise in the village (Cahn, 2008, p. 3). The arts centre is the predominant space for the data collection of this research. The women are involved in the arts-based enterprise to provide a cash income for themselves led by the female matua’u (master weavers) of the district. As a collective, the women have differing ‘designations’ and roles in the village and this is explored in chapters 2 and 3 (under Pacific and Diasporic World Views and Participant Information).

My role as a researcher began with my previous affiliations with the Poutasi region as a teacher and volunteer, therefore I approach the women’s narratives of ‘negotiated’ identity politics from my own understanding from a New Zealand born and educated Samoan. I present in this chapter a
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historical analysis of the site of the data collection and present an overview of the structure of the study. I conclude by unpacking some key terms and definitions used in the study.

The centre was launched in 2015, as part of the Poutasi Development Trust, to help improve economic opportunities in the Falealili region. The centre currently employs two women (one weaver and her assistant) who operate the art centre on a daily basis, one female volunteer business administrator and women from the nu’u who sell their woven crafts at the centre.

![Image of people working at the art centre]

Figure 1 Tama’itai ole art centre: Image credit Charmaine Powell, 2013

In this type of research, exchange is important, and the arts centre is a site where I was already familiar with the people, so that I could contribute some of my own learning in a way that would benefit and contribute to their practices as weavers and makers. In this thesis, I refer to this part of my engagement as my ‘voluntary work’.

Firstly, to understand these exchanges, it is necessary to understand some ways of being, or doing things in an indigenous context. Therefore, I will now briefly look at relational aspects of these exchanges and what they meant in the context of my research.

There are few written accounts of how the vā is lived or practised in a rural village setting. The vā is both a sacred way of being within the fa’aSamoa (ways of acting or being Samoan) and something that is utterly familiar – for both these reasons, perhaps, the vā is rarely mentioned in public. I deal with vā in more detail in Chapter 2 (Literature Review), for now, it is enough to say that the vā, as a diasporic concern, has been developed from the original indigenous term into an explicitly social concept regulating the relationships between people belonging to the same community. This difference between the understanding of the vā in Samoa and the diaspora respectively sometimes
proved difficult in the research situation. However, as a Samoan, I am aware of basic protocols and am able to recognise levels of discomfort or tension in different social spaces – discussed in Chapter 3 (*Su’ifefilo‘i ‘Ula: Research Design*).

My initial visit to Poutasi occurred in July 2012, after the tsunami, when I was visiting family in Samoa. A friend and artist Fatu Feu’u, invited me along to meet a group of people from his *aiga* in Saleilua and Poutasi to discuss a possible collaboration of Unitec students with the creation of an ‘art centre’ in Poutasi. This village had been granted New Zealand Aid funding, via Tuatagaloa Joe Annandale (a philanthropist and main matai of the village). The aid was to support the rebuild of the school and a new community hall, as part of the tsunami relief programme. This was my first meeting and introduction to Tuatagaloa, who helped develop and introduced me to key people in the village, particularly several of my key informants and participants in this research. In 2012, a memorandum of understanding about a partnership was signed between Poutasi Development Trust (PDT from hereon) and Unitec Institute of Technology, Te Whare Wānanga o Wairaka, New Zealand, which I had initiated alongside the Pacific Centre at Unitec. This partnership was developed over a two-year negotiation period between Tuatagaloa, Fatu Feu’u and Unitec, during which time we gauged possible mutual interests between the Trust and Unitec students.

As a scoping exercise following the MoU, I returned to Poutasi with a small team of film makers to explore possible collaborative projects with PDT that our students could support and learn from. PDT was in its early stages of developing a garden project when the team and I produced a short-documentary for our internal purposes, examining the development and vision of the rebuild of the school damaged during the Tsunami.

---

1 New Zealand Aid funding branch to international developing countries. Total aid to Samoa is made up of programme funding for activities specific to Samoa, as well as other funding which can include scholarships, regional initiatives, activities supported through the Partnerships Fund, and humanitarian response. (Trade, n.d.)

2 Poutasi Development Trust was originally set up as a charitable trust. Now officially an NGO for the region, which employs over 60 people (including the RSE scheme workers), contributing over 1.2 million ST to the local economy annually (Russell, 2014).

3 Our small team of filmmakers consisted of a group of Samoan and Tongan academics including myself as the producer, which produced a 12 minute film aimed at exploring a wide range of initiatives being developed in Poutasi.
In 2013, I returned to Poutasi with a class *mala*ga (travelling group) of graphic design students to participate in a wayfinding live studio project, in collaboration with the local carvers and the PDT.

The art centre which is located at the end row of classrooms, looking out towards the outer atoll island of Nu‘usefe‘e, is part of the ‘aid’ development that has eventuated from funding for post-tsunami and natural disaster funding from NGOs. The row of buildings are part of the new development: a library, an Early Childhood Centre and PDT. The layout of the art centre comprises of two large open areas, divided by a high shelf that separates the retail store from the work space that I examine in depth later in this thesis. The buildings are repurposed spaces of the original Falealili Primary School.
On this particular *malaga*, we visited the arts centre which was then under construction. Discussions about possible women’s committee utilising the centre had been proposed by PDT. However, Tuatagaloa and Feu’u commented that the development of an ‘arts centre’ space was originally aimed at developing opportunities for unemployed men from the village. The centre would be a place to build and carved *paopao* (small fishing boat), which could help rejuvenate the small fishing operations of local families, who had lost their livelihoods and boats due to the tsunami. The proposal of a carving studio space to revive *tufuga fai va’a* (customary boat building) was short lived because many of the boat builders who were men had opted for more immediate economically viable work alternatives.\(^4\)

Following these observations, the ever present impact of global pressures and village life, has seen an increase of rural village people from the Poutasi area migrated to Apia or to New Zealand and Australia (Lilomaiaava-Doktor, 2009). Werner Hennings (2017) recent study showed the impact of the tsunami on the structure of the Poutasi village showed that the movement of villagers and their homes inland and the migration of people away from a traditional *malae* arrangement (circular panoramic layout) to the main road inland, is a threat to traditional Samoan spatial knowledge and settlement patterns. I discuss his findings more in-depth in the following chapter on how this impacts on the orientation people to their environment.

What was also evident as a challenge of retaining workers or people in the village, was the increasing popularity of Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) programme\(^5\). This programme supports seasonal workers to work offshore and has increasingly motivated families (mostly men) to take part as a source of income. The average hourly wage in Samoa is $2.30 Tala, and a return bus fare to Apia, where the majority of skilled work places are located, costs $6.00 Tala. Therefore, the establishment of rural micro-enterprises is imperative and pivotal to the survival and maintenance

\(^{4}\) See RSE Programme, below. On reflection, several factors impacted on the sustainability of the initial development, namely, aid funded aluminium boats and already existing *paopao* (fig. 2) were ‘donated’ to these areas as part of the tsunami relief (therefore illuminating the need to carve further boats) and increasing financial pressures on families in the villages largely driven by global influences continued to drain the local resources (of people) overseas and towards Apia township, away from the rural coastal areas.

\(^{5}\) Recognised Seasonal Employer, attract seasonal workers from various Pacific nations; to work in the horticultural industry in New Zealand for a period of five to six months. Workers have estimated to take home with them 4-5,000 NZ dollars back to their homes and families who remain in the villages, making the RSE programme a highly attractive source of income for rural villages.
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of communities in rural areas. The study focuses on the other half of the work force, the women of the village and on specialised micro-enterprises⁶.

The proposal that women should become ‘key stakeholders’ (facilitators) of the art centre was developed later when Volunteer Services Abroad (VSA) and The Tindall Foundation (TTF) joined in partnership with community leaders to form the PDT. Key women were selected with the support and guidance of Marion Muliaumaseali’i, who was a PhD student conducting research in Poutasi at the time, and PDT established in 2012 (Russell, 2014).

This study contributes, therefore, to the narratives of women from a regional or village perspective, and the development of rural economic enterprises aimed at supporting women’s craft-making skills. A considerable amount of literature and case study reports has been published showing that the improvement of economic opportunities for women, together with their education, impacts directly on their families and communities. Part of the regional and cultural context is about understanding Poutasi as a traditional Samoan rural community.

1.2. HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF SITE | POUTASI NU’U

Figure 4 (Plate) The Atua district is in the eastern division of Upolu Island (1924), Williamson, R.W.

⁶ Micro-enterprises is defined as a very small scale enterprise, especially one in a developing world that employs less than ten people.
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Poutasi is located on the southern coast of the Atua district (see lower coastline in Figure 4), in Falealili district. Prior to the 2009 Tsunami, the Poutasi village centre was located mainly on the coast (Hennings, 2017, p. 41). After the Tsunami there is a clear shift of what Hennings describes as the ‘nucleus’, now scattered along the main inland road which includes several government buildings: a police station, the district clinic hospital (which serves the district) and the Falealili High school. Alongside the district hospital stands a Western styled fale tali malo (guest house), formerly owned by the Poutasi Women’s Komiti (committee) which accommodates visiting doctors of the district clinic. Within a 2 km radius of this village centre is a rugby field and a local dairy dating back before the Tsunami. The former village centre was made up of a scattering of houses along the coastline and was known as a popular fishing village. The coastline and physical structures have dramatically changed due to the effects of tsunami.

Like most village layouts in Samoa, the location of important buildings such as falele (guesthouse) is based on family land ownership and their position relative to the malae, the rest of the household resides behind this main guesthouse. The Poutasi fa’alupega (village honorifics) is linked to the larger historical village of Saga. Kramer records that the Poutasi fa’alupega as having two of the highest ranking chiefs of the district - Tuatagaloa and Meleisea (1994, p. 290). They are foundational titles of the village and district and have a significant influence on the lives and roles of the women in this research.

The 2009 Tsunami and more recently the 2012 cyclone drew much attention from the Samoan communities in New Zealand and Australian and as a result, funding agencies from these countries supplied ‘aid’ (Masoe, 2016, pg.1).

The UN General Assembly report recommended the need for capacity building for SIDS and affirming that “small island developing States require continued and enhanced investments in education and training programmes to develop human and institutional capacities so as to build the resilience of their societies and economies, while encouraging the use and retention of knowledge in

---

7 The 2009 Tsunami devastated the island’s coastline, claimed 143 people’s lives and affected as many as 850 households along the southern and eastern coastlines of Upolu and Savaii.

8 SIDS is an acronym for Small Island Developing States, meaning maritime countries that tend to share similar challenges in sustainable developing countries. Samoa is currently one of 57 state nations and hosted the 3rd International conference of Small Island Developing States meeting in Samoa, September 2014. The published report that I refer to in this research is published on the SIDS website (Russell, 2014).
all its forms, including traditional knowledge, within those States and ensuring accountability and transparency in all capacity-building efforts by all parties” (United Nations General Assembly report, 2015).

The PDT aims to build sustainable economic projects as solutions in utilising current people skills and developing future skills. Thus women’s craft in the village context is important to this as it an innovative and transformative initiative for wider women’s circles and partnerships in rural Samoa.

Notions of place and identity from the gendered perspectives of Samoan women and their lived experiences highlight the challenges of ‘designated’ roles within a village community. Today in the changing face of modern Samoa, identities can mean blurred lines of social relations. In this research, it became evident that structures based on fa’amatai can be prohibiting in some situations, leading to tensions with the need to negotiate the running of a micro-enterprise that is not explicitly oriented towards the customary ways of the village.

My observations of the three women involved in the arts centre is that they challenge traditional notions of space as boundaries between people (tuaoi) and their designated roles in the village. Their identity is very part of the understanding politics of gender, power and status (L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; Schoeffel, 1979) and an important part of this research explores the changes in the notion of space as relational exchanges both in the physical spaces of the ‘social’ (vā fealoaloa’i) and the ‘spiritual’ (vā tapuai) within the village.

The study focusses on each woman’s ‘positioning’ within the art centre and village context, thus the individuals ‘social’ and ‘physical’ orientation is important to the study. Bradd Shore (1999, p. 269) discusses the concept of ‘concentric dualism’, as a model of circular radiating influences that shape a Samoan village, and depicts an increasing formality of effects where there is less in the periphery and more towards the centre of the nu’u (village). The centre of the nu’u in this study post-tsunami has ‘shifted’ and as I interpret, has disrupted the traditional notion of ‘centre’ and ‘sacredness’ in the village. Therefore, I am interested in the effects of repositioning of structures and what impacts this might have on the new arrangement of spaces as structures of belonging fo the key occupants. I look at what the limitations are of these ‘new’ space and what do the participants in the study define as challenges?

In previous studies by Penelope Schoeffel and Peggy Fairburn-Dunlop identified that social structures in the nu’u are intrinsically connected to complex hierarchical systems based on the
feagaiga relationship – the relational-division between daughter/son or sister/brother. The feagaiga is a dyadic system premised on the covenant or relational vā between a sister and brother (Schoeffel, 1979, p. 53). I identify in this thesis new emerging political structures for women in an intricate and complex system of hierarchical structures (see chapter 2). I discuss my own positioning as a woman and how this impacted on the research. In chapter 3, I discuss how the participants were recruited, how the questions were framed, and how the project was contextualised in the nu’u.

Because this research is located in a rural setting, it was also important that these ‘negotiations’ involve binary cultural ways of being and understanding. For instance, a person’s behaviour and etiquette in Apia township differs to how one behaves in a rural customary village from how one might dress to how one conducts themselves in public. I examine this practise later in this chapter and how my previous work in the village has helped familiarise the movement between these two separate spaces. An important aspect of this positionality or vā fa’asinomaga is how ‘I am’ perceived by others, as always “the self is never an individual perception, but one governed by surroundings and social context” (Tui Atua 2001, Anae 2007, Mila-Schaaf 2003, Wendt 1997, Refiti 2015). I discuss this further in my findings in how the notion of vā fa’asinomaga plays a large part in the methods used in this research and how this might impact on the findings (Anae, 1998).

My presence in the nu’u also demands that although I may be ‘seen’ as Samoan, I acknowledge that I have a Sāmoan New Zealand understanding of fa’aSamoa (Tuagalu 2008). Thus, I understand and acknowledge that reciprocity and exchanges between New Zealand and Samoa, are well established and practised in this nu’u. Therefore, protocols of a New Zealand and Samoan exchange are contextualised and practised often in exchanges, as mentioned earlier in the introduction. I recognise however, that there are individual differences in the way that Samoan’s understand themselves by location (diaspora or village), by language, by fa’aulupega (family genealogy) and that these then inform a persons vā fa’asinomaga (Aiono 1997), and the interpretation of dialogue (Kogler, 2005) and the social structures from which one works.
It is important in research such as this to establish relational ties, or the vā to determine the appropriate honorifics within social networks in the nu’u (Duranti 1998). The notion of vā fa’afesoloa’i (the consultative space) and vā fe’so’otai (connecting space) are negotiated and established prior to any engagement for purposeful and meaningful engagement with participants (the key stakeholders are people with authority or have a high ranking in the fa’amatai system). Because of my outsider status, I follow protocol by making connections and consultation with the head of the Poutasi women’s’ Komiti (women’s council), the matai (as a cultural advisor) and the manager of the PDT.

An example of following protocol can be described in my scoping exercise, a mealofa (gift) of food was delivered as part of an asiasiga (visitation) from the western fale (owned by the PDT) that I was sharing with another researcher. It was sent on behalf of the Poutasi Komiti o Tina formerly the Poutasi women’s committee. This act of mealofa (gift), through an asiasiga (visitation and acknowledgement of presence in the village/country) indicated that my presence had been made aware to the highest ranking female in the nu’u at the time. The asiasiga was conducted in an informal way, by delivery of mea’ai (food); no speeches, just a kind gesture of food on my second day. Enough food for an entire village was delivered, which I reciprocated by visiting the faletua’s (wife of the matai) house and presenting her with gifts of New Zealand-made food and products. I discuss this further in my analysis of ‘exchanges’ and ‘reciprocity’ in chapter 3: Research Design.
1.3. **CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND QUESTIONS**

The study provides an analysis of the narratives and perspectives of three individual women facilitating the art centre and explores their challenges in their rural space and their ‘negotiations’ of new terms of practise, and therefore new spaces, for micro-enterprises to operate innovatively in Samoa. The research asks:

How do women who run indigenous micro-enterprises negotiate their own social structure within *fa’amatai* systems?

How do women *teu le vā* (nurture the vā) in the arts centre?

Does the Samoan *vā fa’asinomaga* impact on their roles in the art centre? If so, how?

Which role does *fa’amatai* impact on in the facilitation of the centre?

What key elements of social structure in Poutasi impact directly on ‘negotiated’ spaces?

How do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures?

By asking these questions, I explore how these structures and hierarchies impact directly on the women’s identities and on their micro-enterprises within the *fa’amatai* system. I also wanted to know what are the ‘limitations’ or barriers on the art centre, and whether they create new spatial and social orientations in the *vā* of the village. What are their aspirations for the growth of an arts collective in their *nu‘u*?
1.4. POSITIONING OF THE RESEARCHER | FA’ASINOMAGA

Because the understanding of the other’s self-understanding is necessarily ‘our’ understanding, the task is to show how an interpreter situated or grounded in a particular culture is capable of bridging the difference between her own self understanding about something so as to gain access to the meaning and self-understanding of another (Kögler, 2013, p. 353).

I am a ‘New Zealand diasporic Samoan’, an insider researcher with a diasporic (outsider) perspective. The highly discussed and debated constructs of Samoan identity and belonging are integral to how I identify myself as a Samoan in the context of a Samoan nu’u and also how I am perceived in an indigenous Samoan rural context. In the case of Poutasi, I have no gafa (genealogical) connection to the village, but my prior voluntary work gives me a relational association. In this section, I examine how I, as a researcher, am situated in this study and how my fa’asinomaga orients my approach.

Karlo Mila-Schaaf (2010, p. 20) examines the insider and outsider positioning when conducting interviews with her Pacific Island participants and notes the problems associated with being a Tongan in a small Tongan community in New Zealand. This insider/outsider status raises ethical concerns for this research, because I have no familial links to the village that forms the site of the inquiry. So I acknowledge that I am an outsider and sit outside the nu’u. However, I will be viewed as an insider as I have had previous interactions with this village, which I will unpack later in the chapter.

My parents migrated to Auckland during the height of the dawn raids in the 1970’s. Like many of their Samoan migrant generation at the time, they brought with them, fa’aSamoa (ways of being Samoan). Their customs and ways of being were played out in the ‘new’ urban village of church

---

9 The dawn raids were a New Zealand government response to a perceived immigration crisis, which started in 1974 and continued through to the mid 1980’s. Raids were performed on Pacific families homes largely in Auckland to crack down on ‘overstayers’ during the economic downturn.
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communities throughout Aotearoa. In this research, as a Samoan researcher living in New Zealand I refer to myself as a diasporic Samoan which is integral to my vā faasinomaga or identity.

Examining and negotiating this identity construct is an important aspect of this research. The context of indigenous identity is known as fa’asinomaga\(^{10}\), that is, how one is perceived by others, because the self is never an individual perception, but one governed by surroundings and social context (Tui Atua 2001, Anae 2007, Mila-Schaaf 2003, Wendt 1997, Refiti 2015). In the context of Poutasi, my relation is primarily that of an outsider Samoan ‘researcher’.

When honorifics are exchanged in formal introductions, for example during initial meetings, I was referred to as a tamaitai mai Nui Sila (a woman from New Zealand). Situating oneself within the political structure of Samoa, it is important to understand relational ties to specific people in the village. Once participants and villagers understood who I was, as well as the intention of my visit, I was referred to by name: ‘Rowena’.

Samoans always contextualise their genealogies in their introduction. Here lies a key description of who I am. In the eyes of my participants, I am defined by my vā fa’asinomaga. My role as a teacher in the arts becomes an avenue of exchange and reciprocity between myself, the participants and the nu’u. Vā fa’asinomaga also directly relates to how the data is analysed in ‘dialogue through interpretation’ (Kogler, 2005), discussed in chapter 2. This statement defines the processes of associations that I make within a village setting. Because I have no familial ties to the village, I am a Samoan woman, my actions reflect on my families (both immediate and extended), the villages I relate to in Samoa, and finally my personal career, thus making this ‘highly personal’. As Teresia Taieawa explained that as a Pacific researcher, “Pacific studies is not only an academic field; it is an especially intimate field that people enter, often with highly personalized stakes” (Teaiwa, 2001 352, cited in Mila-Schaaf, 2010). I not only agree with Teaiwa but would go further to suggest that these personal stakes, also create challenges in regards to the boundaries with participants and therefore how one is perceived in relation from one participant to another. This was something I was constantly aware of and attempted to manage in my data collection - discussed in the methods and findings chapter. It also influenced the research design in chapter 3, where I discuss the Pacific Methodological framework and approach.

\(^{10}\) Fa’asinomaga is simply described as a persons holistic purpose in life, that defines a persons relation to a their aiga or village.
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I identify as a New Zealand diasporic Samoan-born woman raised in Auckland. Mila-Schaaf adopts the term “second generation” (2010, p. 30), which is derived largely from literary contexts and describes her position as a New Zealand born Tongan. Her ‘stories of our lives’ (2010, pg. 30) has an undefined sensibility – providing the flexibility of “negotiated identities” for those who operate in social and cultural multiple ‘social spaces’, based on Bourdieu’s theory of multi-dimensional social space (Mila-Schaaf, 2010, p. 31). Mila-Schaaf states that this framework allows for the ‘second generation’ to “move between culturally divergent spaces, occupy multiple subject positions and therefore, accrue many cross-cultural resources” (ibid). From this second generation positioning, I explore the varied spaces transnationally across the New Zealand and Samoan spaces further and unpack how these ‘interpretations’ of identity as second generation and negotiated identities exist in indigenous contexts.

What emerged early on in the discussions of framing this research, was the difference of praxis of vā or the transnational differences. The title ‘O feosofaiga’ relates to the shifting and moving multi-dimensional platforms of vā. There are very few accounts that had been written on the actual praxis of vā within the nu’u. However, this is not a comparative research. In this part, I refer to my understanding of vā and that of the praxis of vā in the nu’u. I start by contextualising my positioning as a ‘diasporic New Zealand Samoan’ as knowing ‘her own self’ and then examine is a contextual positioning. It is also crucial to differentiate the context of a Samoan who has not been affected by New Zealand diasporic issues, i.e., displacement (Tupuola, 2004c), to that of a ‘diasporic Samoan New Zealander’. In doing so, I examine the multiple layers of my situated ‘identity’, given my previous associations in the nu’u as discussed earlier in this chapter.

In the research, I explore how the ‘praxis’ of vā fealoalofani and va fa’asinomaga in relation to the participants. In order to understand this, I expand on the definition of this term when directly relating to people and their interactions. I expand on the many nuances with associated terms for vā and how they expand on the many different vā. Because I’m working with a group of women, it is important to look at these definitions or explanations as a relational tool or function in terms of the manner in which we engage with others with its many associated meanings and nuances. As a notion, the use of vā in the Samoan language often orientates itself towards, ways of acting or the ‘praxis’ as defined by Martin Heiddeger: “The fundamental difference between poiesis and praxis concerns the distinction between potentiality (dynamis) and actuality (engergia)” (Verenget & Overenget, 1998). This assumes, that protocol and etiquette are defined equally from different individuals. However, one of my questions raised during the process of data collection, is what if one of the ways of understanding etiquette and protocols are being developed from a diasporic setting
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as opposed to the indigenous setting? How are these ‘negotiated’ and taken into account. For this type of occurrences, I specifically refer to examples in chapter 4 by including the questions and contexts of the questions.

In this context I am ‘seen’ as a Samoan ‘woman researcher’. Identification labels like these help contextualise one of the crucial underpinnings of this research, where ‘identity’ has multi layers and ‘social spaces’ in the indigenous context and especially *nu’u*, according to Duranti (1981a). He describes, social spaces constitute a part of ‘being’ or acting in public spaces. In this research, I investigate how these spaces surrounding the art centre and the women operating them, become part of a place. I also aim to explore how these social spaces are acted upon and what constitutes new identities or shifting identities.

During an early part of the process, a colleague and friend of Samoan US nationality, once questioned the prominence of New Zealand diasporic dialogue around vā; and the importance of defining my research within a New Zealand diasporic experience, which affirms the need to state, I am a diasporic New Zealand Samoan. I adapt the use of both English and Samoan language and terms, as most of my participants have a good command of both languages. However, I operate primarily from a Samoan worldview which I discuss further in chapter 3.

Like many of my parent’s migrant generation, they brought with them *fa’aSamoan* (ways of being Sāmoan) (Anae 1998, Tupuola 1994). Their *fa’aSamoan*-ness operated in the ‘new’ urban village of church communities throughout Auckland. I learnt at an early age that our household’s practise of *fa’aSamoan* differed from other household contexts. For example: I remember my uncle always reminding us in Samoan:

‘*fa’aoga le gagana fa’apiritania i ō le aoga, o’o mai le fale, e sā le gagana piritania e le fale lenei...alu le fa’asamoan ma le gagana Samoa*’ (pers comms of a caring Uncle Sefo).

Loosely translated and directed at us children, ‘use English at school, in this house you are not to speak English but Samoan only’. So I learnt at an early age, to adapt my use of gagana faasamoan in a variety of different contexts. For instance, at home, in the homes of relatives and in wider community (Sunday School) various levels of negotiated platforms of ‘ways of being’ Samoan exist in social gatherings. Navigating a diverse way of ‘being’ a Samoan in a diasporic New Zealand allows for a wider and multi-dimensional level of social awareness and that is ‘acted up’ across different contexts.
My late father introduced me to this abstract notion of vā, as a child. He would say, ‘A’ano, teū le vā ma lou Tinā’, which I would then have to translate into English due to my limited gagana (spoken) Samoa, as ‘nurture the space between myself and my mother’. Hence the interpretation of language is a limited in parts of this research, which are then either explained in footnotes or clarified in translation.

The language that I use to understand Samoan concepts is primarily in English. However, I also am fortunate to have a Pacific worldview (Sanga, 2004b; Tupuola, 1994), having grown up in New Zealand, I am also fortunate to be able to have a career that embeds tikanga Māori (Māori ways of being) where the importance of indigenous rights are also valued. My knowledge of aganu’u (formal honorifics) or lauga (formal Sāmoan oratory) are limited, despite this, I am confident in operating different ways of being Samoan in a very diasporic contemporary way.

1.5. Glossary and Key Terms | Upu ma uigā

You cannot understand our aganu’u and our agaifanua, our tu ma aga or faasamo, without understanding the history of our language and the theology or theologies that shape and define it. (Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta’isi Efi, 2016)

As an educator, I have always been fascinated by the vast differences between the Samoan indigenous terms and its English translated equivalence and vice versa. For instance, in the Samoan language, the term measina is defined as treasured artefacts/objects or knowledge production for customary ceremonial purposes. Recently, this has been linked with the notion of ‘western art’. Whereas the definition of the western notion of ‘art’ which is also problematic, is largely comprised in two very broad generic definitions, ancient art and modern art. However, according to Samoan gagana (language) there is no direct translation of the term ‘art’ in the Samoan language. The practise of ‘making’ of art whether that be within a craft is deemed as a measina. Something that is held in high regard in Samoan society and of cultural importance. However, the term measina has been used in the diaspora, to articulate specifically 3 areas of production, for tatatau (tattooing), fale building and boat building. Which raises questions for me as woman, how are women’s notions of art valued in the Samoan worldview?
Therefore, I examine the use of Samoan indigenous words/contexts in this research and from time to time, expand on indigenous concepts or terms or words either via footnotes or in brackets, that do not translate appropriately into English.

Here are some of the key terms used in this research.

- **aiga**
  - family (both immediate and extended)

- **asiaisiga**
  - visitation and acknowledgement of presence in the village/country

- **augafaoape**
  - female *taupou* title (more respectful term for *taupou*)

- **auamaga**
  - group of ‘untitled men’, an institution in every *nu’u*

- **aualuma**
  - society of ‘unmarried’, widowed or separated women of the village

- **fa’alupega**
  - naming of village *matai* titles, usually performed in ceremonial introductions

- **fa’asamoa**
  - ways of being Samoan, to be Samoan

- **fa’asinomaga**
  - one’s identity

- **fale tali malo**
  - guest house

- **faletua**
  - the respectful term given to a wife of a paramount chief or a church minister.

- **feagaiga**
  - term used to describe a sacred relational covenant between individuals and groups of people, which define protocol and etiquette in vā relationships such as the *vā tapuia*. The most important *feagaiga* is that which exists between a brother and his sister.

- **Komiti/komiki**
  - Samoan transliteration of ‘committee’
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teu le vā  cherish/nurse/care for the relationships.

nofo tane  term to describe a woman who is married into her husband’s family. As opposed to the term ‘faiāvā’ which describes a man who is married into his wife’s family

nu’u  village

malaga  to voyage or travel, aumalaga is a travelling group

matai  chief, or leader of either family or village (a title holder)

mealofa  gift

measina  treasures; referring to objects or knowledge or specific artefacts

matuau’u  master weaver

paopao  small fishing canoe/outrigger

sinomaga  purpose of the topic or person’s role

su’i  to stitch, to mend, to collate

su’ifefiloi  the act of stitching, weaving, synthesising

tausi  (To nurture) – as well as the term given to the wife of an orator chief

talanoa  to discuss in a meaningful way, can be informal and formal (to talk)

talanoaga  and organised discussion or meeting to talanoa

tu ma aga  ways of doing (common practices)

tufuga fai va’a  master Canoe builder/carver
1.6. **OVERVIEW STRUCTURE OF THESIS**

This overview gives an insight to the structure of this thesis. In Chapter 1, I explore my own positioning in this research in relation to the art centre, key participants and context of site. I established the context and emerging micro-enterprise NGO PDT as a key stakeholder, giving context to the association of the women who are key to this study. I also give a brief historical account of Women’s Komiki in Poutasi and its current state of the in relation to the participants, but also highlight possible suggestions as to why there are sustainable challenges in regards to women’s engagement and question this to my participants. Following on from this I have looked at the notion of ‘aid development’ and how this directly relates to the micro-enterprises, the exchanges of and the role of new negotiated collective spaces for arts in rural Samoa and village context to unpack its location, nu’u and key people involved. I also define Samoan concepts and terminology explored in this research around the notion of vā used in theoretical frameworks (Anae, 1998; Mila-Schaaf, 2010; Wendt, 1996) in this thesis. As a diasporic Samoan, I often associate these terms from my own perceived associations of vā. I unpack, whether my association of the notion of vā is the same as my participants (let alone family) in Samoa. Do these associations change due to the context or place? How is the notion of vā played out? Initially, unpacking the notion of a diasporic notion of vā was my original question submitted through the AUTEC Ethics committee.
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Finally, Chapter 1 contextualises the notion of vā as a praxis by introducing the historical site, the significance of the location of the art centre and region of this study in regards to the small study of women identified in this research. As an insider/outside to Samoan customary culture, the impetus for me is to examine my own position as a researcher as I try to explain the effects of interpreting fa’asinomaga in the context of the participants and the problematic power dynamics that this poses, and not to mention the stakes involved in identity relational politics that Teresia Teaiwa (2001) saw as issues for indigenous researchers.

Chapter two presents the Literature Review that examines previous studies and research in relation to this project. Here I have arranged this chapter into a historical overview of rural Samoa and its current societal structures. I briefly examine the types of frameworks and Pacific worldview as a basis of exploring different perspectives at play within my analysis and also discuss briefly the gaps in the literature review and research. In chapter 3, I present the Research Design and discuss the framework I adapt and those I have borrowed from to suit the context of my research. Chapter 4, I present the Findings from the data collected and Chapter 5 presents the discussion of the potential for this (and further) research and the findings.

1.7. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 1

In this chapter I examined how the division of ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ divide woman according to their association and marriage. What evolved in the scope of this project, was the identification of the ‘nofotane’ status of the three woman in this study. Therefore, it was paramount to understand each participant’s relational vā based on their ‘orientation’ and ‘positioning’.

Evidence also suggested that the notion of ‘concentric dualism’ discusses the spatial layout, and therefore ‘power’ dynamics in a Samoan village context, has been used to analyse spaces in a Samoan setting. In this study, I examine the use of illustration spatial diagrams to explore positioning of individuals according to the ‘new’ village, and unpack how and where the woman ‘orient themselves’ in social spaces?
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As a summary of key developments in this chapter, I present the main questions that evolved during this phase of the study:

What are the current challenges experienced by ‘secular’ woman in this art centre?

My secondary questions that during the process of research that emerged from this study are:

How do women teu le vā (nurture the va) in the arts centre?

How does each participant describe or define their fa’asinomaga (identity)?

How do women orient themselves and position themselves in social spaces?

Where does fa’amatai impact on daily in the facilitation of the centre?

What key elements of social structure in Poutasi impact directly on ‘negotiated’ spaces?

How do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures?
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION AND STRUCTURE OF LITERATURE

"We cannot begin to understand either in evolutionary terms or in current and historical situations why and how women in so many cases have been relegated to secondary status until we first reckon with the power women do have, even if this power appears limited and seems outside the political field”.

Annette B. Weiner (1977, p. 227) cited in Schoeffel

The literature review unpacks different ways of understanding, articulation, framing and theorising for the purposes of clarifying previous research and claims. The chapter has been organised thematically to survey previous research that I have either referred to in this study to explore; the process of this research, to examine the idea of vā fa’sasinomaga or roles that are given to women due to their marital ‘status’ as Weiner suggests in the quote above. One of these explorations delved into notions of spatial praxis and literature that provided some insight into how spatial positioning and vā fealoaloai effect the lives of women in rural Samoa. I also explore other Pacific frameworks, and approach’s that helped formulate an appropriate methodology to this research.

This literature looks at the nu’u context (indigenous rural Samoa) and more so recently around the entrepreneurial activities happening in Samoan rural communities led by women and potentially how gender and status studies of women in these communities are affecting change in rural indigenous communities; and how the current vā fealoaloai (social structures) formally seen as boundary driven are being redefined as ‘negotiated’ spaces in this progressive village community. I explore case studies and research not limited to groups, not necessarily as individuals.

The first part of the review gives an overview of the study which is divided into five sub headings – firstly a historical overview of Poutasi through some key case studies (Hennings, 2017; Russell, 2014; Schoeffel, 1979). It also includes a more generic overview of literature based on Samoan social society (Aiono & Crocombe, 1992; Kramer, 1994; P. S. Meleisea et al., 1996; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2004; M. Meleisea, Meleisea Schoeffel, Sio, & Va’ai, 1987; Felix M. Keesing & Keesing, 1956; Shore, 1999; Duranti, 1981b) followed secondly by examining the positioning of Pacific worldview and indigenous knowledge (Du Plessis & Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2009; Efi, National University of Samoa, & Centre for Samoan Studies, 2008; Gegeo & Watson-Gegeo, 2001; Hau’ofa, 1993; Māhina, 2010; A. Refiti, 2015; Silipa, 2008; Thaman, 2003) studies. However, several of this thesis revolves around a particular focuses of woman’s development (Cahn, 2008; P Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1991a; George, 2011; Jeannette Marie Mageo, 1996; L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; Solomona, 2013).
Another integral part of this study, analyses the praxis of vā (Aiono, 1997a; Anae, 2016a; Ka’ili, 2005; Māhina, 2010; Tuagalu, 2008; Wendt, 1996) however, in more detailed analysis of literature, I focus specifically on the unpacking of vā fa’asinomaga constructs and ‘designation’ as illustrated by Fanaafi Le Tagaloa Aiono O le Faasinomaga: le tagata ma lona faasinomaga (1997) publication. I elaborate further on vā fa’asinomaga and how this relates to ‘positioning’ by exploring key studies that unpack identities and populations of Samoan woman (Aiono, 1997a; Anthias, 1998; P Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1991b; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2004; NHRI, 2015; Schoeffel, 1979; Shore, 1999) and hierarchical structures in fa’amatai systems (Felix M. Keesing & Keesing, 1956; Kojo Saffu, 2003; Kramer, 1994; P. S. Meleisea et al., 1996; Shore, 1999; Tcherkezoff, 2005). This section grouped in the fourth sub-heading is organised under the designated roles or vā fa’asinomaga (Aiono, 1997b; Tui Atua T.T.T, 2007) that examine identity politics in relation both from a global (Abdelal, Herrera, & Johnston, 2009; Anae, 1998; Anthias, 1998; Kögl, 2013; Macpherson, 2009; Massey, 1994; Mila-Schaaf, 2010; Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009) and local contextual beliefs around boundaries or more specifically the notion of tuaoi (boundaries) as articulated by Shore (1999) and Tui Atua (2007).

The final part section of this overview 1.2.5, explores the term of Oceanic (Bennardo, 2002; Hau’ofa, 1993; Māhina, 2010) as described by key Pacific scholars, who ‘orient’ their research from a ‘sea of islands’. A key scholar and contribution to this aspect of ‘Oceanic’ is the work of the late Epeli Hauofa’s paper ‘Our Sea of Islands’. Hauofa’s (1993) investigates the decolonising of previous ethnographic research by demanding that Pacific scholarship should from the greatness of our ‘ocean’ vastness, not by the smallness of our islands. I examine, how this term and notion of ‘oceanic’ contributes a wider ethnographic positioning and perspective of ‘exchanges’ and ‘transnationality’ of space and relational connection.

Finally, I examine the approaches to research I have explored in this study (Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Nabobo-Baba & Farrelly, 2014; Sanga, 2004a; Seiuli Sauni, 2011; Smith, 1998; Thaman, 2003; Tupuola, 1994, 2004a; Vaioleti, 2006) also relative to the non-indigenous qualitative methods examined as part of this research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Merriam, 2009; Tashakkori, 2016) which I also elaborate further in Chapter 3 – Research Design. In exploring relational aspects in Samoan led and Pacific indigenous research, I threaded together and adapted aspects of widely used approaches in the research design for this thesis and explain later in this chapter.

In section 1.4 of this review, I examine a more in-depth look into the political structure in a Samoan village (Bourdieu, 1989; Hereniko & Wilson, 1999; Felix M. Keesing & Keesing, 1956; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2009; L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; Schoeffel, 1979; Tcherkezoff, 2005) aspects of rural village
places and the context of space as mentioned previously. In this research, I focus on one rural village, however, identify the rural with the region in which this village is located, as opposed to the urban village or those who live towards the township.

I have analysed this literature review by creating an article centric analysis, by exploring relevant literature and then unpacking key themes by coding/tagging these key themes. I also explore previous research conducted around Samoan women, in Samoan villages that explore stories case studies of gender and social boundaries. A considerable amount of literature has been published on Samoan women stories by various ethnographic scholars and Samoan scholars, however, an exploratory form of research is premised on interactions in a contemporary and stories by Samoan women in an ethnographic perspective, however, these interactions aim to showcase relevant and gaps of literature in the area.

Several Pacific academics and researchers adapt indigenous Pacific concepts in the diaspora to understand the notion of teu le vā as a ‘nurturing’ contextualisation of vā within relationships. In this context Falefa uses the Le Vā as a framework for educational and health sectors. Whereas Mahina examines the ‘ta and vā’ (time and space) relative to Tongan heritage arts and space. On analysis, many of these researchers exist and operate in the diaspora, presenting an interesting notion of the romanticised notions based on diasporic attitudes and what I refer to as diasporic identity studies. The notion of vā is neither discussed in literary circles in Samoa, nor does it exist local according to Wendt (1996), however what is evident in my findings is the constant negotiation around social correctness and social conduct.

In this research I also examined the participants as a ‘collective’ in their efforts to develop an ‘arts based enterprise’, in a rural setting. A non-indigenous term ‘approach’, I look at how little has been written about Samoan women’s enterprise other than Malama Solomona (2013) study on ‘Samoan Entrepreneurship: Natural Disasters, Vulnerability and Perseverance’, which focussed on the Women’s in Business and Development NGO post-tsunami efforts and the wide efforts of this organisation Miranda Cahn’s ‘Indigenous entrepreneurship, culture and micro-enterprise in the Pacific Islands: case studies from Samoa’.

As opposed to Cahns (2008) whose research is from a nationwide scope of case studies, my research focuses on a single art centre, written about the narratives of women’s experience as ‘indigenous micro-entrepreneurs’ a term coined by Miranda Cahn (2008) and later extended on by Solomona (2013). According to both these researchers, ‘indigenous micro-enterprise’ is defined as a blending
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_of fa’aSamoa_ and business entrepreneurship. As this study deals with an art centre model enterprise, I look at the ‘efficacy’ of business and I am interested in how women in particular introduce and negotiate _fa’asamoa_ and _fa’amatai_ aspects into their enterprise.

I explore the narratives of these women from largely a politically spatial orientation and focus the discussion on key narratives of women, and negotiation and how this may involve the negotiation of extending their concept of women in the entrepreneurial within this review it unpacks previous research on identity in relation to Samoan constructs of identity through Samoan islands. However, this study centred on initiatives in Samoa to create sustainable small business initiatives in the Pacific. This literature review thus also highlights recent studies on the influence of aid funders as important denominators who contribute aid and therefore supplementary systems of authority and complexity to the ever developing Samoa (Masoe, 2016). Although, this project does not focus on the enterprise as a key investigation it was vital to look at the feasibility of enterprises as the art centre is currently regarded a small or micro-enterprise (Cahn, 2008). Cahn’s research highlights the differing types of enterprises in rural Samoa.

### 2.2. Historical Overview

Cluny Macpherson (2009) states that the Samoan islands “were the only islands in the archipelago 3000 years ago, with their own distinct, culture, language and customary traditions”. Largely an oral culture preserved in customary ways of being, _faaSamoa_ (Aiono & Crocombe, 1992; M. Meleisea et al., 1987) as historians and anthropologist have long established had been infiltrated by western ideals since the Western migration into the Pacific in the 17th century. With a significant oral culture, early written Samoan accounts of knowledge were largely carried out from non-Samoan perspectives (Kramer, 1994) and advised largely by men and elite _matai_ that were leaders. In this particular research, I pay attention to research derived from women’s narratives and accounts of historical notes collated by women – largely the contemporaries of Penelope Schoeffel (1979) and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop’s (1991) in Samoan and more recent case studies (Tupuola 2004a; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2009).

In this particular research, some of these early accounts by Kramer’s, volume 2, on the _gafa_ (family lineage) where useful in the initial scoping, to understanding lineage and appropriate honorifics for existing hierarchical structures within this village context. However, some of more pragmatic
solutions to constructing narratives were still yet to be understood and were needed to be sourced from wider Pacific region and other indigenous researchers. An emphasis on co-constructed narratives appropriate for the participants were in need. I am reluctant to presume, that the interviews and talanoa carried out are a narrative, but more so an exploration into the praxis of vā.

Albert Wendt’s ‘Tatauing the Post-Colonial Body’ (1996), a literary examination of Samoan concepts, introduces the notion of vā through an association of relational vā, one that is nurtured, taken care of, similar to his retelling of stories of tatau (tattoo) bearers. Wendt demonstrates the notion of vā as form of from a relational space, spiritual connection between a tattooist and the person being tattooed. Wendt also describes and connects the notion of ta (time) and vā (space) by referencing the sound of tapping intervals between the a’u (tatau tool) of the tufuga tatau (tattooist) (Wendt, 1996). However, it is important to note here, that this is different to the notion of ta and vā discussed by Pacific scholars such as Mahina (2010) who see ta and vā in relation to the theory of ‘relativity’ premised to some extend on a Western realist interpretation of reality. This particular research resonated with myself as a person living in the diaspora, especially the idea of ‘becomings and identity’ politics in the diaspora (Anthias, 1998).

Refiti (2009), had earlier examined the notion vā as a panoptic habitus in the exploration of the spatiality of the fale and it’s origin, where he suggests the idea of co-openness in the fale fono to explore the ‘in-between’ around concepts of the maga/centre: “This vā, or co-openness, located at the centre of every gathering, every sociality, structures Samoan identity.”

(A. L. Refiti, 2009, p. 10)

This notion of ‘inbetweeness’ has a fundamental influence on diasporic communities and researchers namely critiques on diaspora and refuses that the points of origin or homeland – stand still. In fact, Anthias stresses that if the diasporic are evolving with technology and migration, how can the homeland stay untouched. In this research, I explore the inbetweenness of these ideals and how they exist in the nu’u.

Melani Anae (1998) and Anne-Marie Tupuola examine how ways of understanding the Samoan saying ‘teu le vā’ which translates to “to nurture/maintain the relationship”. Other Pacific researchers (Mila-Schaaf, 2010; Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009; Thaman, 2003; Tuagalu, 2008) also examine identity and make references to the relational aspects of vā, and its important in scholarly work that encompasses a Pacific perspective. Refiti (2009) advances the idea of Samoan
perspectivism’ where he challenges and suggests we engage Pacific concepts with Western thought in which one must ‘hollow-out’ our own position from that of Western thought, and in turn we can begin to encounter ourself as ‘an other’. Clearly underlining ‘identity’ and aspects of identity are paramount to this project.

2.2.1. PACIFIC WORLDVIEWS AND DIASPORIC WORLDVIEWS

The term ‘Pacific worldview’ is best summarised as ways of being that is premised on indigenous philosophical foundations such as cultural beliefs and values of people originating from the Pacific. Kabini Sanga describes this term, as a way to conduct research and to create inclusive ways of researching indigenous peoples, and the responsibility for indigenous researchers to keep creating these frameworks (2004a, p. 41).

The State of Humans Rights (Samoa Periodic Human Rights Review report) report ‘begins with a discussion of human rights in the Samoan context, including a brief overview of the human rights obligations that Samoa is a signatory to, as well as the rights contained within the Constitution of Samoa (NHRI, 2015, p. 11). It aims to identify the gaps between fa’aSamoa societal structures and the Human Rights core values by surveying participants individually and focus groups across villages and in town. The limitation of this report also clearly highlights, the disparities between the rural and township and the report focuses on collating the data largely from rural villages. It states, that over 85% of participants came from Rural Villages (2148 total. The report identifies women as one of the three groups (disabled and children) in a first human rights report conducted in Samoa that “highlights the need for better safeguards for equality and respect for women”. It is important to note that this study takes place in a rural village.

The Samoan worldview or fa’aSamoa stems from a holistic perspective of politics, customary land laws and identity politics (Abdelal, Herrera, & Johnston, 2009). In a Samoan context this is to do with vā fa’asinomaga (Anae, 1998, n.d.; P Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1991; Le Tagaloa Aiono, 1997, Mageo, 1998; Schoeffel, 1979; Tui Atua T.T.T, 2016) referring not only to the gender of the person, but more so, their status within the family, village and designation based on fa’amatai systems and the nu’u or fa’alupega (family historical connection and hierarchy) (Tui Atua T.T.T, 2016). As suggested earlier, it is not enough to just be Samoan by ones action of being Samoan. Thus I explore ‘constructive’ paradigms (Grant & Giddings, 2002) and shifts, identified in key literature around interviews types,
and to adapt and interpret these based on the available data. They help situate key Samoan ‘metaphors’ (Anae, 2016; Efi, National University of Samoa, & Centre for Samoan Studies, 2008; Refiti, 2015) and their nuances based on Samoan epistemologies and worldview (Tupuola, 2004). They highlight ways of interpreting knowledge based research; importantly here is that I aim to extend these narratives and perspectives by exploring their Samoan identity ‘orientation’ and positioning especially those who are ‘nofotane’ (wife of a male villager) participants.

There are two Christian churches located at the central part of Poutasi. The largest of the two is the Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano Samoa (EFKS). The smaller is the Poutasi Lotu Pope or Ekalesia Katoliko (Catholic church). Both these churches are identified in the map in Figure 7 in Chapter 4 pg. 78.

2.2.2. INDIGENOUS WAYS OF APPROACH AND THINKING

Linda Tuhawai-Smith’s widely read publication *Building Research Capability in the Pacific, for the Pacific and by Pacific Peoples* describes decolonised research as “transforming the institution of research, the deep underlying structures and taken for granted ways of organising, conducting and disseminating research and knowledge (2004, p. 6). Tuhawai-Smith’s (1999) research on the decolonisation of thinking and methods, critique the ways that research has been conducted prior to the inclusion of indigenous ways of thinking. Previously, Edward Said suggested that research can be described as “a corporate institution’ that has made statements about indigenous peoples, ‘authorising views’ of us, describing [us], teaching about [us], settling [us] and ruling over [us]” (1978). Said identifies the process by which this research design is approached. Likewise, Linda Tuhawai-Smith (1999) champions the reframing of research for indigenous communities and indigenous researchers that has greatly contributed to the inclusion of indigenous tools, frameworks, worldviews and strategies and approaches across several disciplines and sectors in the last 20 years. Thus I have looked at a number of methodologies by indigenous Pacific scholars: Konai Helu-Thamen’s (Kakala), Okusitino Mahina (Tā –Va Theory of Reality), Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese (Tofa Saili) and Epeli Ha’uofa (Sea of Islands) in their contribution to creating an ‘Oceanic thought’. Importantly Timoti Vaioleti’s work on the Talanoa methodology in qualitative research has been very influential in Pacific studies over the last 10 years; I examine these further in the review.

The notion of a Pacific worldview (Hereniko & Wilson, 1999; Sanga, 2004a; Thaman, 2003), and Oceanic thought (Hau’ofa, 1993) helps expand the potential of having to position and questions the researchers and the interviewees positioning as an exchange of viewpoints. It also highlights the
need to instinctively re-construct by decolonising our approaches around Pacific research. I explore indigenous Samoan thought in the way they conduct rituals of reciprocity and how this effect their vā relationships and boundaries. By examining several Samoan scholars on the understanding tua’oi boundaries (Efi et al., 2008), I can start to appreciate the nuances and rich metaphors in Samoan society and language. Metaphors helps to articulate a ‘design’ thinking around the processes involved in selecting tools, that are inclusive of participant’s worldview.

I describe myself as a ‘New Zealand Samoan’, and the notion of fa’asinomaga as being central to Samoan identity and belonging and how I negotiate myself amongst others within a Samoan ‘village’. Not to mention, how I will be perceived and therefore how ‘negotiated identities’ play a large part in the analysis of this study. Central to this notion of negotiated identities, comes from the Karlo Mila Schaff’s Phd thesis, that examines Tongan youth identities by where she unpacks the ‘negotiated’ spaces based on the national Youth 2000 Survey data and interviews conducted in her study. Part of this has also been examined in her collaboration with Maui Hudson in their paper “The interface between cultural understandings: Negotiating new spaces for Pacific mental health”(2009), which discusses ‘new spaces’ of negotiating as way forward of understanding alternative ways of understanding ‘identities’ and therefore cultural values. This paper was largely influenced by Smiths model of ‘negotiated spaces’.

2.2.3. Fa’asinomaga and Identities

Mila-Schaaf cites Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi (2010, p. 103) and quotes:

I am not an individual, I am an integral part of the cosmos. I share divinity with my ancestors, the land, the seas and the skies. I am not an individual, because I share a Tofi with my family, my village, and my nation. I belong to my family and my family belongs to me. I belong to a village and my village belongs to me. I belong to my nation and my nation belongs to me. This is the essence of my sense of belonging.

Firstly, a look at past research, whose works have critically narrated the diverse natures of hierarchies of status for Sāmoan women in villages (Aiono, 1997b; Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2013; Felix M. Keesing & Keesing, 1956; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2004, 2009; L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; Schoeffel, 1979). Fairbairn (1988), tells the stories of tamaitai (woman) in leadership, most of whom have had leadership influence on women and in their communities, both in New Zealand and Samoa. Daughters of Sina, was a study of women across the region of Falealili from this same village
as the village used in this study. Studies on Samoan females have long been a fascination for researchers, most infamous of these were Meads adolescence sensationalised publication “Coming of Age”(1961).

However, a raft of scholarship have since investigated more ‘insider’ narratives of Samoan women from a range of studies from gender identity and politics in the fa’amatai, which Professor Penelope of National University of Samoa (Schoeffel, 1979) is growing scholarship around by supervising scholarship in this area. Narratives on gender identity in Samoa has been widely examined, (Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2013; Lilomaiaava-Doktor, 2009; Mageo, 1998; Mead, 1961; Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop editor, Eve Coxon editor, & Talanoa & Development Project, 2014) and beyond the nu’u more recently studies of diasporic Samoan identity in New Zealand (Tupuola, 1994, 2004a, 2004b). These studies, have been well read in regards to women’s studies in Samoa, and provide broad perspectives from identity politics, gender hierarchy and women leadership and status within the context of Samoan life in the homeland.

This part of the literature review is around women’s identities in the literature and amongst similar case studies. It also takes into consideration the contexts and what possible gaps are in the literature review. However, this study looks further into how woman’s roles are negotiated in terms of new spaces and looks at defining spaces in the domesticated and the exterior spaces of a fale. I begin by referring to some of the key publications, I explore by looking at ‘negotiated’ identities (Mila-Schaaf, 2010) who used both quantitative and qualitative data to survey Tongan youth as part of investigation into and the impact of this notion of negotiated identities in an indigenous space text and sub-texts that and identity, play a large role in establishing the spaces seen and unseen.

The notion of ‘Measuring of Identity’ as discussed by something measure something controlled, Gershon (2007, p. 6) illustrates the significance of ‘diaspora’ in different locations. In this research, there are two specific locations involved in this research, that of the participants – nu'u and that of mine -Aotearoa, the significant diasporic space. It is within these various and perceived diverse contexts that she recognises the work of Linnekin and Poyer 1990, see also McGrath 2002; Spickard 2002; Tiatia 1998; Tupuola 2004 to form discussions around diasporic Samoan identities. Diasporic identity constructs, as negotiated spaces as Mila-Schaaf points out, are continuously evolving, therefore in this research I aim to articulate how diasporic identities play a significant part in this exchange between researcher and participants – but also in the development of this particular rural village.
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Teaiawa (2001) paper highlights the a problematic issue that Pacific researchers often come across with when conducting research in indigenous communities as opposed to the ‘non’ indigenous communities. She discusses the tension between ‘Pacific studies’ and ‘Native studies’. Which in this study, I articulate through my exploration of these terms based on the uses of ‘Pacific worldview’ and ‘Samoan worldview’. Tui Atua refers to this as ‘I belong to my nation and my nation belongs to me’, which most probably stems from the proverb, Samoa mo Samoa. In this research, I have examined how I am placed as a New Zealand-born Samoans yet perceived as part of that community and therefore, as a Samoan researcher, I will be regarded by my key informants and participants as a New Zealand Samoan or at worst an ‘outsider’.

An integral part of this study also focuses on previous literature, examined by curators and researchers of ‘artefacts’ and taonga11. Several key publications such as Sean Mallon ‘Samoan Measina’,(2002) discusses and outlines the three key male dominated practises of measina of boat, building, and tatau (tattooing) as a the three crucial. In the Pacific, the term ‘art’ does not exist in any of the languages, therefore in this study, I will refer to measina as way of examining ‘practise’ as a metaphor, for artefacts and crafts. Several publications like (Mallon, 2010; Paperskin [electronic resource], 2009; A. Refiti, 2002) also contribute to a wealth of existing literature around art centres and museums roles. However, one other important literary note is Meleiseas (1981) paper on “Culture is not something you can eat”, highlighting the problematic tension between ‘culture’ and institutions. He discusses an interesting perspective of the tension between the concepts and tension between institutions and measina in practise (the making of art in Samoan context) and living it. Which raises an interesting question, by having an art centre as part of a village, does this not endanger and commodify cultural heritage artefacts? Or is there a risk of endandering measina as a commodity? Which is also highly visible through the art practise of Shigeyuki Kihara (2014) who challenges the faux par of tourism and gender identity in Samoa.

In relation to understanding context and identities, I briefly examined Pacific diasporic descent population is expected to grow by 181 per cent by 2051, from 232,000 to 599,000, making up 18 per cent of New Zealand’s population (Cook et al., 2001, quoted in Macpherson, 2004:137). Some islands have seen more than half of their population migrating to NZ and elsewhere and in some cases (the Cook Islands and Niue), 70 per cent of their diaspora members have been born in NZ (Macpherson, 2004:136, 139; also see Crocombe, 1992; McCarthy, 2005; Teaiwa and Mallon, 2005).

---

11 Taonga, Māori term for treasured artefact or being.
2.2.4. Spatial Orientation and Boundaries

This thesis centres on the notion of women’s spatial orientation and social spaces. However, to understand the notion of boundaries and orientation in a *nu’u* setting, it is important to understand the social order of the determined by the *fa’alupega* discussed in Chapter 1. However relatively recent studies have made links to the stability of the village centre known as the *malae* (village centre). Because this was found rather late in the process of this literature review, much of Henning’s reference is limited to this literature review. However, I think it is important to mention as both our studies indicate the growing challenges of this rural community. Thus creating problematic new challenges to the social and political *vā fesoatai* (consultative) spaces.

Werner Hennings (2017) discusses the impact of the tsunami and the reconstruction of Poutasi based on the relocation of homes and the village *malae*. He discusses this as a nucleus centre shift of Poutasi, from the shores to the Main Road as a ‘shift’ in the nucleus centre. This study was discovered late in the process of this research, but correlates with the current conflict expressed in the importance of the ‘concentric dualist’ spacing and layout of this village. It also analyses boundaries as discussed by the key ‘aiga in this *nu’u*. Each *aiga* spatial organisation and boundaries is based on the *fa’alupega* (family and village salutation) of Poutasi as discussed in the previous chapter.

Boundaries have also been examined as social spaces, space within – space between, as opposed to a void (Benko & Strohmayer, 1997; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). Both these researchers focus on the interactions of social spaces and what informs these interactions, which then examine social constructs and social interactions based on variances of power, capital and in societies from a generic societal perspective. This research focuses largely on the interactions of the participants within certain social spaces and whether these spaces inform a particular way of ‘performing’ or positioning.

Another way of understanding the context of social space was by looking at geographer Doreen Massey (1994) and she discusses her case studies and research on articulating the notion of space
and space (physical) as power. As part of this thesis, I am also interested in the notion of geographical space (physical) that instruct and are the social space and hierarchy within this site. In consideration to Massey (1994, p. 131) where she points out the importance of local studies and context, I am interested in how these spaces are formed or occupied by the women by the division of labour (Schoeffel, 1979). Because this research focuses on indigenous Samoa in the rural, I look at spaces in relation to the division of labour by the women and identify gender-based spaces located in the village.

The division of labour in Samoan society is best allocated in Schoeffel (1979, p. 37) where she breaks down the list of chores based on the gender age and sex of the nu’u. However, in this study almost 40 years later, technology and global influences, not to mention climate change have dramatically impacted on this region, and therefore raise new questions around gender and labour or opportunities of sustainable financial resources in this region. For example, I will be interested to unpack how do ‘roles’ impact on the participants earning capacity in this village? Or whether are specific spaces for women to work collectively?

This context of social spaces and women weavers, is directly related to the fale Lalaga is the Samoan metaphor for the place of weaving, that I will centre some of the key notions around the organisation of this thesis. Samoan women have long held the role of weaving and fine weaving as an integral part of indigenous Samoa; the quote to title in Percivals (2013) documentary ‘E au le inailau a tamaitai’, relates to the contribution of Samoan women weaving of weaving that they women in the process of i’e toga (fine woven mats for ceremonial purposes). In this documentary, he explores, different Samoan perspectives based on the aia or rights of women. This interesting documentary highlights the tension between the western notion of ‘rights’ and that this is sanctioned or given in a fa’amatai system.

In order to understand spatial and social hierarchical structures of women participants, I examined Aiono’s (1997a) analysis on vā fa’asinomaga (identity). In her analysis of fa’asinomaga a Samoan is defined by their (i) family matai/village matai, (ii) fanua that the matai owns or is ‘designated’ to and (iii) gagana Samoa (language). Aiono (1997). She further describes and explains the social roles, social organisation and geographical allocation, however, in this research it will involve several participants with differing views and praxis of faasinomaga, from the diasporic to the indigenous rural. Hence, the need to examine the ‘disconnectedness’ between vā fa’asinomaga and the problematic translation ‘identity’ largely used by diasporic Samoans’.
Complimentary to Aiono’s (1997b) investigations is the ongoing discoveries and contributions of Samoan academics (Anae, 1998; Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2009; Tupuola, 1994) who define and then negotiate new existing migratory patterns in the diasporic Samoan communities. Each of these studies, identify ethnographic research, in ‘ways of being for New Zealand Samoans’.

An aspect of this research, examined the utilisation of spaces and how non-Samoan fale buildings have been adopted and adapted by the women, previously and how the notion of temporality becomes a key theme to describe spaces and the female collective. Refiti (2015) describes this mode of temporality in fale Samoa constructions in the diaspora, however, in this research, I look at the temporality of ownership and spatial praxis or relationship of space and power.

Hennings (2017), explores spatial praxis of the malae based on the narratives of the two large family titles discussed in the Poutasi faʻalupega (see Kramer). It also contributes a recent survey based on the movement of homes and structures prior and post 2009 Tsunami. It uses spatial diagrams to indicate the movement of central Poutasi towards inland. Although, I found this research quite late in the writing of this project, Hennings work validates the discussions and commentary of advisors and key participants who have helped shape a visual image of what Poutasi looked like prior to the 2009 Tsunami.

According to Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson (1992), representations of space ‘social sciences need a further rupture and disjunction’. Gupta and Ferguson (1992, p. 8) state “… by always foregrounding the spatial distribution of hierarchical power relations, we can better understand the process whereby a space achieves a distinctive identity as a place”. Spatial considerations have been explored in a variety of ways in this study. For instance, hierarchical communication lines by Keesings and Keesings (1956) illustrate how communication lines are allocated in the fa’amatai system. Bourdieus (1990) theory of social space, habitus and notions of space become useful when understanding the difference of rural village and the taulaga (township). By examining the differences of space, based on the different cultural notions of space. For village spatial layouts and hierarchies as mentioned previously have been well examined by Shore (1999) and more recently by Hennings (2017). And Duranti’s (1981a) unpacking of social spaces in the nu’u context also help the hierarchy and order of protocols and settings according to the various ‘social spaces’ that he highlights. Therefore, in this study a thorough exploration of ‘spaces’ and attempt of understanding a multiple layer of ‘spatial layouts’ and ‘hierarchies’ have been examined in the process of this study.

2.2.5. **Oceanic vā of Samoa and New Zealand**
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The Oceanic vā is a term, I use in this thesis to describe the connection of New Zealand and Samoa in terms of distance. Recent Pacific scholars have used ‘Transnational’ to look at the diasporic relationships. However, I have Oceanic vā that is derived from Epeli Hauofa’s Sea of Islands, where he decolonises the name Pacific Ocean, by redefining this into Oceanic seas. In this sense, I use this term to describe the vast distance and difference between Samoa and New Zealand Samoan communities. Connecting the two places or drawing them into vā sets the tone by defining each perspective of the ‘homeland’ and the ‘diasporic’. Where many great researchers have contributed diasporic Samoan thought and discussion such as (Anae, 1998, 2016b; Ka‘ili, 2005; Lilomaiaava-Doktor, 2009; A. Refiti, 2002; Tupuola, 2004a), this research focuses more specifically on the relationship between the two ‘perspectives’.

In this subchapter, I introduced the notion of diasporic spaces negotiated in previous research by Gershon (2007), Anthias (1998) and Mila-Schaaf (2010) who examined negotiations as a collaborative space’s but more specifically as a place of positioning. I also coined the term Oceanic va to describe and analyse the spatial differences and perspectives. Mila-Schaafs (2001) thesis notes the considerable attention to ‘negotiated identities’ as a place and therefore position. It is in this ‘negotiation’ that I apply 1) co-constructed knowledge, which allows the participants to play a role in co-construction of interviews and therefore data. 2) I examine the idea of negotiated spaces within the nu’u.

2.2.6. FRAMEWORKS AND APPROACHES

Several Pacific frameworks (or theoretical models), have been developed and disseminated across the education(Airini et al., 2010; Anae, 2016b; Seiuli Sauni, 2011); framework in this nature are developed to incorporate Pacific indigenous epistemologies(Gegeo & Watson-Gegeo, 2001), and knowledge systems.

In this section, I examine curated literature, a range of literature around frameworks (Airini et al., 2010; Seiuli Sauni, 2011; Silipa, 2008)and analysis tools (Attride-Stirling, 2001)that would be selected for this research. In the end I focussed on indigenous Pacific (Samoan and Tongan) scholars whose frameworks and analysis of thought have widely influenced policies largely in the health and education sector.

A significant study of Konai Helu Thaman’s decolonising perspectives (2003, p.3) challenges those of us in higher education to decolonise by examining ‘the dominance of western philosophy, content,
and pedagogy in the lives and the education of Pacific peoples’. I explored how her earlier work also influenced the Tongan approach demonstrated in the ‘kakala’ methodology – where her conceptual framework of making a lei, is about honouring the knowledge collated to be used for research. She is in agreement with Linda Tuhiwai Smiths (1998) decolonising methodologies (as am I) of the perspective that ‘indigenous peoples have been silenced, misrepresented, ridiculed, and even condemned in academic as well as popular discourses’. This is something I address by selecting purposefully – methods that are ‘appropriate fitted’ to the participants.

Her ‘kakala metaphor’ has been utilised to situate education frameworks (Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Thaman, 2003) and influence a growth of indigenous data collating tools by expanding on the notion of making the garland for the wearer, in other words, understanding and taking into consideration who the research is for and about. This research will hopefully contribute back to women in rural villages especially invested in creative entrepreneurship in the Pacific.

The ‘kakala framework’ has long influenced scholarship in research methodologies and frameworks for in the Pacific and influence a growth of indigenous data collating tools by expanding on the notion of making the garland for the wearer, in other words, understanding and taking into consideration who the research is for and about. This research will hopefully contribute back to women in rural villages especially invested in creative entrepreneurship in the Pacific.

2.2.7. Methods

As a qualitative research project, involving researching participants, guides of research practise and explanations of research guidelines were sourced from both western (Bernard, 2011) and indigenous methods (Halapua, 2008; Nabobo-Baba & Farrelly, 2014; Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Toluta’u, 2015; Vaioleti, 2006). As a research located in a developing indigenous community, Kögler (2013) study of the power of relationships in conducting these studies under hermeneutics initially sought to understand some interesting relationships to surrounding text and my previous pre-occupations during the scope of this study. However, as this study progressed, the understanding of qualitative research paradigms helped construct parameters and guidance to what appropriate methods would be engaged. As several of the research approaches were already examined as a starting point; what was overwhelming was the widely used method of talanoa within participatory research in Pacific studies (Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Nabobo-Baba & Farrelly, 2014; Prescott, 2011;
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Vaioleti, 2006). This well-known approach methodology and method, examines a way of conversing, dialogue, talking in several Pacific languages. I discuss this further in the Research Design chapter.
2.3. Village Histories and Structure

The histories of village and family connections reside in the Samoan oratory knowledge of fa’alupega, an oral history of matai and family lineage in relation to titles. Ethnographer historian Augustine Kramer’s (1994) written account of the histories and therefore fa’alupega (family and village salutations and genealogy) is a dense collation of histories collected in the late 1800’s, of family and village ties pertaining to vast regions and in each village across the Samoan islands. Kramer’s volume 2, (1994) was utilised to explore oral histories within the village of Poutasi during the initial scoping of participants. Part of this research would become later useful for honorifics (Duranti, 1981a), an integral part of understanding how to address certain people.

It was vital to find out more about systems and structure that are unique within this village. More specifically the lines of communication within a village structure (Felix Maxwell Keesing & Keesing, 1956). Several nodes of hierarchical structures are outlined in Keesing and Keesing diagrams (pg. 52-53) that show specific lines of communication power throughout a nu’u structure. These lines of communication are also evident in Schoeffel’s (1979) thesis and study of the women in Poutasi during her studies.

Central to understanding fa’alupega is the fa’amatai (village structure) systems of this nu’u and nation. Schoeffel states, that the fa’amatai system is a system of hierarchical structures, organised by a dyad system of diving people into categories that are based on the sister and brother relationship; the aualuma (daughters and sisters) and the aumaga (untitled men and unmarried brothers). Each of these are valued by having ‘designated’ roles to play in the village. Schoeffel’s initial thesis explores the woman, through her perspective as a nofotane in the nu’u. However, the difference being part of the nu’u, whereas I will be seen as an ‘outsider’, which I have discussed in my positioning (Chapter 1, Introduction).

Feagaiga, is described in Pratt (1892, p. 153) dictionary as, “1. An established relationship between different parties, as between brothers and sisters and their children...[] also between chiefs and their tulafale (talking chief and high advisor of family). 2. An agreement, a covenant.”. Making the notion of feagaiga a vital element and heavily debated topic in modern day and contemporary Samoa, has recently been documented in Steven Percival’s documentary on gender equalities via a

---

12 This term is part of the indigenous values system and belief systems in Samoa. It is important to note that this relational power, that was once conceived as being
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youtube video called ‘Exploring Gender Equality Issues in Samoa – E à le Ina’ilau a Tama’ita’i’ (2013), that video records current opinions from; academics to religious village elders, regarding feagaiga in relation to the ‘rights of women’. In the fa’amatai systems, feagaiga is regarded the highest of relational powers that dictate this dyad system, is explored in depth in Schoeffels thesis. Feagaiga, however, since the introduction of LMS and adoption of faifeau (Christian authority in Samoan village) this notion of feagaiga is disappearing.

Aiono and Crocombe describe, fa’amatai as withstanding changes and transformations, they note, “Faamatai systems, are safe guarded by Samoans, who are committed to keeping this way of life, that is not able to break or bend under the onslaught of monarchy, primogeniture and individual land ownership” (Pg123). This quote emphasises the strong beliefs of Samoans in the fa’amatai as something, stronger than colonialism. Several historic transformations of the Samoan society has been examined by Serge Tcherkoff and his contemporaries around the ‘modernism’ of Samoan society. In his reference Culture and Democracy, his explanation of hierarchical structures and in evolving Samoan indigenous village structure absorbs the multiple layers that fa’amatai has prevailed in. However, in order to understand this part of the research, one must familiar with village oral histories, or in this instance of a literature review; the ‘fa’alupega’ of a village. Does this suggest that fa’amatai can therefore be an embedded part of women’s micro-enterprise?

However, previous literature condensed in Kramer, helped explain some of the hierarchies presented for the village at the outset. Two prominent families the Tuatagaloa and Melesea families featured in framework of this nu’u and therefore gave some structure as to who would be ideal as informants of historical knowledge within the village. More recent researchers (Tcherkezoff, 2005) discuss culture and the aspects of ‘modern Samoa’ (Meleisea et al., 1996) examine language in the context of the nu’u (Hereniko & Wilson, 1999). Bradd Shore describes the definition of fa’asamo as ‘the way of being Samoan’.

In this research structures were understood based on the talanoa between some of these structures differ from village to village. Most of the information around hierarchy came through the interviews with participants and through participatory observation. However, a structure of current affairs and political systems were introduced by the matai and faletua o sa’o who was part of the participatory observation.

2.3.1. **Key Participants and Informants**
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Participants were selected largely due to their involvement with the site and space ‘the art centre’. However, because of the nature of an art centre involving numerous people, it was important to identify and to clarify their roles in this research. Most literature surrounding qualitative studies focus on the number of participants. For example, Bernard suggests an actual number of how many participants would be ideal to get a scope (Bernard, 2011) and suggest group numbers of no less than 10 for large studies. Due to the low number of women involved with the art centre and practising entrepreneurship through this trust, the study focussed on those who had direct involvement with the art centre.

I selected the participants based on their involvement and then categorised them into two categories. For those who are identified as key participants, these were participants who worked with the centre on a daily basis and female, they would be included as ‘key participants’. Secondly, if were associated with the art centre but had no day to day involvement, they would be called an informant. This is how the participants were identified. As part of this thesis, I phrase the term ‘key informants’ who are either regular voices or commentary within the nu’u or day to day people surrounding the art centre.

What is also paramount in this study is by understanding the relational ties and the type of research conducted by indigenous researchers, for instance the maintenance and ongoing implications that are part of an indigenous practise like ‘teu le vā’, located in practise and most definitely part of my practise as a researcher in this study. Teaiwa (2001) discusses the difficulty that Pacific researchers come across, when working as ‘Pacific’ researchers and across a terrain widely blurred with Pacific nuances. Here I examine the complications encountered in this type of research whereby customary practise and full emersion of a Samoan New Zealander researcher is located in a ‘foreign’ nu’u (not of her aiga).

What was necessary prior to commencing the study and ethical clearance (see appendix 6.2) was a talanoaga (discussion) between my family and myself and then with my (unbeknown) participants took place in 2012. These talanoaga with family and then my potential participants (including the high chief Tuatagaloa), was imperative step for me, firstly to scope the possibilities of willingness of participants and relevance. Secondly, to gauge the appropriateness of the study from an indigenous perspective in regards to family and then in relation to my participants. This is what I understand as the scoping of the vā fa’afesoa’i (consultative spaces) to establish whether I had the right and permission to conduct a research. As mentioned earlier in my positioning, this is what I refer to as the scoping part of this research process.
2.3.2. **Gender Status and Hierarchical Structures**

Gender status and classification has been well documented in Samoan anthropological references especially as early as the pre-missionary. In fact, the study of women’s roles by early missionaries led to restructure of the female positioning of Samoan women within the fa’amatai systems. Recent contemporaries in anthropological studies in Samoa (P Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1998; Macpherson, n.d.) and key historian (L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015) are key works that that I have based my understanding of the gender status. In order to understand gender role, I also looked at village structure and the roles of women in the nu’u namely (Efi et al., 2008; Schoeffel, 1979) that helped shape my understanding the diverse ways of looking at gender specific studies in Samoa. Director Percival (2013) youtube video resource funded by PACMAS and NGO, notes historians and key leaders based in Samoa, who comment on the rights of women and the difficulties of this notion.

Understanding gender boundaries in contemporary Samoa has been paramount. I examine gender specific researchers in the Samoan context again the classification and coding the involved in coding these 3 women for ethical purposes. I examine the classification of how these roles are defined in this research and the status of each participant. In this small study, women covered all aspects of the lowest ranking and therefore disadvantaged insights according to the fa’amatai system.

Historically, women’s hierarchical systems and modes of operation are defined by the fa’amatai system. Previous research on women’s identity offer some famous or infamous research conducted by Mead (1961) whose work signified ‘old’ anthropological ways of working with indigenous ways, which gradually led to work like Schoeffel’s PhD thesis, whereby this particular research is located in the same village. This research is not an extension or have any other connection, other than the fact that they are both located around women studies and located in the same rural village. Much of village and therefore participants have changed. Schoeffel’s (1979) work examines the work of the women’s komiki, whereas this has almost no connection to the women’s komiki.

Other researchers focused on narratives especially the migration of women and families (Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2013; Lilomaiva-Doktor, 2009). Very little knowledge of women’s still images for context of spatial understandings within the nu’u of Poutasi and examine the key space of the arts centre.

---

13 Abbr. for Pacific Media Assistance Scheme.
2.3.1. Gaps in Literature

This study has evolved to explore, visual representation to examine three woman’s spatial and ‘negotiated’ positioning as individuals. Therefore, an overwhelming lack of reference for existing spaces and ‘designated’ spaces currently exist in this literature. As a small study, some of the review struggled to articulate how woman ‘physically’ positioning and whether this was an appropriate method of understanding social spaces. Parts of this review analysis, focus on women who are working in two spaces. Therefore, some of the gaps in the literature review, are around some specificity of locating social spaces based on gender. Lack of socio-spatial discussion around ‘gender’ representation in Samoan contexts was difficult to locate as only photos of groups or unidentified woman is common in the literature analysis.

When looking at physical structures and ‘spaces’ within a traditional Samoan village setting, one of the interesting discoveries, was the lack of data around pre-modern Samoa ‘spaces’. For instance, the definition of women’s weaving collaborations groups, is discussed in spaces. The term ‘fale lalaga’ which is still used today in rural villages, identifies a ‘practise’ and ‘space’. However, many of these physical ‘spaces’ evolve and change as suggested in this study, but what remains is that the practise is largely by woman. Despite, being the only measina (treasured arts) of Samoan arts that refers to a fale or a structure, what other knowledges or histories are missing from current discourse of designated ‘spaces’. Could this mean, that pre-modern Samoa there existed collaborative weaving spaces?

As there is a term for a master weaver, matuau’u as Silipa (2008) suggests a that traditional, could there be possible scholarship in understanding pre-modern spaces? The only reference of a female space, other than the Fale Komiti (Woman’s Komiti) which was introduced in 1920 is the notion of a fale lalaga. However, according to our key informants, this happens sporadically in random spaces across the village and more recently in the Poutasi Memorial Hall.

2.4. Analysing the Review

The literature review covers an overview of previous literature explored in this research and in the development of this research. I focus largely on vā fa’asimomaga (identity) constructs and the
problematic idea of ‘identity’ through understanding the aspects of space. I examine of the notion of translation: identity and contextual paradigms of which this research is situated in.

Firstly, it examines a process of how this research was approached, to presented research that examined vā fa‘asinomaga (identity) and the impact this has on traditional notions of ‘identity’ and therefore roles that women visibly. It explored how existing literature analyse women in spatial praxis and literature that provided some insight into how spatial positioning and vā fealoaloai affects women who live in villages. I also explore Pacific frameworks, methodologies and methods that helped frame up the research design historical overview of Samoa and Samoans (L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; P. S. Meleisea et al., 1996; Tui Atua T.T.T, 2007; Tupuola, 2004b) and key case studies (Mead, 1961; Schoeffel, 1979) in terms of women’s roles and identity in the nu’u (Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2013; J Marie Mageo, 1998; Jeannette Marie Mageo, 1994; Schoeffel, 1979; Tcherkezoff, 2005). When looking at identity and social contexts (L. M. Meleisea et al., 2015; Schoeffel, 1979), one of the findings around understanding pre-missionary studies, was to look at social space and boundaries taking an ethnographic approach to how space is configured. However, as Massey’s study focuses on the alternative power play and gender. It also looks at the vast amount of anthropological studies around spatial considerations prior to this study, however one of the noticeable gaps, was how new spaces are represented and therefore engaged with in the village. In this literature survey, I was interested in Meleisea’s historical reference for women in Percival (2013), a mini documentary where he comments on the practise of feagaiga in Samoan society, which he states ‘has long eroded by the introduction of missionaries’. Therefore, are their existing spaces for women to work in villages? Could art centre enterprises like PDT art centre operate as a space for women? How are these spaces adding value to the women’s developmental and financial rights? In conclusion what this literature review has provided is a survey of foundational works that have built up narratives and case studies of women in Samoa and around the politics of identity.

2.5. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

It would seem based on this literature review, the notion of woman’s boundaries and challenges have been described as ‘resilient’ in some cases and ‘perseverance’. But firstly, I examine the highlights featured in this literature review and how these inform my secondary questions.

This literature review examined a historical overview of Samoa women studies paramount to rural development in Samoa. This group are also identified as belonging to the nofotane division of their village society. Therefore, as part of this study, what challenges are faced by these woman? Part of
this historical account, was looking at woman’s contribution to the ‘arts’ in Samoan society. An interesting highlight, was looking into the role of woman leadership in ‘weaving’ of ‘fine mats’ which are considered one of Samoa’s highly valued taonga\textsuperscript{14} and heritage arts. However, what emerged was the articulation of male contribution to Samoan measina, whereby ‘weavers’ or matauau’u sit outside this hierarchy of arts. Therefore, creating secondary status of according in literature around Samoan woman’s contribution and leadership, as sustaining knowledge holders or leadership in art contexts. Several or in praxis, the ‘female’ customary roles? And therefore spaces? Although, not addressed, this also highlighted aspects of the notion of fale lalaga. Several of the ethnographic literature does not mention a physical ‘space’ for weavers and therefore, I examine ‘physical’ spaces and gender oriented spaces in this study.

Meleisea’s (comments) historical reference on ‘aia (rights) for Samoan women mentioned in Percival (2013), that the concept of feagaiga has been eroded by the introduction of missionaries. Therefore, I examine, what current relational boundaries exist for these participants. Are there spatial ‘boundaries’ that narrate how existing structures and the placement of their art centre impact on their ‘safety’. In conclusion this literature review has provided a survey of foundational works that have built up narratives and case studies of women in Samoa and around the politics of identity.

Another key report significant to this study, was the overwhelming ‘vulnerability’ of women in rural areas. The Samoan Human Rights Periodic review, provided significant evidence, that state “women, .....most vulnerable of the populations” in relation to equality, respect, and protection. It also went further to recommend that a ‘gender role stereotyping disadvantages women in many areas of life, particularly ‘nofotane’. Therefore, as study that focussed on nofotane woman, I aimed to highlight the differences in ‘status’, and possible barriers as individual cases. This review also suggests that in this study, I need to be aware of how these participants interacted and received by others in the nu’u in and around the art centre. Rather than stereotyping and over generalising, I examine and describe how each participant nofotane status by providing a description of each participant in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 and how each differs from each other, in order to help contextualise the individual participants.

What this review also revealed was the lack of literature around the term fale lalaga. As this study revolves around spaces and designated roles in the nu’u, this emerged was the overwhelming...
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literary around male designated roles and a lack of literature around female led roles in this Samoan village specific to the preservation of measina.
3. **Su‘ifefilo‘i ‘Ula Research Design**

   “Ua āu le ‘ina'ilau a tamai’ta‘i, ae lē āu le ‘inalau a ali’i”,\(^{15}\) Sāmoan proverb.

3.1. **The Nature of the Inquiry**

The objectives of this study are to highlight challenges facing a group of women leading a micro-enterprise in a developing village. The key question is: How does a group of Samoan women leading an arts centre (enterprise) negotiate new spaces of practice in rural indigenous Samoa? My secondary questions that developed while conducting this research: What are the existing politics of boundaries evident in rural Samoa? What kinds of negotiations are evident in this research? How have these women come to claim a space in the centre of the nu’u? What are the current limitations on women of lower ranking within fa‘amatai? What are some existing tensions between hierarchies of women and how does this possibly affect woman of lower ranking?

This is a qualitative study, which takes a Sāmoan worldview, written from the perspective of a diasporic female Sāmoan researcher based in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Parts of this inquiry follow an interpretative analysis. These will be outlined in the design approach.

In this chapter, I explain the design of the research by summarising the Sāmoan worldview and approach in this study. I also examine key aspects of the methods used in this research design. I present and demonstrate the methodology visually (see Figure 6 below) and I show how each component is illustrated to elaborate the whole work. I define my role in this study. I introduce the context and participants in this research and the ethical considerations as intertwined in this design before my conclusion to this chapter.

\(^{15}\) Sāmoan proverb that translates to “the women completed their thatching but men could not.” This proverb relates to the specialised ‘roles’ women have and contribute to Sāmoan customary way of life.
The research design stems from a constructivist and transformative paradigm that observes the concept of threading and synthesis as research methodology that is suitable for analysing and presenting my data. This research design is called Su’ifefilo Ula, which is derived from the metaphor and method of su’ifefilo (A. Refiti, 2015; Silipa, 2008; Tielu, 2016). Su’ifefilo is the act of stitching of assorted material or mixing of contents or words, and can be applied to the synthesising of ideas in relation to communicating poetry or piecing together different music pieces – similar to threading a song, a poem or by making. This approach threads both Samoan and non-Samoan methods to construct a diasporic Pacific philosophy of reciprocity and respect articulated through values of teu le vā or ‘taking care of relations’ (Airini et al., 2010; Anae, 2016b).

These narratives are derived through the use of talanoa as a primary method of data collection in this research. The way I bring the different elements together involves the threading of scoping, collecting, analysing, reflecting (reflexivity) on and interpreting findings within the methodological approaches of Talanoa and Su’ifefilo.
3.1. Analysis, Frameworks and Methods

In this section, I explored a range of research approaches in relations to qualitative research approaches (Approaches to Qualitative Research, 2011; Chu, Abella, & Paurini, 2013; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Kawulich, 2005; Sauni, 2011; Vaioleti, 2006) and analysis tools. In the end I focussed on indigenous Pacific (Samoan and Tongan) scholars whose frameworks and analysis of thought have widely influenced policies largely in the health and education sector. I examined Konai Helu Thamen’s thoughts on the decolonising perspectives (2003) in relation to education and therefore culture. I examined this based on her Tongan approach utilised in her kakala methodology – where her conceptual framework of making a lei, is about honouring the knowledge collated to be used for research. She is in agreement with Linda Tuhiwai Smiths decolonising methodologies (as am I) of the perspective that ‘indigenous peoples have been silenced, misrepresented, ridiculed, and even condemned in academic as well as popular discourses’. This is something I address by selecting purposefully - methods that are ‘appropriate fitted’ to the participants.

In terms of analysing the data – I also examined (Bernard, 2011) research qualitative methods for anthropological studies. I focussed on chapter 4 around the structured and unstructured interviews and adapted some of his notes around ‘unstructured’. This eventually led to more of a semi-structured interview, that was to be utilised sparingly and followed up using summary notes at the end of the day while out on the field. This is further explained in the Research Design under methods.

As part of this analysis, I identified Pacific research that examines indigenous frameworks, that embed the practice of hand craft and ‘making’ of an ‘uala or a lei as a metaphor. I encountered Pacific conceptual frameworks that are structured on models that analyse the ‘making’ of craft largely by women. Several studies and models like Kakala (Johnsson-Fua, 2010) emerged as a way of research based on ‘knowledge systems’ and values of ethnographic communities in the Pacific. What also emerged, were discussions around an emerging notion of ‘analysis’ and selection, by looking at the metaphor of ‘su’ifefiloi’ (A. Refiti, 2002; Silipa, 2008; Tielu, 2016) I selectively and purposefully designed the aspect of ‘stitching’ as a way of including my participants feedback into the data.
Vaioleti (2006) examines talanoa as a methodology, he examines and highlights a key aspect of interviewing or collating data within the Pacific using the processes of talanoa by understanding the concept of ‘talking’ about nothing and different from island nation to island nation. He points out in study a particular reference to talanoa in Samoa. And the multi levels which Keesings (1956) articulates this differentiation as ‘Elite communication’ within the village, used in large communal meetings. However, in this study a more informal approach of talanoa will be utilised with participants and documented using notes and audio files. These notes and audio files were shared with participants either immediately during a talanoa or after the transcribing was completed. This allowed for free flowing process of shared knowledge between myself the researcher and the participants, which stems from the concept of Talanoa – to share ideas and to be clear.

3.2. **DECOLONISING THE RESEARCH DESIGN: A DIASPORIC WORLDVIEW**

My research is designed to be intrinsically linked to the Pacific worldview, contextualised from a diasporic Samoan worldview.

Much of the current literature pays particular attention to Sanga’s (2004 pg.48) analysis of the term ‘Pacific worldview’. He suggests that, in order to understand a Pacific worldview, researchers need to “understand the reciprocity in exchanges of knowledges”. In this section, I explain my understanding of indigenous Samoan knowledge(s), and how this awareness of existing knowledge systems applies to this framework. I examine the types of knowledges and elitist communication views on knowledge exchange within an indigenous Samoan perspective, and how these knowledges currently exist in contemporary rural Samoa.

These are summarised as acknowledgement of *teu le va* (relational aspects across different groups of people) and values of *fesuaiga* (reciprocity) as key approaches in this worldview.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Sanga (2004) describes the Pacific worldview as a view that acknowledges Pacific philosophies of ‘reciprocity’ in exchange of knowledge(s). The Samoan notion of reciprocity is known as in several ways, firstly feso’aiga/fesuaiga that is practised in a variety of ways. In the Samoan ‘Ula Paradigm framework, examined by Seiuli Luama Sauni (2011), she develops a model of engagement to maintain and protect the integrity of the relationships. This was paramount in this study, because I was already known to my participants. At several stages of this research, I encountered various forms of reciprocal exchanges between myself and participants in
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this study.-One of these various forms of exchanges is explained below, in an event known as an ‘asiasiga (visitation performed by hosts to a visitor’s residence).

This particular event was an asiasiga (formal or informal visit with gift exchanges between two parties) formally acknowledging my third visit to the nu’u (this time as a student). It involved a visit by two young women (who were sent on behalf of the tausi Mataumanu Meleisea). They each carried cooked food to accommodate and acknowledge my return to Poutasi. In exchange, I visited Mataumanu at her residence, with gifts from New Zealand I had taken along on my visit. This example of ‘exchange’ highlights Samoan practices of fesuiga (reciprocity or exchanges) and also acknowledgement of teu le va, to nurture the relationships within this village.

Another aspect of developing research in an indigenous context examines the need to address how knowledge is formed. The Samoan term or equivalence for knowledge is poto, which means to have wisdom or privileged knowledges. Relevant to the Samoan context, Silipa (2008, p. 10) describes this as knowledge as power, and is closely guarded by those gifted with specialised knowledge systems. Although, I have limited outsider ‘knowledge’ fa’alupega (genealogical relational ties to land), in my previous experience of working in this nu’u, Samoans (from New Zealand) are ‘nurtured’ and given appropriate methods of guidance by tagata ole nu’u (people of the village).

Prior to commencing ethical clearance from AUTEC, a talanoaga (discussion) was arranged between myself and individual leaders of this community. In this research, these key informants were high chief Tuagatagaloa Annandale; and tausi (wife of high-ranking chief) Mataumanu Meleisea (highest ranking women leader who lived in the nu’u) of the Poutasi Women’s Komiti, and Penelope Schoeffel (wife of current head of the Meleisea family). The appropriateness of the study was based on these founding talanoa, whereby understanding of current hierarchical structures of reciprocity and exchanges of ‘gift giving’ were part of this ‘exchange’ and ethical consideration.

Another key study that this design reflects on is Seiuli Sauni (2011) Samoan ‘ula paradigm framework, where she describes the key Samoan principles as a framework. One of these principles is the reciprocal exchange as a giving or receiving of gifts. She concludes that, “Reciprocity also determines the status of Samoan people. Reciprocity is not only about the exchanging of material

16 These gifts were of New Zealand-made chocolates, tinned biscuits, confectionary and stationery for children.
commodities but reciprocal relationships encompass the art of sharing regardless of status in Samoan Society” (p. 59). This practice of reciprocal exchanges is common, evidenced in these Pacific indigenous people, and is aimed at contributing back to communities (Anae, 2016b; Chu et al., 2013; Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014). This is also an integral part of my experience of attending to nurturing relational aspects that underpin this indigenous approach.

In this chapter, I examine the epistemological positioning of a researcher, that is key to understanding the Pacific worldview – of reciprocity in exchanges of knowledges (Sanga, 2004) and of teu le va (Airini et al., 2010) as an approach. I claim that by understanding the philosophy of approaches and intention of embedding Samoan values, this research design is appropriate.

As part of this approach, a philosophical understanding of the indigenous context is needed. Sanga describes this philosophy as a basis of understanding and valuing a Pacific worldview. Sanga (2004) argues for “Pacific researchers … developing Pacific research within its own philosophical orientation” (p. 42). On this note, I present an example of how I utilise my understanding of cultural competency and confidence, but more specifically an understanding of knowledge and power.

Prior to ethical approval, at various points leading into the data collection, several talonoaga (discussions and meetings) were arranged between myself and Poutasi village leaders. It was in these discussions that appropriate permissions were sought to work with the arts centre women. The appropriateness of the study was based on these initial talanoa, whereby understanding of current hierarchical structures of reciprocity and exchanges of ‘gift giving’ were part of previous ‘exchange’.

I emphatically believe that understanding ‘practising’ or living a faasamoa way of life, enriches the nature of this research project. One of these key values is the ‘approach’ described in teu le va (Airini et al., 2010), which I thread throughout the explanation of the methods I selected. Airini et al suggest that by understanding, engaging, creating, cumulative understanding develops a sustainable approach to policy within education monitoring. In the same way, I have applied this approach through to various exchanges with the participants within the art centre. A viewpoint where active listening exists in talanoa (open discussion) and teu le va (nurturing of relationships), which are key elements to the way I approach discussion and talanoa with the participants.

Several Pacific researchers (Anae, 2016b; Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Sanga, 2004b; Seiuli Sauni, 2011; Vaioleti, 2006) define the importance of ‘exchanges’ and openness by defining the processes of
talanoa; both informal and formal. One the most noted research contributions is the concept of talanoa, explained by Vaioleti:

Talanoa can be referred to as a conversation, a talk, an exchange of ideas or thinking, whether formal or informal. It is almost always carried out face-to-face. Tala means to inform, tell, relate and command, as well as to ask or apply. Noa means of any kind, ordinary, nothing in particular, purely imaginary or void. Churchward (1959), in the Tongan dictionary he compiled for the Government, described Talanoa as to talk (in an informal way), to tell stories or relate experience (p. 447). Tala also means to command, tell, relate, inform and announce, and noa means common, old, of no value, without thought, without exertion, as well as dumb (unable to speak) (Churchward, 1959). Talanoa, then, literally means talking about nothing in particular, and interacting without a rigid framework (2006, p. 23).

Vaioleti, goes further to analyse talanoa as a methodology in his research; however, in this framework talanoa has been used and analysed as a method as part of the Suifeifiloi ‘Ula methodology. Previous researchers have adapted talanoa as a method. In this research, I have examined several key researches (Anae, 1998; Mila-Schaaf, 2010; Prescott, 2011) that utilise talanoa as a method of data collection.

Because this is intrinsically embedded into Pacific knowledges and ways of being, I will also discuss this later in “Research Method of Talanoa”. However, the purpose of introducing this is to highlight the significance of talanoa as an integral part of understanding how people exchange knowledge in this indigenous Samoan context.

Meleisea (1987) discusses pre-Christian knowledge systems as being ‘specialised knowledges’ that were firmly valued as privileged knowledge for those who were gifted or handed oral histories within privileged families. One of the ‘core’ values and belief systems that are key to this study and to an indigenous Samoan way of life, is the concept of feagaiga (P Fairbairn-Dunlop, 1991a;
Schoeffel, 1979), an indigenous Samoan term for the sacred relationship between sister and brother. Both Schoeffel and Fairbairn-Dunlop highlight the importance of this pre-Christian covenant still relevant in fa’asamoa today. This concept of ‘relational power’ is a key principle to how this research is designed and aimed at embedding Samoan indigenous views.

Smith’s (2004) demands Pacific “research, that allows ... the interrogation of new ways of knowing, of analysis and reflection” (p. 6). Parts of the analysis are based on new emerging methodologies, evidenced by Tielu (2016) and Refiti (2015) that allow for reflection, and aim to raise questions. In this research, I adapt a tested method that allows for an ‘inclusive’ way of analysing that is aimed at threading multiple personal accounts.

Decolonised research frameworks need to be cognisant of indigenous philosophies, cultural worldviews and processes. In this spirit, I also adopt the teu le va approach as a philosophical positioning and combine it with the diasporic Samoan indigenous worldview and the fa’asamoa (Samoan way) belief system. These approaches value participants’ and researchers’ constructive ways of knowing and doing and use talanoa as a way to converse and convey information, and Su’ifefiloi Ula as the manner in which data are gathered and findings reported.

Su’ifefiloi ‘Ula uses Samoan-proven methods and frameworks (sometimes borrowing from a wider Pacific scope of tools) that include inclusive ways of research that take into account values and belief systems of a Samoan way of being. The inclusion of indigenous analysis tools aims to minimise conflict and therefore tension, specifically concerning issues of gender, age, and the positioning of the researcher. Smith (2004) affirms, “[...] Pacific and indigenous research also needs an agenda that transcends all the ‘small stuff’ and enables broader and more inclusive aspirations to be articulated, that signal [...] directions and possibilities for their own [...] that allows for different kinds of collaborations [...]”(p. 6). In response, I use a holistic Samoan framework to deal with issues of gender specificity, and am aware of my New Zealand Samoan privileges or perspectives. Therefore,

Feagaiga is the Samoan term, describing the ‘sacred’ relationship between a sister and brother.
in this research design, methods are based on shared values that have been threaded and synthesised into processes that create an inclusive and shared collaboration between the researcher and participants.

To recapitulate, the purpose of this study is to understand what the limitations or boundaries in a women’s arts centre (micro enterprise) in an indigenous Samoan village. Fa’asamoa is the Samoan term that describes a way of doing things as a Samoan. So, fa’asamoa literally means ‘a way of being Samoan’, which is paramount to this research and research design.

Another significant aspect of this notion of Samoan values is Tupuola’s (1994) challenge to Samoan researchers to design research so that it prioritises “[...] the cultural (fa’asamoa) and gender needs of both research and participants [...]” (p. 180), to minimise exploitation of the research participants. At the risk of sounding ethnocentric Tupuola claims how she emphasises the use of fa’asamoa values as a basis of Samoan research methodology frameworks. I explain below how these values of being Samoan relate to the project.

Fa’asamoa values have been embedded into Pacific and Samoan research. One of these notions is the highly valued practice of the teu le va approach, as examined by researchers (Airini et al., 2010; Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Tielu, 2016; Tupuola, 1994). Both Sauni (2011) and Tupuola (1994) also explain the values of protocol and etiquette of fa’aaloalo (respect) and fesuiagia (mealofa, reciprocity), alofa (love) tautua (service) which are directives for the teu le va approach. In this research, I have included the values and practice of fa’aaloalo (respect), fesuiaga (reciprocity), tautua (service) and vā fealoa’i (relationships) as the foundation (holistic approach) of a Samoan approach in the framework of this research design. See Figure 6.

As this study progressed, the necessity for both the researcher and participants to use appropriate process, common epistemologies, cultural perspectives and experiences became increasingly
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apparent. “Cultural sensitivity to fa’asamoan protocol and etiquette of fa’aaloalo (respect) is imperative for the researcher and participants before, during and after the research” (Tupuola, 2000, p. 175, cited in Sauni, 2011). This relational va still continues well after the research and therefore demands etiquette.

This quote by Tupuola (cited in Sauni) also pinpoints some of the key aspects experienced as a Samoan (insider outsider) researcher, as discussed in Chapter 1 and which I recap later in this chapter. One of the by-products of etiquette is the reality and understanding of the maintenance involved in Samoan relationships or vā fealo’a(i) (respectful space). The notion of va fealo’a(i) extends beyond consent forms and space and time for data collection. As Teaiawa clarifies: “Pacific studies is not only an academic field; it is an especially intimate field that people enter, often with highly personalized stakes” (2001, p. 352).

For instance, the notion of teu le va (nurture the relationship), was initially described by Wendt (1996) as a nurturing of relational space. This is significant in the proposed approach, as it honours the participants and ethical conduct of the researcher. It also is important because it not only infers reciprocal protocols, cultural etiquette, both physical and sacred, and tapu, it also implies both proscribed and prescribed behaviour and the concomitant moral and ethical underpinnings of behaviour (Anae, 2003).

Furthermore, Sanga (2004b) suggests that Pacific research approaches should have a philosophical framework. He believes “indigenous Pacific research is based on a philosophy of human nature” and proposes that Pacific researchers develop “[...] its philosophical orientation” (p. 48). Philosophically, this research design observes the vā between me as the researcher and the participants in a holistic manner, by understanding that the vā is a natural part of being Samoan and can transcend beyond this research timeframe. It is natural in this case to expect relational acts of ‘asi’asi’iga (visitation) to occur ‘naturally’ well after the research has taken place.

The Teu le Vā approach (Airini et al., 2010) defines the Samoan worldview as a core responsibility of the individual researcher for its constituents and community. In this research, I am the researcher; the community I refer to is the Poutasi arts centre and nu’u. By examining the Teu le Vā (2010) approach, I adapted Airini et al.’s six-stage recommendation policy for research involving Pasifika students:
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1. engage with stakeholders in Pasifika education research;
2. collaborate in setting the research framework;
3. create a coordinated and collaborative approach to Pasifika education research and policy-making;
4. grow knowledge through a cumulative approach to research;
5. understand the kinds of knowledge used in Pasifika education research and policy-making;
6. engage with other knowledge brokers. (Airini et al., 2010, para 20)

Although these steps are of a report for education policy, I have adapted these here:

1. Engage with stakeholders in rural Samoan village
2. Collaborate in setting the research framework
3. Create a coordinated and collaborative approach to women[s] research and policy making.

3.3. **Epistemology of Su’ifefiloi Ula**

Su’ifefiloi is defined by the Sāmoan word ‘su’i’ to stitch/weave/perform together, usually used in the context of fagogo or storytelling (Tielu, 2016), or performances and craft making or the su’i su’i (sewing) of an ula lei (flower garland). Fefiloi means to organise, to mix, to arrange, to compose, to blend. For the purposes of this research design, I examine its use as a metaphor in the making of an ‘ula lei – to sui an ula, using a mixture (fefiloi) of materials and examine the role of the weaver as a key aspect of the construction and direction of the data analysis.

---

18 Here I use the term craft making to describe hand-made crafts made in Samoa that cover a wide range from the tourist-trade woven artefacts and crafts to the customary crafts such as the artefacts made by matua’amua’u.
Su’ifefiloi (the threading together of sequences) is a method that accommodates the patching together of diverse parts in a way that is sympathetic to the cobbning together of identities in realising a diasporic Pasifika community (Refiti, 2015). As a case study that explores trust initiatives for women, this explorative study is a work in progress. In this thesis I use this notion of su’ifefiloi as a process outlined by stages of making a contemporary ula/garland for the making, stitching or sewing together fragments to form an artefact of textual qualities.

As a methodology, Su’ifefiloi Ula lends itself to this study for a number of reasons; firstly, it is a Samoan concept and practice of threading, mixing, arranging, composing; in this case Suifefilo ‘Ula is aimed at celebrating the craft of ‘making’ (largely designed by women) in that it is related to women’s communal practises of ‘ula (garland) making for special occasions; and it is premised on Samoan values and belief systems. Ua āu le ‘ina’ilau a tamai’ta’i, ae lē āu le ‘inalau a ali’i,19 in terms of the concept of suifefiloi ‘ula, is the practise of women threading and weaving or sewing in a communal space, with a clearly understood purpose for the project; in this project, I adapt this practice of threading an ‘ula (necklace), or a set of ‘ulas for guests as a metaphorical approach to this framework.

Part of this metaphorical framework of ‘ula construction extends to the metaphors of colour. By this I am referring to the arrangement of contrasting and complementary colours used in the making of an ‘ula (see Figure 6). Similar studies of constructed metaphors such as the construction of kakala (Johnsson-Fua, 2010; Toluta’u, 2014) also examine the importance of colour arrangement. Suifefiloi ‘Ula emphasises the importance of arrangement by selection, then by highlighting irregularities, as shown in the diagram. Su’ifefiloi ‘Ula is illustrated as an untidy or irregular ‘ula lei. As Refiti (2015, p. 27) explains, the purposes is “to maintain this tension in the manner of a su’ifefiloi, that is, to let the diverse elements initiate a sense of variety, so that the clash of colours and materials that make up the study give it a particular texture[...]”or a rhythm.

One of the subsidiary issues that arises in this research focuses a spotlight on women’s gender stereotyping20 in terms of leadership within the nu’u, and aims to emphasise the difficulties within

---

19 Translates to: the women’s weaving is complete, whereas the men’s weaving is incomplete.

20 See Samoa Periodic Human Rights review.
non-indigenous micro-enterprises. However, these are only partially addressed in this research and would require further investigation.

The notion of su’ifefiloi also exists in poetry, dance, music or performance, digital suifefiloi; these examples are created by all genders. Suifefiloi Ula privileges women’s craft in creating new knowledges and maintenance through talanoa (talking in communal groups).

The representation of string (or binding material) is metaphorically interpreted as the synthesis and analysis, and the flower arrangement and coding is metaphorically the various findings. Other researchers who have used this metaphor in Aotearoa New Zealand include Silipa (2008) in the context of education frameworks; Refiti (2015) used Su’ifefiloi Ula in the context of Samoan architecture and tufuga (builders); Tielu (2016) applied the metaphor as a blended research design methodology for her study of fagogo (digital storytelling).

In using this metaphor analysis we are indebted to Professor Konai Helu-Thaman, whose Kakala methodology derived from a Tongan worldview. Helu-Thaman states “…(3) it is about developing a new philosophy … that is culturally inclusive and gender sensitive …” (Helu-Thaman, p. 3). Kakala, as discussed in the literature review, has been widely used as a research methodology, firstly as a Tongan research framework but also amongst pan-Pacific research practices across various disciplines; mainly ethnography, education and health, and visual communication design (Chu, 2013; Johansson Fua 2009; Manu’atu, 2009; Mila-Schaaf, 2003; Toluta’u, 2014).

A key component of Su’ifefiloi Ula is the ula itself; the ula carries value for two reasons:

1. ‘Ula lei are designed and made by women.
These are also created in order to honour significant people at an important event.

Sa’uni (2011) used the metaphor of ‘ula to create a theoretical framework for exploring educational outcomes for Samoan students in Aotearoa New Zealand. In this research design I have argued for an inclusive and decolonised methodology approach, with employment of Pacific methods like talanoa and Teu le Vā approaches. The epistemology of metaphors and nuances will be discussed in the next section of this chapter.

3.4. **Su’Ifefiloi Ula | Objectives and Limitations**

Su’Ifefiloi as a metaphor is something that binds, threads, weaves and interacts selected materials by the researcher and participants. As examined earlier in this chapter, it is also important to acknowledge the vital role of the matuau’u (master weaver) as lead contributor to weaving metaphors. In this research, we adopt a threaded garland as the basis of our framework.

The Sāmoan notion of su’Ifefiloi, is made up of two key words, su’i which means to sew or thread and fefiloi means mixture, so it’s a mixture of different flowers that we sew together. And then at the end, you hook them up, and they become an ula, a necklace of flowers [...] people will sing this very long song so that more alofa is shown, so they’ll go from one song and then they’ll hook that up to another one and another one, stringing all these songs together, and these songs are absolutely independent songs that are just stuck together ... (Refiti, 2015, p. 38).

Silipa (2008), introduces su’Ifefiloi as a metaphor for story-telling. He says, “My story, as outlined in this paper, was inspired by the nature of the Samoan oral tradition of story-telling [...] literally means the careful threading or stringing of different flowers together to make a ‘ula[…]’” (p. 6). Silipa also relates this reference of the metaphor or a fagogo (storytelling) stories ‘passed on by older family members’ in night-time stories (pg. 6). Therefore, the Su’Ifefiloi metaphor is an adaptable metaphor and utilised not only the construction of an ‘ula but also of narratives.

Refiti (2015, p. 38) describes su’Ifefiloi as a method “[...] in which diverse elements are brought together to construct a sequence or build a surface area from many pieces, establishes an order without denying heterogeneity and discontinuity [...].” In this adapted framework, I explore the
weaving of methods that are fragmented, disjointed, unpolished – analogous to Refiti’s notion of ‘discontinuity’. In this, constructed sequences may not necessarily look complete or discussed, possibly due to tension or lack of regularity in the sequencing, because it shifts between the diasporic and indigenous paradigms that often, in negotiations, can be viewed as unpolished with a surface of uncertainty. In this method, similar to Refiti, I will embrace the irregularities as points of interest in this study.

Similar to Refiti’s approach, the ‘ula is shaped in a circular, regular lei, but one with open ends, with irregular strands or adapted methods, that allow for diverse ways of applying the research methods that make up the segments in the lei in Figure 6 above. This feature in the ‘ula helps identify ‘disconnects’ disjointed sometimes unanswered or partially answered questions in this study. Some of these can be evident in open-ended questions, that are asked in semi-structured interviews, where topics are left not been fully acknowledged, but open up for other topic areas that participants may want to leave ‘open ended’.

Refiti (2015) goes further, to describe fefiloi as a nuance. “To make use of what you have,” (personal communication with Refiti) is the idea behind this method, especially in a village context where resources for data collecting may sometimes look foreign or may cause tension. Given the unpredictable nature of timing in a nu’u (as I discovered in the process of this research), the notion of fefiloi (mixed) is appropriately adapted throughout the data collection. For example, during participant observation, I would need to adhere to certain dress codes, which I discuss further in Chapter 5. To make someone look less foreign, or to blend in, is to fefiloi with others.

Tielu (2016) also argues the metaphor su’ifefiloi to examine the ‘threading or synthesis’ application in search of a digital fagogo (digital storytelling), “…to describe multiple threads of knowledge, practice and speakers as a culturally-specific practice of passing knowledge within and through Samoan generations” (p. 30). She also contributes some key questions around how does a researcher design research framework, by employing blended epistemologies in her research framework.

In this application of su’ifefiloi, I utilise it in a similar way to thread existing methods, already existing knowledges (literature), of the co-constructed new knowledges that emerge from the discussion (findings), but to also use this as a metaphor for the analysis processes (analysis method as detailed earlier). Su’ifefiloi ‘Ula will be negotiated, threaded and analysed together to examine the narratives thematically, which I discuss in Chapter 5.
Su’ifeiloi Ula is designed to value women’s unique contribution to Samoan knowledge creation and, therefore, embed an inclusive gender-specified approach that values Samoan women’s positioning and worldview. Part of this epistemological underpinning examines the need for Samoan gender-specific metaphors. I have argued that Su’ifeiloi Ula is appropriate for several reasons: firstly, this is situated in a constructive making; ‘ula (garlands) are specifically women’s traditional craft (see weaving quote), creating specialised, new, emerging knowledges to current literature; secondly, Su’ifeiloi Ula is inclusive of participants’ contribution to the selection process of creating knowledge; thirdly, when making ‘ula lei, the ‘ula is designed by a lead matuau’u (master weaver) or when making woven lalaga (weaving), there is a matuau’u (master weaver) present, to help guide the making process.

For this research, I claim the method of Su’ifeiloi and metaphorical framework of Su’ifeiloi ‘Ula (woven garland) to present a research design as a blended framework; this is a Su’ifeiloi ‘Ula methodology. I then use this as a framework to examine the identified processes and methods to adapt to the teuteu (scoping and selection), narratives (talanoa and participatory observation) and analysis (thematic analysis and teu) as part of a Samoan specific research that values women’s knowledge, which I discuss in the next part of this chapter, before I present my research design illustration.

3.5. RESEARCH METHOD OF TALANOA

“A talanoa approach is a traditional Pacific reciprocating interaction which is driven by common interest, regard for respectfulness and is conducted mainly face to face”

(Morrison & Vaioleti, 2008, p. 11).

Talanoa is a practice of speaking and listening openly between two or more people. The word is found in many Pacific languages and has been described as discussions, chatting, telling of stories, however with a purpose. In this chapter I examine the process of talanoa, and relevant studies that have explored talanoa, as key studies for this method. In this study, talanoa will be utilised as a research method to collate narratives and open ended discussions between the participants and myself.
Talanoa has been thoroughly discussed as a Tongan approach and methodology by Timote Viaoleti (2006) within Pacific research. He clarifies that utilising talanoa as an approach with Helu-Thamen’s ‘Kakala’ signifies a more inclusive synthesis of moni (real talk, in depth) conversations with participants in a Tongan context. In this research, I will claim the use of Talanoa as a method of collating and co-constructing narratives, by embedding this as a tool in the Su’ifefiloi research design.

Another researcher, Sitiveni Halapua (2008), also discusses talanoa as understanding “engaging in dialogue with, or telling stories to each other absent [of] concealment of the inner feelings and experiences that resonate in our hearts and minds” (p. 1). Because of openness in the dialogue, this allows for participants to also narrate and contextualise their own voices in the process of talanoa; it is considered a holistic approach to research that includes Pacific participants. This quote also reflects the significance and responsibility of researchers using talanoa, which is arguably one of the most prominent research methodologies applied across indigenous Pacific research.

Supporting this notion of a holistic approach, Nabobo-Baba and Farrelly’s (2014) research also validates the holistic effects of talanoa as a method: “When our participants talk, they carry us on a cognitive journey, imaginatively moving us from past to present to future so that we can better understand how they live and feel their world. This will be crucial in the study, in order to understand previous events or encounters that the participants may have experienced or chosen to disclose.” (pg. X).

So for Viaoleti (2006) this method is “[a] personal encounter where people story their issues, their realities and their aspirations” And because talanoa is the “process in which two or more people talk together, or in which on person tells a story to an audience who are largely listeners [...] Talanoa is guided by rules of relationship and kinship” (p. 21). Therefore as a listener, I will be observing participants’ reactions of comfort or discomfort, that are guided by our relational vā as researchers.

It is important to note that talanoa is a process of talking as discussed above. However, Unaisi Nabobo-Baba and Trisia Farrelly (2014) explain that in Fijian contexts, their study highlights two types of talanoa in this research, the formal and the informal. Similarly, in the Samoan village context, talanoa can also occur formally and informally, however is guided by the relationship of the participant to the researcher, and vice versa.
The participants’ sinomaga (designated roles) indicate the two examples I present below of the types of talanoa conducted in this research. This also emphasises the process of talanoa is largely led by participants. For instance, formal talanoa requires certain protocols, and in some cases specific ceremonies, to occur before it can take place; especially because formal talanoa suggests a hierarchy, and sometimes an asiasiga (visitation) as discussed earlier in this chapter, presents us with an example of this type of talanoa. In this event, the receiver or host welcomes the visitor by then questioning the visitor’s intentions or purpose of visit. These largely happened in private homes of my key informants. Formalising a cultural and interpersonal relationship. The informal talanoa, is represented in the everyday ‘chat’ in the arts centre that occurred between participants and myself. It was during these informal discussions that participants in this phase of the study were encouraged to think individually and talanoa openly.

In this research, participants were engaged by talanoa in an informal manner. The talanoa happened both individually and in then informally in groups, and formally as discussed earlier. They were initiated by introducing broad key themes relative to the village life, the micro-enterprise and their roles within the arts centre. I instigated talanoa with key informants and participants. These talanoa sessions are recorded in the table below, indicating the types of sessions conducted. As part of my ethical consideration to nurturing the vā fealoaloai (respectful space) I would signal the use of data collection at various points of the talanoa, during and after my participatory observations for recording purposes. These are recorded and indicated in my digital recordings, as appropriate and especially when key discussions would need to be highlighted, because some talanoa was seen as ‘informal’.

I have argued how the use of talanoa is applicable to this study. I have also explored previous studies that validate this as method of storytelling appropriate for Pacific participants, both as methodology and method. In this research I define the two types of talanoa present in my data collection. I discuss informal talanoa and formal talanoa. In this research I examine the use of talanoa as a method of collecting data, by creating, listening and recording conversations.

3.6. Research Method of Participatory Observation

Barbara Kawulich (2005a), describes the method of participatory observation as a tool of data collecting about people, processes and cultures. As this is a cultural study of women in the context
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of a remote rural village, I have chosen to adapt basics of participatory observation to conduct the ethnographic research. For instance, at times I would need to observe the participants around the site of the study and beyond the site of the arts centre. For this, I selected two sites for participant observation, the arts centre and the Catholic church located in map in Figure 6.

Data Collection Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview (transcribed)</td>
<td>1:1 x 3 Key Participants Semi-structured interviews occurred twice per participant.</td>
<td>40 – 60mins on average per interview. On average 6hrs in total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talanoa (mix of transcribed, partly filmed)</td>
<td>Formal talanoa with participants 1:1 or key informants. Informal talanoa with key participants or key informants.</td>
<td>36hrs of formal. 140hrs of recorded digitally or written notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Observational notes (audio, parts transcribed, daily interaction notes)</td>
<td>2hrs per day.</td>
<td>140hrs approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual: Video and photography</td>
<td>Six events (photographed) and parts of participatory observation filmed.</td>
<td>4hrs 215 images.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Data collection table, ARF, 2017.
In order to be open and upfront, I explained to my participants in the initial outline of the process what type of data I would be collating. I also explained that these also extend beyond the context of the arts centre, but largely during the church exchanges. Kawulich (2005a) analyses why researchers should use Participatory Observation in cultural studies and why this is a useful method in ethnographic-orientated research.

This was a method that allowed me to blend into village life at times during the normal day-to-day living within the village, for example church cleaning, supporting the participants in writing reports after their work, driving key participants to the shop. These situations were very useful in gauging a sense of trust and respect (fa’aaloalo) of the participants and also of the village.

As a study that examines the social spaces of participants’ lives in the arts centre and in public, selecting a method that examines a wider perspectives of participants’ lives was crucial:

"[T]he goal for design of research using participant observation as a method is to develop a holistic understanding of the phenomena under study that is as objective and accurate as possible given the limitations of the method." (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2002, p. 92, cited in Kawulich 2005)

It is important to note here that not all aspects of the lives of the key participants were able to be observed, for instance I could not collect from the privacy of their homes.

Kawulich (2005a) goes further to examine Bernard’s (1994) study, listing five reasons for including participatory observation in the research, all of which increase the study’s validity:

1. It makes it possible to collect different types of data. Being on site over a period of time familiarizes the researcher to the community, thereby facilitating involvement in sensitive activities to which he/she generally would not be invited.
2. It reduces the incidence of "reactivity" or people acting in a certain way when they are aware of being observed.
3. It helps the researcher to develop questions that make sense in the native language or are culturally relevant.
4. It gives the researcher a better understanding of what is happening in the culture and lends credence to one’s interpretations of the observation. Participant observation also enables the researcher to collect both quantitative and qualitative data through surveys and interviews.
5. It is sometimes the only way to collect the right data for one’s study. (pp. 142-3)
Kawulich (2005b) points out that participatory observation helps the researcher observe ‘normalised’ expectations of everyday activity. In this research, participants were observed several times at the arts centre during normal work routines in order to gauge levels of comfort and familiarity, and create consistency of data. For instance, one of my regular observation sites was the workshop area of the arts centre. As part of my routine, I set out to record and observe participants in familiar settings. However, this had its limitations as not every participant was available at the time of the data collection, therefore data from this method is uneven in relation to the participants.

I have argued the value of the adapted method by examining appropriate fa’aaloalo (respect) to the participants of this research. I have outlined how this method has been utilised in this study and explained its limitations.

### 3.7. Research Method of Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as a method to allow for greater choice of topic during data collection. Martyn Denscombe describes this qualitative research method tool as “ideal to gain an in-depth understanding of the motivations of a particular group of people” (2010, p. 141). In this research design, as a collective group of women, one of the core questions was to highlight challenges as a group, but to conduct these individually with each participant, then collectively as a group. This method will be utilised to illustrate participants’ ideals and understanding of future prospects of the arts centre and their individual aspirations.

Denscombe (2010) explains that semi-structured interviews allow for ease of transition that allows “interviewee elaborating points of interest” (p. 175). This is described as a useful method that helped a free flow of information and was able to clarify points of interest during the semi-structured interviews with participants. However, during the processes of interjecting or clarifying ‘points’, during the semi-structured interviews, several of my participants’ responses indicated that the discussions went from informal to formal. Therefore, the use of this method was limited. However, it gave some structure to themes explored for talanoa, as this was one of the first methods explored in this study.

As part of the interviewing processes, I identified two types of semi-structured interviews, firstly individual interviews with all three participants, then secondly interviews that include one or two of the other remaining participants. This is indicated in the analysis as individual or mixed interviews.
I have so far explained how I utilised semi-structured interviews. I elaborated on ‘fractured’ responses when raising points of interest during a semi-structured interview. I explore the limitations in semi-structured interviews and explain the disruptiveness encountered in some of the responses in this setting. As a comparison, semi-structured interviews were seen as more formal than talanoa with the participants in this study. Therefore, for possible future research, the talanoa affords the notion of moni (truth, or from the heart) whereas semi-structured interviews indicate a more restrictive response in some participants, which I discuss further in Chapter 4. In this phase of the study, the discussions were both individual and collective.

3.8. Role of Researcher

As a Samoan researcher, I am personally and professionally invested in this research. I have discussed this role briefly in my positioning in Chapter 2, considering how this may affect the outcomes of this research. In this section, I discuss how my role as researcher impacts on the delivery and engagement of this research and the adaptation necessary from methods explored in this research design affected or may affect certain outcomes.

I initially set out to transcribe all the material and translate the transcriptions myself, in order to have a sense of what the emerging themes were. However, the reality of transcribing all interviews and audio files, was difficult at that time of this process. I sought the assistance of a transcriber who was fluent in both English and Samoan, who helped transcribe and translate the audio files into a word document. During this time, I listened to all these to select initial themes, which then required me to scope the quality of each particular interview and to write up the contextual notes and key emerging themes under each participant.

3.9. Context of Study

The context of this study is primarily located in a rural indigenous Samoan context. Based in a village that has been devastated by the effects of climate change; namely the 2009 tsunami and recently by cyclones. The entire project started in 2013 through initial discussions with key informants, however was only formalised as a research project with AUT from 2015 through to 2017. The data was
collected in Samoa over a period of 8 weeks (not including the scoping of the project). It is also important to note that much of the data has been interpreted in the diaspora of Aotearoa, which undoubtedly affects how this study was interpreted. The study examines women’s hierarchical status in contemporary rural Samoan life. Therefore, it warranted the contextual awareness by including both Samoan communities around me both in the indigenous context of Samoa (both rural and town based informants), and key informants and vital support of this project in the diaspora of Aotearoa.

Another aspect of conducting this research is that, the diasporic positioning of the researcher (myself) has been taken into consideration, meaning that I am aware of my privileged position in regards to the complex and hierarchical positioning of the researcher. The notion of ‘diasporic va’ is a term I have used to describe the differences of fa’asamoa between the New Zealand (diaspora) Samoa and the Samoa (homeland) and the differences of approaches. Throughout this study, I have articulated the comparative differences of spaces and notions applied to this study and context.

3.10. PARTICIPANTS AND INCLUSION

A key component of identifying key participants was reliant on public social spaces and individuals within this village. This was supported by the highest-ranking woman in this particular village – Mataumanu. This person also happens to be the matua’u (master weaver). She helped identify the church-cleaning as an initial alternative to finding other participants.

She also helped give historical oral stories to the Poutasi Women’s Komiti and references and context to the shifting spaces over some of these locations; for example, the current Women’s Komiti (committee) house, which was no longer in use by the women. At the time of the data collection, it existed primarily for visiting health professionals for the local district health clinic. Although not addressed in this study, a sequence of questions around the shifting spaces of women’s-oriented spaces in rural areas became evident in this scoping. For example, I primarily thought of a fale lalaga (women’s weaving spaces) as a physical house, but I learned in several discussions and interviews that no such space existed, and that women would use whatever space available, which was currently the large memorial hall (see Figure 6). Three key participants directly contributed to the everyday operation of the arts centre and lived in the village at the time of this
data collection. These participants were chosen specifically because of their association with the arts centre and their gender.

In reporting this research, I use pseudonyms to protect the identity of participants. The three main participants are aged between 30 and 57 years. Participants were already associated with the site and location of the arts centre. The only non-inclusion of participants were children of the women, family members and other staff surrounding the location of the arts centre. I had originally hoped to have more women, however, at the time of the study, there were only three women involved.

The decision of focusing towards the arts communities in the nu’u was made, largely due to supporting the research principle of reciprocity. It allowed reciprocal exchanges to contribute back to the nu’u as discussed earlier, but also allowed me to participate in village life and social obligations as a female. Given the scope (time and resources) of this project, two sites are identified as an ideal parameter given the resources for this small study: the arts centre and the most public and central site, the Catholic church belonging to the Poutasi Ekalesia Katoliko.

The only criteria for inclusion of participants was that they had to identify as female and live in the nu’u, and have existing vā fealoa’i (social relational) linkages to everyday village life in this nu’u (village).

3.10.1. **Ethical Considerations**

Relationships and authority for Samoans are based on fa’aaloalo (respect) and fesuiaiga (reciprocity). I have explained and clarified that as an insider outsider, I have followed appropriate etiquette by performing an ‘asiasiaga (visitation of a traveller) with key leaders of the village prior and during the research, in order to tausi le va (nurture the relational space). Each reciprocated their blessings in numerous and affirming ways.

An ethics application (see appendix 6.2) was submitted to AUTEC and approved in 2015.

3.10.2. **Participant Information**

The scope of this study allowed me to cover the situation at the centre through access to a small sample, as there were only three women working directly with the centre, plus, more indirectly, one
matuau’u (master weaver and key informant), one matai (key informant), one gardener,* pre-school teachers* and one librarian.*21

Niva (pseudonym) was interviewed first due to her availability. She describes herself as the fesoasoani (supporter or assistant, in this context) of the other participants in the arts centre. She has lived in this village her entire life, is married to a matai and has raised four children. Three have left the nu’u, and the youngest resides with her and her husband in the family home. She stated that she has not had any formal secondary schooling, however has been the carer of her family in Poutasi. Her home is located closest to the arts centre, centrally located in the nu’u. Prior to working at the arts centre, Niva was a housewife, throughout her entire married life. She is the oldest participant and is described as the mama of the centre. She tends to the arts centre garden and occasionally assists Moana (pseudonym) with producing or printing. As the most senior of the participants, she is held in high regard and part of the aualuma (daughter of the village). Niva is, untypically, a tausi (female role in village, the wife of a tulafale, orator chief). Recently, she has progressively learnt skills from visiting artist guests and from her counterparts at the arts centre.

Niva participated a total of ten times, the highest of the three participants. She participated in three talanoa and two semi-structured interviews, and I conducted five participatory observations where she was present (events and full days). Her command of English is limited, however we both managed by speaking informal Samoan.

Moana (pseudonym) describes her role as the arts centre manager. She married into the village and has seven children. She is identified according to village fa’amatai as a nofotane (meaning married into the village; married women). Moana was born in the neighbouring village of Vaovai and is married to a non-titled man in the Poutasi nu’u. The fact that her husband holds no matai title, and therefore is known as an ‘untitled man’, situates Moana’s positioning in this study according to village law, as the lowest status in comparison to the other women. However, she is also the only participant out of the three who has business skills in ‘indigenous’ micro-enterprise. She has previously owned and facilitated her own ‘craft’ shop prior to taking on the role at the centre. She talks about her roadside stall and is very proud of her family’s history as market entrepreneurs. She is disadvantaged by her status as a nofotane, in having very little to no say in the nu’u. However, as

21 These individuals were not part of the research, however, they worked in the vicinity of the arts centre.
mentioned previously, her skills and the entrepreneurialism evidenced in her previous craft store position her well in the arts centre as a leader.

Sele (pseudonym) is the operations manager of the arts centre. She describes herself as the matai’s partner (who was a key informant particularly in the early stages of the research project). In a faamatai context, she is positioned as a nofotane, living with her de facto partner. In her forties, she actively engages with the arts centre on a day-to-day basis and supports the two other key participants’ work by looking after the purchasing, wages and business development for the centre. While she lives in the nu’u, she also works at her family business located in town. Sele was born in New Zealand and now resides in the nu’u, in a de facto relationship with her matai partner, who played an influential role in the setting up of the arts centre.

The male matai (‘the matai’ in the data analysis) has a prominent authoritative voice in this village. He is an entrepreneur and philanthropist who raises funds for the NGO operating the arts centre. He freely engaged in discussions and talanoaga, explaining his visions and aspirations, sharing his insights and knowledge. For this, I am also grateful. I initially spent a considerable amount of time with this informant, as he was my initial contact in this village.

Another key informant was Matumanu Meleisea, who was identified in the AUTEC application as one of my key participants. However, due to timing the participant was largely unavailable due to her poor health at the time of my data collection. Nevertheless, our initial talanoa and occasional participatory observations of her at church gave me some understanding of her positioning in the nu’u context, and I was very grateful to have her as a key informant of this study.

Although a small participatory study, these brief narratives and insights highlight the ongoing need for relevant research that provides voices for individual women, who may feel the disadvantaged voice that women have in rural Samoan spaces.

3.11. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH DESIGN

In this chapter I have examined and demonstrated how Su’ifefilo ‘Ula research design is situated, by evidencing a new emerging methodology that embraces the blended approaches of synthesising and threading. I examined the epistemological positioning of a researcher, derived from the Pacific
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worldview and redefined as a Samoan worldview. I claim that by understanding the philosophy of approaches and intention of fa’asamoan values in this context, one is consciously aware of being a diasporic Samoan.

This methodology is designed to enhance a blended approach that values *teu le va* and *fesuiga* (reciprocity) as key approaches to gathering information. A crucial underpinning to this framework embraces talanoa as the key principle and method of the data collection and analysis processes explored in this study. I have also argued for research to be aimed at being gender specific, embracing women’s specialised knowledges and utilising women’s organisational groups within a village context. I have also introduced key participants and key informants as part of this research. I argue that this research design Su’ifefilo ‘Ula supports new ways of collating new knowledges in an indigenous context, by threading and weaving appropriate methods, to analyse, to contrast, to highlight, and to complement in a developing rural Samoan nu’u.
4. FALE LALAGA DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. INTRODUCTION TO DATA ANALYSIS

Utilising the analysis method of su’ifefiloi (Refiti 2015), findings were arranged thematically (Attride-Stirling, 2001) to evidence and highlight themes that emerged from the study. Each of these findings illustrated emerging narratives and suggestions that are in response to my primary question: How does a group of Samoan women leading an arts centre (enterprise) negotiate new spaces of practice in rural indigenous Samoa?

I present and discuss my analysis in this chapter, by elaborating on key themes that emerge as part of the questions and topics in this study. Some of these themes emerged out of talanoa (both informal and formal), semi-structured interviews, participatory observations (using notes and illustrations) and preliminary talanoa methods during the scoping. A visual context of the spatial orientation emerged out of historical accounts given by key informants and current spatial layout of the site of this study. These contextualise the orientation and developing structure of the nu’u and are noted as Figure 7 in this chapter. By presenting an outline sketch map of the village (see below) my aim is to illustrate that these findings are cognisant of ‘shifts’ and ongoing ‘negotiations’ of tuaoi (boundaries) and therefore identity and positioning in this village.

This sketched diagram is traced from an image (see Figure 7 description below) captured in an aerial photograph by a film crew in 2013. This diagram shows key buildings, structures and spaces identified in this study. They are coded according to the purpose of each particular space. Initially, I had attempted to identify gender-specific spaces, by marking triangles and squares to indicate the participants. However, in the end, this became a useful drawing that allows the reader to visualise the shift in the village centre towards the Main Coast Road. This diagram also gives a perspective of the spatial orientation of current and former structures existing in Poutasi during the study.\footnote{Also see recent publication by Werner Hennings (2017), recent study for further spatial re-organisation of the nu’u of Poutasi.}

Part of this analysis aims to look at the context of ‘boundaries’ within the village, based on illustrations of the geographical layout of the nu’u on the fa’amatai system and the social boundaries inherent as part of the fa’amatai system (these are discussed in depth in Chapter 2). In Figure 7, I look at how spatial exposition examined by Refiti in his ‘A Psychedelic Method’ (2013, p. 29) is
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comparative to how I illustrate spatial orientations and the current ‘placement’ of the arts centre, by presenting spatial orientations evidenced in this data. I also look at how this method of spatial exposition also helps the orientation of their micro-enterprise. Shore (1999) describes the notion of tuaoi (boundaries or a neighbour) and parameters, as things that are seen and not so seen. Figure 7 also highlights that the key buildings within this ‘new centre’ also surround a ‘rugby field’ (12) are predominately facilitated by women. If my analysis is correct, does this suggest that women are key influences in the surroundings spaces? If so, what are challenges of this new space? By understanding the ‘seen’ and the ‘unseen’, that is described by Shore, as a layout and boundaries within spaces identified in this village centre, I hope to unpack, possible challenges that this notion of ‘spatial exposition’ have on the participants, which I describe in detail later in this chapter. I’ve illustrated below how women are prominent facilitators in each space surrounding the new village centre. This analysis provides new ‘overarching’ evidence that the layout is being nurtured by women facilitating each individual space located in the ‘Current village centre’ surrounding the (12) area (see the pink triangles [women] and blue squares [men] in Figure 7.
Figure 7  Poutasi drawing showing spatial shifts in boundaries, and the arts centre. Illustration: A. Fulufaga, 2016.
1. PDT arts centre
2. PDT Early Childhood Centre (ECE)
3. Poutasi community hall (Memorial hall)
4. PDT office and residence (Tuatagaloa)
5. Fale o Meleisea
6. Falettele Tuatagaloa
7. EFKS church
8. Fale of Tuatagaloa
9. Catholic church
10. Poutasi District Clinic
11. Fale faifeau EFKS
12. Rugby field
13. Police station
14. Niva residence
15. Poutasi Fale Komiti

Figure 8. Original aerial image of Poutasi village. Photograph: Venusi Taumoepeau.

Each theme presented in this analysis provides narrative-based data that informs a ‘conscious act’ (Tupuola, 1994) of threading together of individual or collective narratives. As a reminder, these ‘narratives’ are to be analysed in relation to the fa’asinomaga (identity) of the participants as only partial perspectives of the participants and therefore not including their ‘private spaces’. As discussed previously, these ‘narratives’ were constructed, threaded together to form parts of an ‘irregular’ and sometimes ‘disjointed’ ʻula lei (flower garland). Therefore, findings are explorative and constantly evolving as is this village and tagata ole nuʻu (people of the village).

Based on the Su’ifefiloi research design (see Figure 6), data is represented as ‘sequences’, or ‘themes’. Therefore, in this chapter, sequences are arranged thematically, where themes emerge from the data that have been gathered utilising the research design approach. The analysis utilises interviews, participatory observation (PO), site analysis, photos, other documentation and talanoa.
These are then presented in sub-chapters based on the four sets of questions that were explored in this research. As discussed earlier, parts of the research process required a variation and diverse data collection methods and blended approach, therefore presenting themes as emerging data sometimes appearing ambiguous in parts of this chapter is a natural effect of this method. As Refiti (2015) suggests, a certain level of embracing the “irregularities” or “disjointed” sequences in su’ifefilo as a method, dictates that the ambiguity allows for deeper and future investigations to be determined as knowledge evolves. In parts, this ‘ula lei appears disjointed, as indicated in Figure 6, however in other areas of the ‘ula formation, sequences appear texturally rich and therefore suggest stronger emerging themes.

The first set of questions aimed to identify key social ‘boundaries’, based on each individual participant’s fa’asinomaga (identity). What kind of negotiated spaces are evident in this village? What are the existing politics of boundaries evident in rural Samoa? In this chapter, I look at aspects of the participants fa’asinomaga defined by their birthplace, marital status and geographical location.

The second set of questions is aimed at identifying ‘social spaces’ (see Figure 3). These social spaces, according to Aiono et al., are defined by the hierarchical roles. Based on the indicative questions the key aspects of ‘social’ spaces were limited to two locations. These were highlighted by the participants as appropriate spaces, to understand this. The analysis focuses on data made by the participants concerning two primary physical environments: firstly, the arts centre and, secondly, the church. By exploring ‘social spaces’, I explore how each of these participants is located and positioned in these sites, how each interacts with these sites; and what informs their positioning in the context. The women were only observed in public spaces and therefore these findings only apply to communal spaces.

The third and fourth sets of questions were focused on the location of the arts centre and on the fact that it is a repurposed space. How have these women come to claim a space in the centre of the nu’u? I discuss how the participants responded to what challenges they face in a rural village and its political structures, and also how they respond to and negotiate the operation of new spaces.

Therefore, as a thematic sequence approach in this chapter, I present the data analysis in a thematic approach that is threaded together and given sub headings in this chapter. Each sub heading presents a sequence set that form parts of the ‘ula that may appear ‘disjointed’ and ‘irregular’.
However, each set of questions is aimed at presenting a sequence of emerging themes that are parts of the ‘ula lei (garland) that respond to key questions explored in this study (see Chapter 3, p.52).

4.2. NEGOTIATED WOMEN’S SPACES AND STRUCTURE

Firstly, the first set of questions aims to establish each participant’s context by unpacking the notion of *fa’asinomaga*. Participants’ responses differed according to their birthplace, cultural context, marriage and interpretation of their relational vā– clearly articulating birthplace as significant together with marriage as a key indicator of vā *fa’asinomaga*. The research identified a tension between the diasporic and the indigenous Samoan practice of the vā. The set of questions in the semi-structured interviews and talanoa aimed at looking at the person’s birthplace, social ‘orientation’ (where one knows to situate oneself) within certain spaces and how they came to live in Poutasi. See below an extract of the indicative questions:

Are you originally from Poutasi? If not, please explain where you’re originally from and how you ended up living and working here?

What is the name of your aiga here in Poutasi? And where do you live? Are you able to indicate to me on this paper, how far you live in proximity to the centre of the nu’u?

Where is your family situated in the nu’u?

Do you have a matai title? If so, where is your title from?

This research is also around the notion of *va, va fealoalofani*, How do you see *va fealoalofani* playing a role within the context of the arts centre?

These questions were indicative only and were asked in through several methods, both talanoa (informal and formal) and semi-structured interviews. Some of these questions also required observed in participatory observation for enriching the data. I will indicate where and when different methods were applied in context to the participants quotes or data.

Niva stated in her interview:
(ARF) Fa’amatala mai lou faasinomaga fa’amolemole
(Niva) loe, o lea lava. O lo’u tina o ***, a’o lo’u tamā o ***... ole igoa ole matou aiga ***. Ole lou nu’u lea o Poutasi na fanau ai...

(ARF) Pe iai sou igoa matai? (pause and slight probing from me).
(Niva) Leai o a’u o le tausi. Tausi e ave I to’alua o matai tulafale, a’o le faletua e ave I to’alua o matai alii.

(Translated)
Can you explain what your fa’asinomaga is please?
Yes, for sure. My mother’s name is *** and my fathers name is ***, the name of my husband is ***. I was born here in Poutasi...(slight probing from me).

(ARF) Do you have a matai name?
(Niva) No I am the tausi (wife of an orator).

(Interview with Niva, 2016)

Unsurprisingly all participants’ responses demonstrate that this group of women also reflect what is traditionally common in rural areas of Samoa. Samoan women predominately migrate to their husband’s villages and live with them based on the fact that men have more authority over land ownership in Samoa:

Fa’afetai lava mo le fesili. O lo’u igoa o Moana...
Thank you for the question, My name is Moana.

O lo’u nu’u o Vaiusu
My village is Vaiusu.

O le mafuaga ua ala ai ona o’o mai i Poutasi ua oe fa’aipoipo i se alii Poutasi.
The reason why I live in Poutasi is because I am married to a man from Poutasi.

(Interview with Moana, 2016)
However, one of the contentious occurrences in this sequence is the view on marital status. This view impacts directly on all participants but more directly with Sele who states:

Okay, no I was not born in Poutasi, I am originally from Auckland, first born, oh sorry, first generation Samoa, I ended up being in Poutasi with my partner, I say partner because were not married yet. Umm...so that’s how I ended up in Poutasi

(Interview with Sele, 2016)

I say contentious, because the issue relates to the views of ‘rights of women’ (from a Human Rights perspective) and the notion of ‘rights of women’ (from a Samoan worldview), which according to Percival’s (2013) video is highly debated and contentious in Samoa. Therefore, one of the questions was to address “What are the current limitations on women of lower ranking within the nu’u?” In this context, one of the limitations on women could be the perspectives of marital status in Samoa. However, because Christianity is the largest and most influential religion in Samoa, this does cause issues for the women, and the positioning of this particular participant in the arts centre, and therefore the fa’asinomaga of the arts centre. I also identify this in other themes.

Another important aspect of the ‘limitation’ is due to Sele’s relationship, this places her outside the fa’amatai system, giving her no say in village life. As she has no actual division or role in the fa’amatai system, she navigates herself between the spaces comfortably as not to offend anyone by following village protocols. This I discuss later in this chapter. However, this theme looks at identity and positioning as an ‘orientation’.

The data suggests through several of my observations, each participant practised va fealoalo‘i’ (respectful space) whereby the participants actively sought to nurture the relational vā between each other. For instance, in my observations during a Mother’s Day church service, Sele carried a large bag of ‘ula lolē (lei made of lollies) with her to the service. After the service, one of these ‘ula lei was presented to each tina (mother) in a
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23 Living in a defacto relationship is frowned up in Samoan villages.largely due to the Christian views present in rural villages.

24 It is important to note that the participant and partner are engaged to be married.

respectful way with *loto maualalo* (humility). Sele approached the mothers sitting in the shade of the porch after the service as to fa’a ‘ula the mothers of the congregation. Each mother who was gifted returned the gesture by gifting back an ‘ula lole to Sele. This form of exchange of ‘ula lole and act of respect is something all of the young unmarried married women of the church were actively partaking in during this day. This ‘exchange’ of as previously examined by Marcel Mauss (1967) as a form of exchange as a ‘reciprocal’ exchange, one that helps nurture existing relational spaces between the giver and receiver. Therefore, this public acknowledgement and ‘ula example aims to highlight how this participant actively engages in community (public) gift giving and therefore nurtures the vā.

As mentioned earlier, the marital status impacts on the *fa’asinomaga* of women, however is negotiated between participants in the arts centre and the church. In Samoan society, the *fa’asinomaga* of a woman is dependent on the status of her husband (Aiono, 1997). However, in this study all the women are aware of impact of her status and therefore ‘negotiate’ around spaces to nurture the *va fealoaloai* (respectful space). For instance; both Moana and Niva refer to Sele as an honourary faletua, and call her “faletua Sele”, between themselves at the arts centre. This evidences a ‘negotiation’ between the hierarchies and the realities of their positioning. (05.1).

It is important to highlight that this is not a comparative study of diasporic and indigenous narratives, and that the study was not set up to analyse this. However, this does emerge as a key theme of ‘disconnectedness’ sometimes, between the interpretation of participants’ responses. A key issue of ‘interpretation’ as Kögl er (2005) suggests is that a more radical approach in the ‘orientation’ is needed to look at how or where disconnections occur. It is important to keep the notion of ‘orientation’ when looking at this analysis; that I am oriented by my own cultural assumptions and therefore so are the participant’s response. Sele’s comment also highlights, her ‘orientation’ by defining her status of being in a ‘de-facto relationship’ emphasises her awareness of her and her partner’s living situation. In Samoan society or in the fa’amatai system, there is currently no, structure of operation for those living in a de facto’ relationship. Therefore, this is a new identity structure, being examined as part of this study. Which relates to on of my key questions ‘How do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures? Although, not set in concrete of a fa’amatai system or recognised in fa’asamo, this does evidence, that a ‘blended approach’ of ‘identity’ structures exist in this study.
In Moana’s nofotane status (married into the village), she is identified as belonging to a lower ranking in comparison with the other participants. In the fa’amatai system the in-marrying wives who are married to the non-titled men do not register in Fairbairn-Dunlop’s model (1998), however systems of communication in the nu’u also represent a form of hierarchical structure mimicking the fa’amatai system. Keesing’s (1956, p. 53) Channels of Communication and Authority-Responsibility map suggests that Moana’s status, in the nu’u, is comparatively low and is positioned as aualuma. Throughout this study, I identify several of her observations to highlight how women of lower ranking adapt and ‘negotiate’ within the nu’u. As a nofotane who is married to a non-titled man, she has no say at a village fono. However, she states ‘she has the right to raise issues, co-opt women in Niva’s position (of higher rank and with a voice a fono o tamaitai) who can then voice her input or dispute into the fono o tamaitai (Women’s Council). Moana, status and positioning, also reflected how she would actively sought to teuteu to act as if ‘nurturing’ or tending to relations that matter.

One of Moanas’ examples of negotiating teuteu (to adorn) these relational aspects is her example identified in 4.1.5.1, whereby she acts and nurtures relationships through acts of fa’aloalo (respect) for her elders and those of higher ranking.

As a researcher, I was reminded by a colleague and friend while conducting data collection in the nu’u to affirm my position of ‘married status’ to the men in the nu’u. Understanding the varied differences of roles and therefore social boundaries for each participant serves to look at the functions and obligations that each participant discusses and ‘how’ they discuss these. This sequence was quite a challenge in terms of analysing data as it involved a process of threading together sets of information in parts to make this one sequence. This involved threading together responses from talanoa, semi-structured interviews and participatory observational data that included notes, images and photo that engages with in this set of questions. How do the women’s interactions affect the centre’s vā fe’so’atai (connecting space) in relation to the nu’u? How do they negotiate new ways of operating, between an arts centre model and the fa’amatai system (translation)? How do they collectively teu le vā (nurture the vā), and how do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures? Which role does fa’amatai play in the facilitation of the centre? How do diasporic notions of the vā change the social spaces in the arts centre?
The most interesting data, was evidenced in my observational notes in regards to participant Moana’s positioning in the church. My reflections noted:

Moana attended church. Sits out the back with her children. She is wearing casual clothes, earrings and seems sparkly in appearance. She’s is wearing ofu palagi (western clothing). Sele, this morning has made an effort to purposefully remove earrings and jewellery as if to appear ‘plain’ in her appearance. Niva sat right at the front of church, where she sits most Sundays. Loku (church) has started.

(Field notes, ARF, 2015).

Later on that week, I asked Moana what her opinion was of clothing attire for women.

She stated: E pule ia fafine so’o se ofu. O lo’u ia manutu, i mafai ona pule le fafine so’o ofu.

Translated. Women can wear any clothing. In my opinion, women are allowed to have a choice to wear what they want

This was a surprising observation and therefore an interesting comparison between Moana’s and Sele’s choice of attire. In this instance, Moana (Samoan born) stipulated her choice and freedom in clothing, whereas Sele made a conscious effort to dress ‘plainly’, choosing to dress down in this situation (I revisit this later in the chapter).

As a reminder, Aiono (1997) states that it is crucial, to understand the relationship between the social role, social organisation and geographical location in order to define a Samoan person’s fa’asinomaga (identity). However, the women in this study reflect an interesting discourse between ‘indigenous modern views’ versus the ‘diasporic possibly romanticised views’. However, I am certain this is not that simple. In this sequence, I have examined part of this complex contextualisation of fa’asinomaga, it also aims to understand the person’s positioning and meaning. As mentioned, in part of this analysis, I highlight the points of interest in regards to differing views that go against current literature. However, parts of these sequences blend and overlap, as does the process of stitching and threading.
I also identify through their social organisation in terms, the way some of this data was approached especially in areas of caution, but also highlight the different ways in which participants responded to identifying their different roles in the arts centre and within the nu’u. All of the responses were similar in relation to purpose and role, in that each participant identified specific roles that each played in the management and facilitation of the arts centre.

As Tuagalu describes, “It is my contention that the meanings and nuances of the va fealoaloa'i, though not lost, become muffled in translation” (p. 41). ‘Muffled’ and sometimes ‘blurriness’ will feature throughout this data analysis and is unique to the design of the research, as Refiti indicates. It is not a regular ‘ula, it embraces the irregularities and exposes the complex narratives where tension can sometimes arise; but in general the teu le va is a paramount approach in how participants negotiate complex situations.

Another interesting theme that emerged out of this set of questions was the notion of tuaoi (boundaries) in relation to geographical location. Again Tuagalu suggests, “The proverbial imperative [...] of understanding tuaoi’ 'Aua e te si'i le tuaoi’ (literally, 'Do not lift the boundaries!') implies that even if there are no fences (pa), 'you and everyone (in the village) know where the boundaries lie, as they never change” (2008, p. 10).

Although, this quote directly relates to the land boundaries, it also suggests that ‘boundaries’ never change. However, in this village, data emerging from talanoa with key informants and recent publication by Henning (2017), suggest that these have been ‘re-negotiated’ or ‘re-constructed’ due to the effects of climate change and natural disasters.

4.2.1. Social and Public Negotiated Spaces

This arts centre is located in the ‘new’ village centre (see Figure 7) situated on ‘public’ land (previously land acquired by the government for a school). During these observations, what emerged was although the women had overall power within the space of the arts centre to create and work, the notion of ‘power’ or authority was limited only to the interior spaces, whereas the outside spaces and therefore boundaries were problematic. I discuss this below in the extracts from the participatory observations.
Due to the arts centre being located in a ‘public’ place, and ‘idealised’ as a ‘social space’ for all and not belonging to a family, the boundaries are blurred and caused some tension at various points of this sequence. Because there has been a dramatic shift of boundaries as Hennings (2017) points out, the notion of ‘boundaries’ or tua’oi are problematic in this study. For instance, the arts centre is situated between the rugby grounds and the Faifeau’s (minister’s) property, where the faifaeu has rights and authorities. The PDT matai acts as the ‘property manager’ in the case of the arts centre and liaises with the faifaeu to ‘negotiate’ the spaces for the arts centre. In several incidents the arts centre women required actions over certain issues that would arise, however due to the processes involved, the women were constantly delayed. However, this sequence aims to address questions of how does this group of women ‘negotiate’ or facilitate these ‘spaces’ when they have no authority over the land? And how to overcome and ‘negotiate’ facilitation of the micro-enterprise on a daily basis?

Firstly I briefly revisit the notion of ‘tuaoi’ described by Tui Atua (2007 pg. 3) that states: “Tua’oi ...‘i tua atu o i e le au iai lau aia po o lau pule.” Translated this means, “your rights (aia) or authority (pule) do no extend beyond that point”. Therefore, I argue that the lack of authority for women, or control in this instance, is the crux of the problem in acting in public spaces in the village for women; they appear to have no authority.

For instance, during a participatory observation in the arts centre, the women were forced to stand by watch as four large boars belonging to the EFKS faifeau (church minister) ran riot and were damaging newly planted gardens that Moana had worked on throughout the week. The women watched in frustration over the intrusion of the animals. One participant half jokingly said “Aga gei sau faga ua leva na faga pua’a ia.” (Translated) “If I had a gun, I would have shot the pigs already” (Participant extract during participatory observation, 2016).

The reason why they watched instead of acting on the situation was largely for safety reasons, but also because the pigs belonged to the minister. Fears of causing tension with the faifaeu, while the matai was away, intensified the situation. However, Moana claimed that if those pigs went into my fale, we could have shot them. According to village law, this
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26 This incident suggests the lack of authority in this current ‘new space’ of the art centre.
was allowed. Posing a very different situation if the arts centre was under authority of a different governing body.

This indicates that not only land ownership and therefore power dynamics can be problematic for the women in this study. However, this was not a central focus in this study. But it does strongly suggest, that power and land ownership in indigenous Samoa, indicates that this is still largely held by men. This group of women, live in Poutasi, due to the fact that their husbands or partner live and have land ownership in the villages they live in. This is common practise of land ownership as land is inherited by the males in the family.

Participants’ responses to the interviews were generally kept short and brief in response to this thematic sequence. However, what emerged ‘unsurprisingly’ was the vast difference in approach to answering va fa’asinomaga when translated to ‘identity’ for the English interview, with one particular participant.

So, to recap, in this first set of questions I explored parts of unpacking identity as problematic data. I am reminded that in the ‘transfer of knowledge’ and exchanges using talanoa methods (Farrelly & Nabobo-Baba, 2014; Prescott, 2011) discussions can become repetitive. However, this allows for an empathetic process of knowledge acquirement as Farelly and Nabobo-Baba state. Part of this research is aimed at understanding the construction of knowledge or emerging narratives; by repetitive junctions asked in various ways reaffirming each unique contribution to this ‘new’ emerging area of micro-enterprise in indigenous rural Samoa.

For instance, Niva, who predominantly spent her time in the back of the arts centre as an assistant, would work away and reaffirm and reflect on the questions, by using her memory in terms of referring back to a topic.

Niva: Na e maua le ta upu le aso?
   T: Did you comprehend our discussion from the other day? (vague)
   ARF: Leai, i mafai ona ta talanoa pea ia le uliga o isi mataupu?
       T: No, are we able to talanoa about it some more?
   Niva: la faiga
       T: No worries

(Participant observation data, ARF, 2016)
Another emerging, interesting finding, revolving around spaces, emerged out of the data analysis in this sequence. It looks at questions continuing to unpack the notion of ‘seen’ and unseen spaces, which emerge from this study. I look at how this relates to the wider social aspects: their designated role or positioning, status (in hierarchical systems) and their own view of their place in the nu’u.

In this context spaces referred to ‘physical’ and the ‘unseen’ social spaces. Social spaces are traditionally part of a village centre or a malae. In this village, the centralisation of new buildings closer to the Main Coastal Road (see Current village centre in Figure 7) suggests that the traditional malae structures exist in the current space, apart from an open rugby field. Findings suggest that negotiated spaces are dependent on the neighbouring physical spaces of this ‘shifted’ village centre. In this theme I explore narratives that emerge from this sequence of the seen and unseen.

From a spatial analysis, the positioning of the arts centre, is located between a stream and the faifaeaus (pastor of EFKS church residence) and the rugby field (see figure 6). The arts centre is at the end of the row of buildings. This ‘void’ as Shore suggests, area between is overgrown ‘dense bush’ leading to the stream. This depiction and analysis fuels the notion of ‘tuaoi and boundaries’ in a village described in Shore’s (1999) accounts of ‘dark and light’. However, clearing of the dense bush between these spaces, looking out to the shore, would greatly improve the light and therefore visibility for the arts centre location.

Another source of uncertainty around social parameters, identified in this analysis, showed that all participants identified as belonging to the Catholic church in the village. However, there are two significant churches. Therefore, the social interactions and active community lives of these participants who facilitate this arts centre are orientated towards only one of the pillars in the village community life – Poutasi Catholic Church. Despite the fact that the majority of religions are Christian based, the level of competition between church members, and the competitive division between them, is apparent in this study. This explains the challenge for the women of the arts centre of how to engage more women.

27 There are two churches located in this village. Families either attend one or the other. In this case, the women of the arts centre belong to the same one.
All three women have a strong sense of their place and designation in the context of the village and clearly outlined different perspectives of how they operate and contribute. Their responses suggest that the fa’amatai system and its hierarchical structures are woven into the facilitation of the arts centre and also indicate that this centre is run as an indigenous micro-enterprise.

For instance, Sele shared her views about choosing not to partake in fa’amatai alongside the other participants. This is interpreted as a lifestyle choice, that studies on diasporic Samoans or New Zealand Born Samoan indicate as a ‘selective’ process. She openly admits not always adhering to Samoan village laws, like wearing of lavalava’s (long traditional wear) around the nu’u. However, for ceremonial purposes she would purposefully and respectfully wear long clothing. This is noted as Sele’s way of negotiating her va fa’asinomaga which is common in ‘negotiated identity’ constructs in the Pacific (Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009).

However, another reading of this could be that Sele is aware of her privileges as New Zealand born which correlates with the NHRI report (2015) that suggests, women from rural villages have little or no access to education and opportunities in their districts. And that further professional training is greatly diminished when they came from rural villages. Therefore, her privileges of wealth are also part of this ‘negotiated’ space that the participants also consider when negotiating vā. Several incidents and evidence suggested that the women collectively utilised Seles education to their advantages and would rely on Seles expertise. Indicating that regardless of place of birth, in this art centre model the women were able to work effectively by utilising each other’s strengths.

To clarify each participant’s va fa’asinomaga, each participant was asked to clearly articulate her own individual status. One of the women, Sele, is unmarried, and living in a de facto relationship with a matai. Sele was born and raised in Auckland.

Moana is described as a nofotane (lowest ranking of the three women), who lives with her husband, family and children in the nu’u, a participant who was married also but originates from this district, actively engaged in the aualuma, mea fai ole nu’u (things to do with the nu’u). She states, that although she was born in American Samoa, her family have been involved in selling and makings crafts.
As mentioned before, the status of women depends on the context. As the only participant to be working in Apia, Sele is described as a minority in that she commutes daily to her workplace out of the nu’u (NHRI, 2015). This report, as discussed in the earlier chapters, looks at the differences between rural and urban environments, but largely looks at the rural areas in terms of the Human Rights of people in Samoa. Sele is described as a nofotane in her status, who works the majority of the time at her family’s distribution company in Apia. This indicates the vast economic differences between participants in this study. It also gives contrasting lenses of differences regarding economic opportunities prior to them working together in the arts centre. As the Human Rights report suggests, the vā between rural and urban, is further widening. With limited resources, in terms of economic stability in the rural areas, access to education and training, further widens the gap of those who have access and those who don’t. In this study, only two of the participants own a car, however, only Sele drives; Moana’s family car is driven by her husband. Therefore, this finding suggests challenges in acquiring resources and access to the main urban areas for at least two of these participants.

The data suggests different types of interactions present examples in this study. I examine various points, communicated by Niva and Moana in their day-to-day discussions, for example data from their participatory note:

Niva: ... Po’o ua fea ai le mea  
Trans: Guess you or I must be hungry...(refers to the self)  
Moana: Se’e uma ta feau le... la tu lou amata ia le tatau lunch.  
Trans: Let us finish this job first...and I’ll go and prepare and start our lunch.  
Moana: Pule ia oe...  
Trans: Up to you

The first set of questions not only aimed to establish the positioning and self-view of each participant but also sought to establish how they understood the concept vā in relation to their own positioning.

From the interviews, Sele states that Moana, who lives in the neighbouring village of Vaovai is married to a non-titled man from Poutasi, is disadvantaged by her status as a nofotane. However, as mentioned previously, her skills and the entrepreneurialism she developed in her previous craft store position her well as a leader in the arts centre. Being ‘disadvantaged’ does not necessarily have to have a negative impact; Scale and Goffer state “entrepreneurs may be more likely to emerge from those groups in society which are
discriminated against, persecuted, looked down up or exceptionally exploited” (cited in Solomoa 2013, p. 10).

Niva was born in Poutasi and, untypically, a *tausi*, that is, the wife of a *tulafale* (orator chief) from Poutasi. She was originally meant to help with the maintenance of the gardens since her own garden has for long been admired by everyone in the village. Niva says, “[...]...leai o a‘u o le tausi. Tausi e ave I to‘alua o matai tulafale...” <translation>, placing her higher in status than Moana.

However, between the three women at the arts centre and amongst the other women in the ECE centre, Sele’s often referred to as a faletua. This was an interesting observation that correlates with the data collated through the participatory observations. However, Sele explicitly comments on how this is an honorary term only (I discuss this later on this chapter). Sele states: “so that’s how I ended up in Poutasi even though [my partner] and I aren’t married [...]...they still see me as the faletua. So there is a lot of respect there [...]” (interview with Sele, 2016).

It has a bearing on the relationships between the women, and also with the aualuma women of the nu’u. It seems from the responses in the interviews that the situation prompts them to attend to nurturing the relationships more constantly and more carefully than might otherwise by the case.

“[...] Niva is the matai, she’s the leader I’m the support person, Niva is the matai. However, I was chosen to work at the arts centre because of my skills, I still have to respect Niva’s position and what I was tasked to do [...]”

(Interview with Moana, 2016)

This highlights a key ‘negotiated space’ that the women nurture in their social context of their arts centre but also their public spaces. 2 between the two sites; arts centre and the nu’u.
Niva describes an aspect of her fa’asinomaga as “o au ole tausi”, “I am the wife of a titled man”, which positions her over the other women involved in the centre. However, in my observations, the two Samoan-born women practise and nurture this va fealoalofani daily towards Sele, who is not yet a faletua or tausi, however she has been given an honorary fa’aloalo (respect) by both Moana and Niva. This is an interesting aspect of the way in which this group of women ‘negotiate’ and nurture aspects of their beings. Through respect and reciprocity, which I argue is the key to the success of their mafutaga (associated group) and how they operate within the fa’amatai context.

During some participatory observations conducted at the Catholic church on a Sunday morning, Niva (tausi) seems much more secure in her positioning than the other two participants. The observations highlighted the difference of appearance and spatial orientation of each participant across two different spaces. For instance, Niva is located at the front pew of the church, whereas the other two were always situated somewhere at the back. Then in comparison, Niva is situated largely in the back of the arts centre or in the garden, whereas the other two are predominately in the front of the arts centre spaces.

Figure 9 Poutasi Catholic Church Mother’s Day Service, 2016. Photograph: A. Fulufaga
The church orientation firmly replicates the Samoan hierarchical structure, (see image above). By this I mean, the leaders of the congregation preside at the front in full public view and those who do not fit into the higher status locate themselves at the back – usually children and young men and unmarried women. Whereas the arts centre enterprise dictates the orientation of an arts centre and therefore is oriented towards an alternative fa’amatai system, where elements are selected and negotiated by the women.

What is evident and should not be misguided in the interpretation of this image is the seating of men on one side and the women on the other side. The reason for this is simple. The men of the congregation had facilitated the service and were also singing in the choir on this particular day. The arts centre space is created to ‘nurture’ an intermingling of western spaces and therefore is situated somewhere between ‘fa’asinoomaga’ and ‘socio-spatial identity’. This highlights a complex series of issues and therefore protocols. These complex socio-spatial organisations are interwoven with pre-ordained concepts that aim to teu le va fealoalofani (nurture friendships). This would demonstrate in practice Wendt’s (1996) argument that relational vā is changeable depending on the context – see his description of vā (p. 6). I will discuss more about those negotiations below (in section 4.5.1, p.120).

Moana, as a nofotane, acts on her positioning by ‘consulting’ and negotiating the vā fealoaloai (respectful space) – which is the practise of nurturing the va through fa’aaloalo (respect) given to those older and therefore deemed more wiser. Sele comments on this action “[…] what I find is that […] the women … well especially Moana, because she’s married into the village, she will consult with me, on certain things, because in the village there’s certain rules in the village that … women from Poutasi … who are matali’s can get away with and she’s married into it …” (Interview transcript, Sele, 2016).

None of these responses were entirely unexpected, however, they raised questions for me around the growing imbalance of layering of roles that nofotane such as Moana currently live in – with the added layers of responsibility and function within the arts centre, on what is clearly the disadvantaged. Or have these women developed a supportive network based on va fealoaloai (shared space) and fa’aaloalo (respect) that transcends and enables skilled nofotane like Moana to operate? These are questions cannot be answered in this study, but further research could provide a knowledge base that could help develop specific strategies for women in rural environments in Samoa.
In this context ‘spaces’ refer to ‘physical’ and the ‘unseen’ social spaces. Social spaces are traditionally part of a village centre or a malae – in this village, the centralisation of new buildings closer to the Main Coastal Road. Findings suggest that negotiated spaces are dependent on the neighbouring physical spaces of this ‘shifted’ village centre. The layout of the nu’u, and therefore the positioning of the arts centre, places this between a stream and a not-so-well-travelled area. However, the new ‘promised’ driveway suggests that traffic will flow easily. However, the notion of physical ‘boundaries’ emerged as a difficult space. As all of the participants identified as belonging to the Catholic church (9), this then makes it difficult for the women to act on ‘disturbances’ around the parameters of their arts centre.

Participants’ responses differed according to their birthplace, cultural context, marriage or relational vā – clearly articulating birthplace as significant together with marriage as a key indicator of va faasinomaga. Each participant follows different hierarchical structures and it became apparent how diasporic ideas of fa’asinomaga are different according to these participants.

4.3. VĀ FEALOALOAI : VS PHYSICAL SOCIAL SPACE

The second set of (indicative) questions was aimed at investigating the arts centre as a new ‘social space’ for women (see questions below). Since the erosion of a village centre indicated by Hennings (2017) study, I explore how this arts centre has potential to be a new ‘social space’ and a place of making for women. Therefore, I am interested in how these participants occupy a central role in defining new spaces for women in a newly layed out village. These questions hope to examine new challenges within these social spaces in the and what possible futures may have arisen due to the ‘shifts’ of layout in the nu’u. In this sequence, I examine themes that emerge as points of interest from the data.

Context of the arts centre as a social space

Can you please explain how you came to work at the arts centre?
Do you have a particular role in the development of the arts centre? If so, can you explain what you do for the arts centre?
What skills do you bring to the arts centre and how do you share these.
Can you please explain your understanding of the vision for this arts centre?
What are the challenges of managing/producing/making the arts centre in a village?
Do many women visit the arts centre?
What do you think are the benefits of having an arts centre in the nu’u? Especially on this side of the Island.

Pre-arts centre what were some other forms of making/sustaining measina o Samoa in this village, for women? And what were the main purposes of those groups?
How accessible has the arts centre been for tagata ole nu’u to participate in?
How do you manage the fa’amatai systems and politics with the arts centre?
How often do you have tagata ese (people from outside the nu’u) visit and stay with you? And if not, why not?
If so, how are they initiated or inducted into the village?
Have you ever visited an arts centre prior to working in this one? If so, please explain.
What are your hopes and aspirations for the nu’u of Poutasi?
In terms of spaces within the village, who are your regular visitors to the centre?
If carving of va’a/ornamental carving were to happen here at the centre, where would the men work?
(Indicative questions only)

In the interviews, the women gave accounts of their understanding of social structures in these two environments. Based on my participatory observation of these two environments, I will now analyse the historical movements of ‘traditional spaces’ for women and identify the new spaces of collective making in comparison to the new arts centre.

One of the early patterns emerging from the data is the adaptability of the women’s function and operation as a collective within the nu’u. By this, I mean the varied ways in which communal spaces have been adapted and adopted in this study.

Sele’s comments on the challenges of running an arts centre in the village are relevant in this context. She notes a lack of engagement from the women in the nu’u. Sele states “[…] the women in the village aren’t as proactive as they should be within the arts centre, […] if we could get them […] children as well as anyone else, it’s a space where everyone can come, and participate in whatever they want to do. For some reason, they think it’s all [the local matai’s] […] there’s no barrier there, no one’s ever said that and they’ve always been
encouraged to come and participate but there’s this ‘them’ and ‘us’ thing. So that’s a big thing.”

In informal talanoa situations, independently of each other, the women also discussed probable reasons for the lack of engagement from the Komiti Tina Poutasi. The PDT, in its infancy stage, employed a palagi volunteer from New Zealand, who according to the participants (inadvertently) offended the faletua o sa’o (highest ranking women), which caused ‘tension’ from day one for the arts centre. This ‘tension’ has unfortunately impacted on the progress of the arts centre and the inclusion of the other women into the operations and therefore association with the arts centre.

Both Moana and Niva are actively part of the Komiti Tina Poutasi. Because Sele is not officially married to her partner, she chooses not to take part in this komiti. This starts to identify an emerging theme of ‘navigating’ wider social spaces that are bound by protocols and systems amongst the participants.

An interesting aspect emerging from Sele’s interview concerned fa’amatai systems. Hudson and Mila-Schaaf describe the negotiated space as “... an interface between different worldviews and knowledge systems” (2009, p. 116). Sele states by implying there is a matter of choice for the women, “not much of that in the arts centre, it’s a pretty free space where, I’ve given the girls free rein to run it as their own ....” Whereas when observing the other two participants, each had a firm place and understanding of where they were ‘positioned’ in terms of rank and how they would negotiate this. For instance, during one of my participatory observations, during a lunch break, Moana hurriedly finished her morning duties, to go and heat the lunch and serve Niva – who is of a higher ranking in terms of fa’amatai, and who is also older. In this way, she acknowledged and practised tautua (service), which in Samoan customs is highly acknowledged as an esteemed practice of honouring your elders.

Here, a Samoan saying, “ole auala le pule, ole tautua”, meaning “the road to leadership is through service” is important. The operations of teu le vā and fa’aaloalo suggest that regardless of newly-introduced modes of management like that used in the arts centre, fa’amatai systems within the associated notion of vā fealoaloai prevail and remain the founding principles of village structure and overall general life.
An informal talanoa with the faletua Mataumanu identifies pre-existing designated spaces for women in the village. She mentions, “Poutasi has a fale komiti (points to the direction of the fale), now that is being used as a residence for the Hospital.” She claims,

“[...] o aso nei, e matou masani ona potopoto lalo o pulou o le hall memorial...”  
(Translated) “[...] these days we would meet casually under the eves of memorial hall or in the hall of our church....”  
(Talanoa with Mataumanu, 2015)

Their organisation and mode of operation is not necessarily defined by a physical structure or its place, but defined by the purpose of the meeting or the gathering. This suggests that modes of operation of the Poutasi Women’s Komiti adapt and are able to ‘float’ between spaces, depending on the context.

This becomes an interesting sequence, and possible in this analysis, around the concept of ‘women’s spaces’ or Samoan spaces designated for women. The only term I could find in relation to the notion of ‘female designated spaces’ is identified in literature, as the ‘notion’ of a ‘fale lalaga’ (house of weaving). What we have discovered is that ‘house of weaving in the nu’u, is currently utilised as a dormitory. However, discovered late in the writing of this thesis, it was not included in the analysis or as a secondary question. However, further analysis and studies on the existence of fale lalaga as a physical space are recommended.

However, what is unique about this arts centre and possibly paramount to the idea of ‘social spaces’ in this particular arts centre is the influence and support of visitors and art practitioners from New Zealand. Niva mentions:

“[...] Fatu i l le fale lea fa’asino le faiga o elei na sau ma aumai ana patterns ma laupapa, o ia na fa’asino mai le faiga o na mea uma. Fa’asino mai le mixing o vali. Na vali lava ie a le tagata ia ma ave l le fale. Na fai foi su’isu’iga ae oute lē fiafia l le la’au uila,( electrical sewing machines) ona o le uila. (Because of the power). Fa’ato’a ‘ou tago nei lava fa’aaoga la’au uila ona ua fa’asino mai e Loreta, ma Salona[...].”

Fatu helps us here, on how to use the patterns and woodblocks, then he shows us how to use them. He shows us how to mix the inks. Visitors can also come and
then paint their own and take them home. We’ve also learnt how to sew which I enjoy [...]”

(Excerpts from Talanoa with Niva, 2016)

Which leads to one of the themes that emerge from this study as a key influence of New Zealand expatriates and artists, and starts to address my key question “How does a group of Samoan women leading an arts centre (enterprise) negotiate new spaces of practise in rural indigenous Samoa. In this arts centre, a transnational New Zealand Pacific arts community is clearly an influential force, however, what happens once expatriates leave? I attempt to evidence this in my next chapters.

4.3.1. **Va o Tamaitai ma le Arts Centre**

One of the promising features of the arts centre location is the adjoining buildings. I have illustrated this in Figure 7, which shows the layout of the arts centre in relation to the early childhood centre and the surroundings spaces (Figure 10). All of these buildings are operated by women; the two centres operate independently but also work well together. Wherever possible, I would try to collect data at the arts centre (independent), and avoid any disturbances. However, when the school bell rang, the teachers would walk over and support the arts centre women during their busy periods. The teachers would help Moana and Niva with the ironing and the cleaning of the ‘shared’ facilities and vice versa. In 2
This suggests that the indigenous arts centre is already working as a new social space for women in the nu’u. However, only a small number of women from the village are involved, which presents a challenge for engaging more participation. The establishment and the current interactions between the women of the arts centre and the ECE support suggest a
move towards ‘indigenous’ cultural spaces. Meleisea suggests “[…] our cultural centres and museums will have to draw together the social, economic, technological, political, historical and environmental aspects of our cultures and see them as interwoven, like the strands of a mat, to make a whole thing”(1999, p. 123). Could this suggest that as micro-enterprises become more entrenched in fa’asamoa, that these ‘new spaces’ are able to more culturally sustainable?

As mentioned in the introduction, following the 2009 tsunami, family houses were often rebuilt further tai (inland) according to Solomona (2013, p. 10). On the map (Figure 7) a handful of family houses are shown which remain close along the water’s edge. Prior to the tsunami, several families’ homes were located closer to the centre, between the EFKS church and the Catholic church. However, Sele says, “[…]we are right on the water. It used to be the central part of the village, but it’s not anymore … after the tsunami, everyone’s moved inland …”. So displacement and an irregular circular village currently exists and is evident in the illustration of the ‘new’ village centre in Figure 7.

In my talanoa with foletua Mataumanu, we discussed her thoughts on collaborating with the arts centre by teaching the other women how to weave tapito. She was careful in her response, replying that, while she would like to, some of the ‘politics’ involved in working with the arts centre prohibited her from doing so. She did not go into detail about it, which suggests to me that there could be ‘other’ underlying issues. She continued to mention that she also felt that the only way she would be able to pass on the practice of weaving tapito (small decorative woven mat) would be through her own daughters. Her entire family were now overseas in Australia and New Zealand. This raises the question of maintenance and sustainability of customary arts in a depopulating region.

Because the Trust and therefore arts centre sit outside the ‘traditional’ model of the village of a village structure, the inclusion of women’s traditional weaving practices has been difficult for a number of reasons, but largely to do with the impact of cyclones and therefore lack of resources for weaving. The arts centre is identified as a micro-enterprise and therefore is facilitated by the Poutasi Development Trust, which also sits outside the norms of the village law. Although this was not fully interrogated in this research, it was evident, based on the discussions with participants, that production in the arts centre has currently more sustainable practices. Given the effects of climate change on the availability of the lau
fala (pandanus). At the risk of advocating printed fabric (possibly imported from Asia) over customary weaving practise – this is a real concern.

As a developing village looking at sustainable economic growth (Russell, 2014). It suggests that there is real need for alternative methods of craft making for these women in the current post-modern global world, and to look at other ways of promoting women’s craft and weaving practices. For example, the lengthy processes taken to weave as opposed to printing (the core practice of craft in the centre) suggests faster production and is possibly more sustainable for families. All key participants indicated they wanted to learn tapito weaving, however found this problematic. So therefore, a double-edged problem arises.

Another emerging theme that impacts on the daily business, and therefore impacts on the sustainability of the arts centre, is captured in this interview with Sele, who raises her concerns for the arts centre, “[...] Niva definitely helps, however she can be very upfront about things, which can be intimidating … for some of the villagers, so … I guess sometimes we need to remind them that we need to encourage our people to come in here, not yell at them so they don’t come back […].” This suggests that resourcing for training and therefore education from NGO organisations to help women in the village develop in regards to facilitating micro-enterprises would be a start to supporting this group of women. In light of this this study, several challenges have emerged. I draw these together in the final chapter.

4.4. **Spatial Awareness and Proximity**

This third set of questions explored the physical positioning of the women, in both the physical location of the arts centre and the positioning of the self in the church environment. Going back to Aiono’s definition of knowing where one sits. My intention was to find out the current patterns and why they would position themselves in the places they would operate in. The other emerging theme in the data was reflecting on the position of the physical building that the arts centre operates in (see Figure 10).

The introduction of a new space, largely operated by different women of lower status in the village was initially contentious. In the early scoping, it was made clear that politics were a large part of this, but also the position of women and the notion of an arts centre are foreign to the context of a nu’u. Also, women or men who are married into the nu’u have no claim over key spaces or physical buildings within a traditional village setting. So I sought to
understand, what are some terms that we could identify to establish the importance of women’s making spaces?

Massey (1994) points out “the most evident aspects of this joint control of spatiality and identity has been in the West related to the culturally specific distinction between public and private” (p. 179), whereby in Samoa, Refiti indicates that “[...] the village malae is the centre of fanua (whenua in Māori), [...] and to which personal identity is connected, as the family land where one was born the place where, in most cases, one’s ancestors are buried. Identity is fa’asniomaga, literally, one’s ‘appointed place of being’, which is always determined by tofi – the roles and functions bestowed by one’s family and village” (2015, p. 64). Because this village contains both western-style houses and Samoan fales, I adapted my blended approach of suifefiloi by attempting to interpret whether the arts centre was considered a public or private space.

In our informal conversations, Tuatagaloa (personal communications) described the arts centre’s infant stages met with some reluctance from the village’ at first, based on a number of factors around the central positioning of the buildings in the centre of the village, and the prospect of having a foreign concept of such as an art centre at the heart of the nu’u. However, with small progress for those few women who are actively involved, has indicated that this potentially could be a thriving centre. According to Sele, “[...] it’s a space where everyone can come, and participate in whatever they wanna do. For some reason they think it’s all Tuatagaloa Joe Annandale’s [...] theres no barrier [...] no one’s ever said that and they’ve always been encouraged to come and participate but there’s this ‘them’ and ‘us’ thing. So that’s a big thing [...]” So then what I find interesting is how does PDT’s NGO protect these women?

Working with histories and cultural connection of this site, I queried in interviews, what existing ‘parameter’s or challenges were inherited as part of this site and establishment of the art centre? What emerged from an interview, was Moana’s account of her ‘adopting’ of the ‘art centre’ as a place of opportunity and a place to work, was identified by the women, working in conjunction with PDT. “[...] E iai le aso na ou, alu ai I Apia faimai la’u fanau na alu atu le taavale a le palagi o Sharon (PDT volunteer), ia toe o’o I le isi aso toe alu atu foi le taavale a lea fai le faatau I la’u small maketi ia talanoa atu ai loa Sharon e uiga I mea taulima. O’u toe alu foi lea I Apia ae toe alu atu le taavale samasama a’o le taavale lena a Sele, fai mai
Where she notes that several visits from Sharon (PDT volunteer), Sele on another occasion, and then Marion PhD student visiting Poutasi, to persuade her to come and work at the centre. This was supported by the Matai of PDT therefore, adoption of new spaces are associated with ‘negotiated’ spaces by those with authority in this study.

The issues of Moana being of lower ranking, in the centre’s formative years, was mentioned by several participant’s interviews. This was stated by all participants in their individual interviews. Several participants state, because of Moana’s status ‘nofotane’ (especially not being born on the fanua) the engagement of other woman in the village is a challenge. Sele notes, “...I know that Moana umm had challenges before Niva was there, because Loleka is married into our village Poutasi, she use to have other people come in and sort of boss her around...and they, well not boss her around, they’d come in and...they’d just walk around the arts centre and do this and that...that she had no say to that...to ask them to leave or to ask them to respect her space, which is very hard for her [...].” This gives an example of one of the challenges of lower ranking women having pivotal roles in micro-enterprises. Which raises the question, how can these issues be avoided in the development of these centres in the future?

One of the key differences in approach to the practise of fa’amatai/identity, was Sele’s ability to operate and select across two worlds, something commonly understood as a diasporic positioning (Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009), first that of a tamaitai ole nu’u, secondly as someone of New Zealand Samoan identity. I spent a considerable amount of time with Sele in the mornings, when we discussed plans and possible areas I could help the participants Niva and Moana in throughout the day. So it was easier to collate more observations on a daily basis. Sele divided her days based on her family-owned business in Apia and that of the nu’u where she spent the best part of a day – dedicated to meetings, administrative duties and tending to the arts centre management. One of the most visual notes made was her choice of clothing – on days when in town, cotton knee-high shorts and when in the nu’u – long skirts or ie’ lava lava and a long shirt. Out of respect for her soon-to-be-husband and the nu’u, she explicitly notes this as a sign of respect – she was observed to actively engage with what she was wearing if she were visiting people in the nu’u and going to church.
Furthermore, I’d asked Sele one morning before church, where her jewellery was, she mentioned that as a sign of respect, she chose to wear plain clothes, which she noted was something she had to be aware of while living in the village, as some villages can be quite strict with what you should wear. Whereby Moana, who is also a nofotane, felt differently, “[…] A’o a’u a ia, e pule a a’u ia a ta teuga ma ata tautaliga e fai aua o la ta te alu i le lotu …” Translated, “[...] in my opinion, however, for me I think it’s up to me to choose what I want to wear to church.” This clearly pinpoints the different views on dress codes or approaches by these two participants, which doesn’t necessarily point to any conclusion for the collective ideals for nofotane. However, this raised the question for me on how different the perspectives were between a native Samoan women and a diasporic Samoan perspective. Which I think highlights the importance of not necessarily understanding, but what probable further studies can be made to understand the diverse associations of this term nofotane, and how diasporic Samoans also associate with these terms.

The new spaces in this context refer largely to the arts centre and surrounding buildings; in this section I look at the spatial layout of the arts centre in comparison to the surroundings buildings. The 2009 tsunami was a catalyst for these changes, which dramatically changed the layout of Poutasi amongst a list of things, but also the tsunami aid relief that poured into this country and village.

Sele describes the position of her fale in contrast to the effects of the tsunami, “… We are right on the water. It used to be the central part of the village, but it’s not anymore … after the tsunami, everyone’s moved inland.” Several centre participants, also suggest that the centre of nu’u was located along the coastline (see map), however these days, it is now located up in the Main Coast Road. Which poses several problems, especially socially or but also holistically as a functioning village. Having fewer people in your immediate village surroundings impacts on your ability to connect, to see therefore a reduced connectivity, based on the new developed fales, in the distance (see aerial map, Figure 8).

This has impacted also on the access to the closest central spaces, church and hospital. Niva was appointed largely due to her position, but also as a gardener to help maintain the area of the arts centre, and as part of the aualuma, who could protect and support Moana in her work. She also extends this to the actual day-to-day work. She describes this in her articulation of the positioning of the art centre:
Collective rights of women were prioritised and acknowledged when it comes to working within the nu’u. Several statements of the participants aligned with collective making or making as ‘groups’ of women as opposed to the individual entrepreneur. And could be problematic in the art centre model. In this transcription, there are specific rights of women, as indicated earlier in the thesis 2.3.2. In the data collated of images and interviews, what was interesting when analysing the images, was that the majority of ‘work’ was conducted in ‘internal’ walled spaces for the women, suggesting traditional values of work is still very much part of the spatial and operation of this centre. With the exception of gardening or cleaning, usually conducted by unmarried women and women no longer at school, aged between 15 and 19).

For example, one afternoon when I was to help make and gather materials for a wild bamboo shelf to help build a display cabinet for the art centre ie lavalava, what emerged were some interesting viewpoints on the understanding of ‘spatial’ boundaries and ideals that operate in this centre. In particular, the participant Niva, who was resistant to the notion of making the furniture and felt that a store bought piece would suit the arts centre, but more so that she felt that it was not the place of women to be handling tools and working in roles that men are tasked with. Unsurprisingly, Moana was intrigued that I knew how to use the tools and that we had the resources in the bush on the slope located behind us available.

An interesting observation across all the participants, was a comparison between positioning of the women during community gatherings and those within the art centre fono (meetings). Sele made a conscious effort to quietly sit at the back of the church during Mother’s Day, which is an important day for mothers, as she is not a mother. The deacon – catechist at the Catholic church – motioned her to sit at the front. She politely acknowledged this honour, but declined it and sat at the back of the church. This is also noted as fa’aloalo.

Although a western idea of an arts centre in operation was evident, this centre was most definitely grounded in fa’asamoa. Daily acts of fa’aloalo were observed across all women.
involved and the nurturing of customary hierarchies is still applied within the daily operation. For example, the nofonotane Moana serves lunch to Niva as a sign of fa’aaloalo, while Moana freely affirms her voice and decisions as the arts manager – not entirely surprising. However, the interesting findings in this sequence suggest that this is unique to women in this rural context.

During my presentation to the Pacific Postgraduate Talanoa Series, a response was fed back to the forum by Reverend Apelu Tielu, who mentioned, that he was surprised yet pleased to hear of the aptitude and ability of the women to adapt these systems. Consequently, my thoughts are that ‘balancing fa’amatai systems in the workplace’, is a unique feature to this type of ‘negotiated space’. However, in indigenous micro-enterprises Cahn (2008) argues that this is the formation of a sustainable micro-enterprise, as discussed earlier in this study.

When it was business, protocols and roles would be re-arranged, evidencing that in this centre women were able to adapt fa’amatai systems through fa’aaloalo but more importantly practising the vā fealoaloai. Sele operates as a business manager, however she shows fa’aaloalo to Niva and Moana, when she as a leader can, but is also well versed in running a successful business in Apia herself; she is aware of the difficulties of the financial burdens these women have and stresses to them the importance of business thinking when it comes to operating their arts centre.

4.5. FOURTH SET OF QUESTIONS – FALE TUSIATA

The fourth and final set of questions look at how these women have come to claim a spaces in the centre of the nu’u. It also looks at how each participant first came into contact with the arts centre. Each participant also contributed their interpretation of what an arts centre is, and how they contributed to the arts centre. Each participant had varying answers ranging from the specific needs of engagement of skill level, to what they envisioned as an ‘art centre’.

In this extract below, I ask Niva to explain how or why she came to work here at the arts centre. She responds here:

“[…] ona la alu atu le toeaina ia te a’u pe mafai uma lea fai mai oute alu e fesoasoani ia ona ou sau e fesoasoani I le gaulega […] Na Moana, le ala lena o le ma galulue fa’atasi ma
Niva primarily indicates in this extract that she was asked by the matai of PDT to work at the arts centre. This also correlates with the other participants’ responses. She also commented in an informal talanoa, the reason she was working was because her son was no longer studying or working, so she needed to contribute financially and help her family. She goes further to explain:

“Le maua lava se galuega, ae oute taumafai lava ia maua le seleni e tausī ai le aiga e toto gi ae(wages) e fiafia lava le matou aiga e nofo ia ile fale ae ou sau oute faigaluega, e tu’u lava falelalaga ae ou sau ia maua lava se tupe auā le cash power ma mea fa’a-le-lotu ....”

(Translated) I appreciate this work and I try really hard to work for cash in order to look after family. My family (or husband) like to stay home while I work. I don’t go to fale lalaga (women’s weaving groups) because I pay the cash power and things that I need to contribute to church. (Interview with Niva, 2016)

In summary for this participant, Niva states that this type of work is ideal because of regular bills like cash power (pre-paid electricity). She makes a reference to the preference of arts centre work over the fale lalaga, based on the regularity of the wages as opposed to the one lump payment of a fale lalaga. Does this suggest that an arts centre model is ideal over a fale lalaga one, based on its wages? This is hard to quantify in this study, because this research was not set up to look at the sustainability of the arts centre, nor did it look at the financial sustainability of the micro-enterprise, let alone the comparisons. However, this could be an interesting research question post this study.

In Moana’s interview:

ARF Pe na fa’apeafea ona e iloa ma maua le arts centre?
Moana Fa’aafeta mo le fesili. O lo’u faigaluega ai i le arts centre, Ua ou lagona lava le fiafia. E tele galuega na ou i ai, Mumua, ai ua ou filifia lava iinei ona o lelei, e o’o i volunteers. O le fiafia ia pe ō mai, e o’ofoi le o loo fa’aualulu ia ai e fesosoani malosi mai, e leai se mea e tutaia ai le faiga o galuega, ma e lelei lava le feso’otaiga o mataou ma e o lo’o taitai galuega. Ma o le galuega lenei ua lima taumatau ai a’u mo le tausīa o le
fanau, ma le aiga, le nu’u fa’apea le lotu. Ua telē lava le aoga o le galuega ia te a’u.

Translation
ARF How did you come to know the arts centre?

Moana Thank you for the question. My role here at the arts centre, I am very happy. I have had lots of roles prior to coming to the arts centre, but I chose this one because the volunteers were so good to me. I really enjoy it when the volunteers come, I enjoy helping people and with the support of others, there is nothing we can’t achieve, I was approached by some good leaders here at PDT. Also, the work has become my right hand in helping support our children and family, also my village contributions and church obligations.

There is plenty of good reasons to work for the arts centre.

A slight anomaly appeared in this participant’s response, which was not a clear understanding and interpretation of the interview. However, it is important to note, that this participant’s mother had passed on the day I arrived for my data collection (7 weeks). A possible explanation for the unclear response of this participant’s ‘interview’ in this extract, can be attributed to this stressful time. In this interview, our time was cut short at this first attempt to interview this participant and I agreed to complete the interview at a later date. However, I move on to Sele’s interview and discuss how she became involved in the arts centre.

In Sele’s interview, I interpret two of her questions below:

So can you tell me a little bit about your involvement with the arts centre?

Sele When Bruce Russell left the PDT (back home – New Zealand) ... he was the general manager of PDT, so it was when he left they were looking for someone and they asked me, but I did say to them I could only do it for 1x day a week ... but I found myself gravitating to the arts centre, because I actually enjoy the arts. I use to do that at school and I understand it. I also travelled lots (in Europe)...went to galleries and I enjoyed going to shows, so it was easy for me to gravitate to that, I’m a bit of a dodder uhh doer, yeah ... so it was easy ... it was an easy transition and that’s how I ended up there, looking after PDT and the arts centre falls under that.

ARF: Do you have a particular role in the development of the arts centre? And if so, can you please explain this involvement?

Sele: 5: 22 Okay ... my role in the arts centre is to advise, facilitate ... ahh help the girls ... look at the business side of the arts centre, I mean they are doers, they’re really great with their hands, but they’re not too ... well they don’t understand the
business side, so they are slowly learning that ... umm I honestly wish I had more time, so I can put more into it.

Umm so that is my role, to advise and guide the girls ... cos our people tend to ... they finally ... get things and what they enjoy to do, but they always revert back to it. So you try and open their eyes to different things, but you’ll find they’ll revert back. So it’s just pushing those boundaries with them, and giving them those ‘gentle’ reminders be there for them, for that support. Sometimes not so gentle, but just being there for them and for that support.

Again, these responses were a little different in approach. Moana’s and Niva’s responses were largely in Samoan, and responded back in a very formal manner. For example “fa’afetai lava mo le fesili” at the beginning of the interview response, notifies a sense of formality and collective response. For the next interview, Sele’s questions and answers were conducted in English. The interviews with the other two participants were conducted in Samoan with English translations. This stage emphasises the competing paradigms in which this study is situated, the constructivist approach as suggested in Grant and Gidding (2002) is analysed as being constructed narratives to be competing across two paradigms. However, Kögler argues that the interpretation of the data is interpreted through cultural lenses of a required empathy.

In this next threading of narrative, Sele indicates in the discussion the benefits of the arts centre location in proximity to township and rural space.

ARF   What are the benefits of having an arts centre on this side of the village (pointed to map), especially on that side of the island?

Sele   11:50 I think it’s really important for our people to have another space, where they can make money, or possibly to be able to make money through their arts and crafts. We’re not all gifted with smarts of numbers or being able to read or go to school, but we’re good with our hands, and we’ve got that space, so we can, well we can showcase it and make something of it ... that’s the big benefit.

We also live on the other side of Upolu, it’s a $6 Tala bus ride (one way) ... so if we can make our crafts here ...

This clearly situates a purposeful argument for the need of alternative income opportunities for this group of women and those in the village. In this next section, I summarise the main points
4.5.1. **TEU AS A NEGOTIATED FOUNDATION**

The notion of ‘teu in the context of this project emerges as a place of ‘negotiation’. Given the evidence stated in the ‘limitations’ of negotiation within a fa’amatai system for nofotane, Samoan women have traditionally sought alternative modes of operation within the nu’u, and therefore asserted their designated rights. But some of the data points to the notion of ‘teu’, that Refiti expands on in the notion of teuga (2015). Here I examine how women, dominate in this area of ‘teu’, to teu teu fale (domestic chores), to teu teu le fale så (adorning church spaces): to teu teu is to adorn. Refiti, examines and applies these architectural and spatial expositions, here I’m applying the notion of adornment as a key role, in negotiated spaces of vā. To teu to literally nurture the spaces. This can also be read as ‘adorning spaces’ clearly the women in this study and village have pivotal roles in.

And in external spaces, participants Moana and Niva were often observed ‘directing’ unmarried men or taulealea, how to do things. This differs to the previous example above around ‘authority’ and external spaces. But, what this does emphasises, is that Samoan women, especially Niva in this case, present a higher authority than the ‘unmarried’ men in these observations. However, it is the role of men, to operate and who are designated roles for ‘outdoor’, however, clearly in these observations, the woman were able to affirm their authority and status. This example illustrates the notion of ‘teu’. This is term that Refiti defines as a way of ‘adorning spaces’. Therefore, this analysis suggests that the women participants in these spaces were the drivers in ‘teu’; men were the labourers, during physically laborious roles around the centre.

A Pacific scholar once said to me, that there is no Samoan word for the term ‘art’, there is only the definition of specific making or production of tasks that are part of the person’s fa’asinomaga (centre) therefore vice versa with identity and vā fa’asinomaga. These are only the closest relative words. These slight inconsistencies could be deemed problematic in this research, but on review – I think this is where each theme impacts on the coding and therefore analysis has not only been thematically. So you will note, under the thematic code – each response has been correlated in comparison with each other. Therefore, concepts like ‘teu’ and ‘negotiated spaces help adorn and nurture current ‘new’ spaces that are located in this village centre.

Fa’aloalo (respect) is a strong Samoan value system, which grounds the centre for all the participants in this research. Tupua (2007) explains this as the fundamental of Samoan indigenous religious
belief. Throughout the interactions, this guides comments within 1:1 interviews. This fa’aloalo is extended to honorifics and addressing in public spaces.

4.6. ASPIRATIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL VS COLLECTIVE THROUGH THEIR MAKING

In communities that value the collective over the pursuits of the individual, as Wendt suggests (1996) such as a Samoan rural village like Poutasi, it was evident that the pursuits of a ‘individual’ led business within the art centre was difficult. In this section I highlight individual aspirations each of these participants contributed during the interviews and the talanoa. As discussed throughout this chapter, each participant’s responses depended on the method used to collate some of the analysis, which I have discussed in my research design.

Firstly, it is necessary to include the first women who agreed to meet me in Poutasi, prior to the large data collection. I visited with Mataumanu Meleisea at her home with gifts I had brought from New Zealand (enough for a cuppa tea and biscuits). She was head of the Komiti Tina Poutasi at the time of my visit was the highest ranking women in the nu’u. She is well versed in English as a second language and was able to converse freely – without mincing words. As a daughter of one of the highest chiefly titles, she explained in our talanoa exchange, that she wished the arts centre well as a thriving community for the women involved. Mataumanu had also mentioned that in her pursuit (referring to her influence over the wider network of women in the nu’u and komiti o Tina) that she was also wanting to keep matters of exchange between the women of the nu’u and the art centre very traditional in the context of exchange. By traditional I refer to the matuau’u model of accessing knowledge and the passing on of the knowledge.

4.7. SUMMARY | EXPOSITION OF AN ‘ULA SU’I

The analysis is a threaded approach of sequences that emerge from the key questions explored in this research. Within these key questions, several of the secondary questions were identified in interviews, talanoa or participatory observation, exposing findings that are intended to examine possible contrasting views and themes that emerged through the data.

However, raw data was analysed using a thematic analysis into themes that were sometimes open ended. So displacement and an irregular circular village currently exists, therefore new spaces are formed, new connectivities and openings are formed. Which raises questions and insights about current ‘negotiations’ at hand for a new phase of ‘social enterprise’ in the rural village led by
disadvantaged women, in this nu’u, only to raise further enquiries, like Do these current models of the arts centre assume more layers of responsibility and function on what is clearly the disadvantaged group or individual? Or have these women developed a supportive network based on vā fealoalofani (shared space) and fa’aloalo (respect) that transcends and enables skilled nofotane like Moana to operate? Questions arise around the equity of layering and responsibilities, especially for nofotane, or is this as literature suggests part of the resilience within these women often in disadvantaged positions or lower status, is there room for ‘blended’ spaces and ‘blended approaches?’

In this data analysis, I also analysed and presented interesting points along the way and interpret the findings, based on interviews and observations.

_Va fealoaloai_ and spatial awareness are intertwined notions – all part of _teu_, to nurture (Wendt, 1996). Vā has many associated terms and in this data analysis, I only explore a few of these. I think, with a longer time of collating data and a longer time with participants, I would like to be fully immersed in the _aganu’u_ (cultural aspects of fa’asamoa) to ‘unpack’ the varied ways of how this term, that defines so much, is utilised. In several of all my observations and data collection, the term and use of the word vā was never spoken of between any of the participants. (Never casually, only if I had probed them in talanoa or in interviews.) The term itself was almost reacted to as ‘taboo’ or sacred as many have described. It’s a term that is simply not part of the everyday language.

However, when taking into account the research aims, each participant contextualised their questions in relation to my positioning and prompts, for which I am very grateful for their trust and patience.

In summary, for the participants in this study, each devoted time and space to allow me to observe their private lives and work lives – for which I will always be eternally grateful for their trust and _aga lelei_. Each participant was able to articulate and reflect on the negotiations of their forward-thinking and progressive arts centre.
5. SUI SUI IE ELEI Conclusion

This research set out to examine the ‘boundaries’ operating around an art centre in Poutasi through the notion of ‘negotiated spaces’ of *va fa’asinomaga*. In this study, I encountered an intricate, complex layering of systems involving hierarchical structures favouring a traditional village setting. The traditional settings in the nu’u were made even more complex by the introduction of Christianity. More recently, changes caused by natural disasters have added to this and, therefore, rural communities and women in this study are evidently ‘surviving’ in the best way they can.

This study expanded on the discussions in the existing literature, concerning the complexities of ‘boundaries’ and ‘negotiated spaces’ and the roles of women in Samoan rural villages. Informed by a socio-cultural, transformative paradigm and an adaptive method of documenting women’s narratives, it sought to understand the positioning and gender identities for women in newly created spaces nested within customary spaces. It recorded the women’s narratives of earning a livelihood in an indigenous Samoan village art centre and their navigation, within the context of their developing micro enterprise art centre, between hierarchical status and current fa’amatai systems. While there is a rich literature about the roles of women in entrepreneurship generally, very little is known about new emerging micro-enterprises run by indigenous women. In this study, what emerged is the rejection of ‘fine mats’ as a commodity in this women’s art centre, but more so ‘ie lavalava.

The Small Islands Development States report identified “... gender equality, women’s empowerment, reducing inequalities and the overall commitment to just and democratic societies for development …” as development targets (SIDS, 2014). For women in Samoa it is difficult to become entrepreneurs in economically sustainable enterprises, WIBDI and small enterprises and small business run by women for women are key areas of focus and interest for organisations like WIBDI (Women in Business Development Inc). While I first developed an interest in the art centre collective because I felt able to provide support through training and so forth, this study aims to contribute to the sustainability of such collectives in growing and challenging environments more widely. For instance, How do the women who run an indigenous micro-enterprise in the Poutasi arts centre negotiate their own social structure within fa’amatai systems? Parts of this study revealed in the analysis ‘terms of endearment’ as a form of acknowledging one’s position and authority, which are based on respect. This was a key principle in understanding how the praxis of vā is nurtured in and around the context of the arts centre?
To explore Samoan women’s praxis in a rural setting often required me to digest interactions in smaller manageable groups. The first Samoa Periodic Human Rights Review report (2015, p. 11) highlighted “the need for better safeguards for equality and respect for women” and identified the relationship between the faasamoa and human rights as an important factor impacting on women as one of the most vulnerable groups in Samoan villages. In response, this research focused on a small network of women set up to provide economic opportunities within their nu'u and region of Falealili as an important step towards providing a voice for enterprising women in rural villages more generally.

In Chapter 1, I examined my experience of the post-tsunami situation and noted the resilience shown by the community, in my opinion largely led by the women. I observed va fealoaloa’i (social space) and va fe’soata’i (consultative space), and the diverse exchanges and negotiations between Samoan women and the volunteers from New Zealand and Australia, as well as with the district nurses of Aleipata, specific to rural and town areas or sites. In rural communities, a certain sense of ownership or adapting fa’amatai systems was practised; for example, the filing systems for the district hospital in Lalomanu (during the time I volunteered) had systematically catalogued and maintained every persons records according to their aiga matai or village name. There were examples of the Art centre administration functions that presented similar blended approaches. For instance, within meetings a hierarchy of fa’amatai was evident in group gatherings during meetings, suggesting blended approaches to the way the centre functions.

On reflection, these experiences highlighted two key ways of operation, which appear to be based on the different types of knowledge and perspectives held by the diasporic and the native Samoans. ‘1.4 ‘Blended approaches’ may arise from these differences in rural collaborations when local knowledge and practices are to be embedded within western practices in, for instance, a district hospital administration.

These observations highlighted for me the impact that outsiders like me have, when ‘aid’ is delivered to these rural parts. This made me ask about alternative ways of operating within existing systems of indigenous structures, of which we, as ‘outsider’ researchers or NGO workers or volunteers, may not be aware. How may these initiatives and exchanges exist in art or creative sector for women in rural villages when, as I also explained in Chapter 1, the relocation of families inland (ūta), away from their coastal land, accelerates the gradual erosion of customary expertise in that particular area?
Parts of this research aimed to address How do women of lower hierarchical status challenge and redefine ‘designated’ identity structures? This research focused on providing a ‘voice’ to working Samoan native women to highlight the challenges they face in operating small enterprises in rural Samoa. In this, it naturally gravitated towards exploring notions of boundaries and the stigma often attached to traditional faamatai politics in the nu’u. It highlights that fa’amatai systems in this nu’u are still predominately facilitated by men, as they were at the time of Schoeffel’s work 40 years ago. Christian morals still determine the perception of relationships (like defacto relationships) as taboo. I have illustrated how this study examines individual va fa’asinomaga and how each relate to their social structures within this village in Chapter three and four.

Given that the participants had very little free ‘voice’ at times, the research focussed on the roles of each participant, and the interactions within the existing hierarchies within the art centre, in either maintaining or ‘negotiating’ within certain concepts of ‘boundaries’. The research was made more difficult by the fact that the activities of the art centre, operating as an NGO within the village, sit outside the village council and fa’amatai systems. This made it more difficult to triangulate the data across the nu’u, in terms of the centre’s relationships with village laws and across the nu'u political structure. However, each participant would confidently express their awareness and limitations in the fa’amatai system, thus in this art centre model, open discussions of negotiations and ‘blended approaches’ of communication as part of the management system, allow for alternative and multiple layers of access for these woman, suggesting alternative routes and access.

Vā fa’asinomaga here means negotiating boundaries, roles and status of women in the current enterprise in a developing rural village. There were differing perspectives and negotiations evident between diasporic Sāmoan and native Sāmoan women in this study. In the diasporic communities in New Zealand, for example, the notion of vā has been re-contextualised into policies and social and cultural studies, based on accounts provided by early Western anthropologists. With a certain degree of ‘slackness’ (Refiti 2015), this notion of vā is now utilised in both health and education sectors, to conceptualise a ‘space of identity’ for Pacific communities. Increasingly, it is popularised and re-contextualised in the exploration of indigenous voices. Thus, social media groups like ‘Pacific Spaces’, a closed discussion group made up of a suifefilo of academics (anthropologists, archaeologists, marine archaeologists, architects, artists, and postgraduate researchers like myself) provide new platforms for discussion and support for Oceanic matters. Likewise, Pacific Spaces – a network of international academics across Oceania – explore indigenous practices of spatial orientation and collaboration.
In Samoa, by contrast, the ‘praxis’ of vā is a way of being, a fundamental aspect of social order, relational status, that keeps social order in the nu’u and between communities, people and individuals (including elite boundaries as discussed by Keesing and Keesing (1956) concerning status, gender, age and descent). What, then, was my initial question, is the relationship between diasporic associations of vā and the vā in its original context between tagata ole nu’u? I set out to examine this question in relation to the effects of aid distribution and the suitability and the remnants of aid across climate-affected regions of Samoa. It highlighted how sometimes the most effective type of aid was financial assistance and education (1.1). An important aspect of these developments in rural areas, which led to the location and site of this study, was the importance of women’s infrastructure and organisations in working with remnants of aid – adjusting, negotiating their work experiences to suit the needs of a nu’u struggling to keep up with global and traditional village life.

As already mentioned, the diasporic vā is a concept deployed by Samoans who identify as New Zealand-born Samoans and therefore only marginally associate with customary fa’amatai systems. I discuss this as a space from which they operate and articulate their worlds, and this was confirmed in one of my key findings in the data analysis (see pg 97). Used as a guiding principle in this exploratory research project, vā was contextualised across all founding principles of law and order between tagata ole nu’u – which was not without its problems. Also, having very few New Zealand-born as participants research made it difficult to triangulate any conclusions around the diasporic notion of va in relation to Sele, which was central to my original question. However, this does contribute a new emerging influence in rural Samoa. The perspective and influences of the ‘diasporic’ nature. How are diasporic notions vā fealoalofani practised in a nu’u?

Initially, through participatory observation and interviews, I looked at the way the women practise the vā in the arts centre through the lenses of vā fesoatai (connecting space) and vā fealoalofani (shared spaces). In the process, the question was refined further to locate a more definitive association, namely that of vā fe’aloaloa’i (relational space). That describes how women and people relate differently to each other based on each others fa’asinomaga and status.

Far from being written in stone, vā is a negotiated interpretive and a shifting space (Tui Atua T.T.T, 2007), related to how the women in this study negotiate secular and sacred spaces. These spaces, for example, the arts centre, the church have different protocols, or vā fealoaloai. These demand that people operate differently within these spaces, as noted in the findings (chapter 4.3). In this context, the original research question re-emerged as an important part of the participant’s interactions: What does the diasporic notion of vā look like in a rural village? Global effects of
communication and economic pressures are forcing small rural villages to adapt by creating enterprises in their villages that sit outside traditional spatial village structures.

The subsequent introduction of the diasporic notion of vā into the nu’u environment, as part of these newly negotiated spaces, is one of the key findings of this research. One of the participants, particularly, partially engages actively in customary community events due to the pressures of living in two spaces, in a globalised town environment in Samoa and that of living in the nu’u. The negotiated diasporic ways of being are continuously negotiated to teū fealoaloai within their art centre. How does this then affect the positioning or operation of those who do not have the same liberties? This question could not be adequately addressed within the scope of this research project, and it warrants further research.

Nevertheless, it was evident that each female participant regularly nurtures each other’s roles or in this case vā fa’asinomaga by friendly banter or by honorary terms of endearment, creating a sense of ease amongst working circles during my observations. In the environment of the arts centre, status and vā fa’asinomaga was dealt with differently from the nu’u, and skills became more important, which was important since the arts centre.

I had expected to find fa’amatai systems operating at the centre. However, the women at the arts centre upheld resilience and customary fa’amatai (ways of being) by nurturing the vā fealoaloai in the realisation of the ‘impact’ of ‘selective’ diasporic Samoan vā. Refiti notes that teu or teuga is about the displaying of things publicly, or in front of the nu’u. The show of actions or collective words of cohesion was often noted in my observation notes, and during talanoa with the participants.

5.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CHAPTER SUMMARIES AND DISCUSSIONS

In chapter 1, I examine vā fa’asinomaga and its boundaries, by articulating what is present in the art centre and how these are operating in the current village. In this chapter, I also identify key terms and historical references to this site and the participants. To summarise, this chapter gives an introductory account of participants and researchers positioning to provide the context of the research. In chapter 2, I explore previous research, conducted around women and rural villages in Samoa. I also examine the importance of space as power and positioning. Chapter 3 outlines how the suifefioli-ula methodology is adapted to suit the particular context and the female participants in this Samoan nu’u. Leading on from this chapter, I discuss the methods of talanoa, interviews and
participatory observation as key methods used in this research. The hybrid suifefiloi – ula methodology describes the order and contrasts used to analyse the data analysis. In chapter 5, I present my data analysis and discuss key findings concerning the nofotane (married into village) as an evolving term, adapted and progressed by native Samoan women. I also identify how our perspective as diasporic Sāmoans can sometimes hinder understanding and impact on already existing relational aspects. Finally, I examine how the notion of teu (to nurture) is founded on fa’aaloalo (respect) and peace amongst the participants.

5.2. Scope of Research

I had initially expected to attempt to locate and visualise the boundaries within each participant’s spatial praxis, based on observations of the women’s interactions at the art centre. However, the observation of spatial praxis on one or two sites was too limited to fully understand identity issues in context. I therefore decided to replace some observation by talanoa conversations concerning boundaries of land and the surrounding spaces. Because of the temporal limitations of this study, spatial praxis was difficult to map and, given the small sample of this study based mainly on the continuous occupancy of only two participants, this made it difficult to triangulate data and support solid conclusion. One of the high-ranking daughters, who is key to sustaining communication lines with the household, was unavailable due to health reasons at the time of participatory observation and interviewing. The participation of more women with a New Zealand-based background interacting in the arts centre could have provided this project with further observations possible but my limited resources did not allow this. Initial promise of wider engagement during the scoping visits did not come to fruition. These limitations are important to bear in mind when evaluating the scope of the study.

This research looks at how key participants within the Poutasi arts centre operate between the spaces of fa’amatai and nu’u, particularly alternative ways of using social spaces. It aims to identify possible political issues arising when adopting non-Samoan modes of operation within a Sāmoan customary village. As a result, the study focuses largely on relational aspects and the production of this enterprise, as well as the challenges occurring in these alternative organised spaces and infrastructures diversifying the economic opportunities for rural communities.

5.3. Open Questions for Future Research
Several questions emerged from the thesis that could not be addressed adequately. For instance, are there any significant differences between the ways in which the vā is negotiated between lower ranks of men and women, respectively, in the nu’u? How does Keesing and Keesing’s (1956) original diagram fit into the spatial praxis discussion of this study? An initial attempt to describe these connections failed because, particularly for women who do not fit their definitions (pg 53), it is hard to draw any conclusions, given not only the modernisation and development of communications structures but also missing data in this study. What does the decision to focus my study on the interactions between the existing participants and to observe their non-elite, non-hierarchical modes of communication leave out? Schoeffel’s (1979) thesis would suggest a comparative study, looking comprehensively at the development of the women’s committee and the roles of women based on case studies. An associated question that deserves further research would be, if women’s art centres can operate effectively in the nu’u, how might this impact on women’s rights in this context?

Following on, and most interestingly for me, there is the question: how might the notion of matuau’u (master weaver), evolve as a ‘key’ role in the support the advancement of future art based entrepreneurship for lower ranking women in rural villages? How are these women’s roles valued in the nu’u? Aside from the annual fa’aliga (exhibition and parade) of fine mats presented to government and the Ministry of Women, are their alternative ways of collective making appearing as a result of technology made available, and due to the issues of ‘sustainability’ of production caused by climate change?

These questions arose too late in the project to allow me to address them, but I consider them promising avenues to follow up with new research to support micro-enterprises in the arts sector. Many of these women have been marginalised due to their association with the non-customary art centre. However, given the need for economic opportunities, how can art centres contribute to evolving and changing villages in Upolu?

What this study has hopefully been able to show is that the women in the art centre are both innovative, collaborative and resilient in nature. Their environments are challenging, although I sense a new space and time developing where women are operatively leading innovative change. It may also inform future projects investigating Samoan women’s narratives within a rural Samoan context for diasporic researchers.
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6.2. ETHICS APPROVAL LETTER FOR RESEARCH

6.3. CONSENT FORMS FOR PARTICIPANTS

6.4. TRANSCRIBER AND TYPIST AGREEMENT
Date: _____________

Project Title: *A snapshot at the diasporic notion of vā within a Samoan village*

Talofa lava i lau Afioga/ Susuga/ Tofa

An Invitation

O lo’u igoa o Aanoalii Rowena Fulufaga, tulou lava ma fa’atalofa atu.
(My name is Aanoalii Rowena Fulufaga, I respectfully greet you)

Thank you for your expression of interest in this research project, which I am undertaking as part of a MPhil research at AUT University in Auckland.

You are warmly invited to participate in this project and I hope that you can find the time for an initial discussion with me. This will help you make an informed decision about your participation, which is entirely voluntary.

Your participation is much valued as it provides the research with important insights into the way Samoans make and think about their buildings and architecture, and how this relates to the making of place and space in Samoan society.

What is the purpose of this research??

*A snapshot at the diasporic notion of vā within a Samoan village* is an investigation into New Zealand Samoan perspective of space and a survey of what this looks like in Aotearoa.

The research explores the relationship between the *New Zealand visitors and Tagata ole nu’u*, particularly with respect to the development of a new Art Centre which is part of the relationship between the *Poutasi Development Trust* and the village of the Poutasi.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?

You have been invited to participate as a person of knowledge that will provide the research with information on the history and cultural protocols for making o measina o Samoa in the village.

I am currently planning to interview members of the *Poutasi Development Trust*, and also experts on Samoan culture and
1 October 2014

Tina Engels-Schwarzpaal
Faculty of Design and Creative Technologies

Dear Tina

Ethics Application: 14/315 A snapshot of the diasporic notion of va within a Samoan village.

Thank you for submitting your application for ethical review. I am pleased to advise that the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) approved your ethics application at their meeting on 29 September 2014, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of the authorizing signature for section O.3 of the application;
   - HOD of A+D, signed by Andrew.

2. Provision of evidence that the PGR1 has been approved;
   - Attach letter of confirmation of offer into Mphil. Post PG1 approved

3. Clarification of exactly how potential participants will be approached and what culturally appropriate practices will be employed;
   - See amendments in part D and in participation observational protocol.

4. Provision of revised responses to part D of the application, answering the questions asked in relation to the research under consideration. The researcher is advised to refer to the prompts provided for assistance;
   - Complete, See part D.1, D.2 and D.3.

5. Provision of full information about the researcher’s role as a visiting teacher to Poutasi and how any conflicts of interest between that role and the current role of researcher are being managed;
   - Complete See E.1

6. Definition and explanation of the processes of Kakala and Teu in relation to this research;
CONSENT AND RELEASE FORM

For interview participants

Project title:  
A snapshot at the diasporic notion of vā within a Samoan village
(M.Phil. Post Grad, School of Art and Design)

Project Supervisors:  
Dr Tina Engels-Schwarzpaal, School of Art and Design,AUT
& Albert Refiti, School of Spatial Design, AUT

Researcher:  
Aanoalii Rowena Fuluifaga

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 11 September 2014.

☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

☐ I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio or video-taped and transcribed.

☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself, my image or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection on 1 July 2012, without being disadvantaged in any way.

☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.

☐ I permit the researcher, Aanoalii Rowena Fuluifaga to use the audio and video that are part of this project and/or any drawings from them and any other reproductions or adaptations from them, either complete or in part, alone or in conjunction with any wording and/or drawings solely and exclusively for (a) the artist’s portfolio; and (b) educational exhibition, examination purposes and related publication, performance or visual art works.

☐ I permit the artist to use the photographs that are part of this project and/or any drawings from them and any other reproductions or adaptations from them, either complete or in part, alone or in conjunction with any wording and/or drawings solely and exclusively for (a) the artist’s portfolio; and (b) educational exhibition and examination purposes and related publication and design works.

☐ The audio and visual material recorded of me in the research project may only be used for academic purposes and may not be published in any form outside of this project without my written permission.

☐ The audio and visual material recorded of me will be archived for the duration of the project.

☐ I agree to take part in this research.

☐ I agree to being identified in the final report by name (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s signature:  ..............................................................................................................

Participant’s name:  ....................................................................................................................

Participant’s Contact Details (if appropriate):
..................................................................................................................................................

Date:  .................................................................................................................................

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on type the date on which the final approval was granted AUTEC Reference number type the AUTEC reference number

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.
Title of Project: A snapshot of the diasporic notion of va within a Samoan village.

Project Supervisor: Tina Engels-Schwarzpaul

Researcher(s): Aanoalii Rowena Fuluifaga

I understand that all the material I will be asked to transcribe is confidential. I understand that the contents of the tapes can only be discussed with the researchers. I will not keep any copies of the transcripts nor allow third parties access to them while the work is in progress.

Typist's signature: ...........................................................................................................

Typist's name: ..................................................................................................................

Typist's Contact Details: .................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Date: ...............................................................................................................................

Project Supervisor Contact Details:

Tina Engels-Schwarzpaul, phone 921 9999, extension 8204, tina.engels@aut.ac.nz
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