

Wally Penetito

Where are we now in Māori education

- A sense of radical hopefulness.

Background

The kaupapa Māori movement

In my view there has never been anything as potentially transforming in the history of education in New Zealand as that which sprung from the kaupapa Māori movement of the 1980s. It began from within the Māori community as a cultural movement to revitalise a rapidly diminishing Māori language; it rapidly became a schooling movement to enable Māori to enhance their identity as Māori; and now, I will argue, kaupapa Māori is developing into a social movement affecting all New Zealanders. This is what I want to talk about this morning; something about where Māori education has been, where it is now, but most importantly, where I think it is headed.

I will begin by saying something about how the purposes of ‘education’, as perceived by the mainstream, has not helped in relations between Māori and Pākehā let alone made it possible for Māori to enhance themselves educationally as Māori. I will then outline a set of ‘radical ideals’ that are at the core of what is meant by ‘kaupapa Māori’. In the third and concluding section, I will suggest how these radical ideals derived from kaupapa Māori might be applied to transform the mainstream education system in the interests of all New Zealanders.

Māori-pākehā – forms of hopefulness

I think something important is happening in New Zealand today in relations between Māori and Pākehā New Zealanders. Some kind of ambiguous force seems to be operating that is close at hand, yet not quite within reach (Penetito, 2009). There appears to be emerging what the American philosopher Jonathon Lear (2006) refers to as “a peculiar form of hopefulness” p. 13). It is a hopefulness that arises out of despair, a hopefulness that finds a way to regenerate a traditional fighting spirit, a hopefulness that is able to exercise a form of courage that requires the ability to face up to contradictory realities, and at the same time helps us to exercise good judgement. I think this is an apt description of Māori aspirations and hopes especially as revealed over the last 30 years.

Culture and the context for learning

This is the argument I am using as a backdrop for a philosophical perspective on Māori education developments over the last 30 years. Māori are demanding answers to some fundamental questions about the purposes of education for Aotearoa/New Zealand. I will outline three of these purposes each in the context of developments in Māori education.

Given the sub-title to this talk, ‘radical hopefulness’ which sounds like an oxymoron, my intention from the outset is to frame where we are in Māori education in a favourable light. I have borrowed this elegant model from the book by Dr. Alex Frame (2002, pp. 32-33) who in turn borrowed it from the renowned French anthropologist, Claude Levi Strauss (1952). According to the latter, “within certain limits, cultures thrive and prosper best when they encounter other cultures, and *the more different the cultures the better* (emphasis in original).

The purposes of education for Aotearoa/New Zealand

1. Winner takes all

The first of these I have labelled somewhat provocatively ‘Winner takes all’. “[A]ssimilationists would have one plus one equalling one – winner takes all”. The principle and policies of assimilation and its variants (accommodation, integration, multiculturalism etc.) are well documented in both research and in politics. The Māori experience of these practices is less well documented but what does exist (for example, the Waitangi Tribunal Report, 1986) suggests that the idea of ‘winner takes all’ is close to what those who gave evidence felt about this sustained period of Pākehā cultural hegemony. Some things Māori were included in the curriculum, mainly of a performative nature, such as action songs, kapa haka, weaving and carving etc. but there was never enough of this knowledge to create doubt as to which culture was dominant.

Mis-education

Through the lens of Māori education the ‘winner takes all’ ideology lasted for more than a century and can justifiably be described as a period of mis-education. By mis-education I mean a whole host of educational malpractices (Baugh, 1999) from trained professionals over an extended period of time. Mispronouncing names, distorting history, treating Māori children as though they were all the same, ignoring them, embarrassing them, stereotyping them, invisibilising them. The research from Bishop and Berryman (2006) on student and whānau contemporary narratives must surely be sobering evidence for those who think this is some kind of exercise in ‘teacher bashing’ or reverse deficit theorising. These are all forms of malpractice because the role and responsibility of the teacher is to ensure that each and every child throughout the compulsory years of schooling has the opportunity to optimise their learning. Given the inter-generational nature of this phenomenon this is not just about ‘missed’ opportunities (in fact that sounds to me like more deficit theorising). I think claims of malpractice are not overstating the case.

A ‘restorative project’

Policies and practices such as that promulgated through Māori-medium (MM) initiatives is one of the answers to this question of mis-education but unfortunately there doesn’t seem to be any consensus across the board given something like 85% of all young Māori remain in mainstream schools. Perhaps if MM schools were more readily accessible to most Māori across the country the story might be different. Perhaps if it was more widely known how successful many MM schools are (Alton-Lee, 2008) that might also persuade Māori parents

to enrol their children in these schools. Perhaps if the general public was more affirming of te reo Māori opportunities and they too enrolled their children in these schools and classrooms we might be surprised by the way attitudes can change. To be a successful restorative project we would expect that the MM initiative needed to be ‘owned’ psychologically, philosophically and practically. It would need to be ‘driven by Māori in their own interests. It would focus on te reo as the ‘context’ for learning, ‘mātauranga’ in answer to ‘what’ should be learned, and ‘tikanga’ related to ‘how’ the learning might be best facilitated. This brings me to the second purpose of education for Aotearoa/New Zealand.

2. Mirror image

The period of the ‘mirror image’ is about Māori waking up to the fact that the education system was never going to deliver an education to their children in their interests as Māori. For example, from the earliest times when literacy was introduced to Māori they showed a great deal of zeal and skill in acquiring this new ‘knowledge’. It took more than a century for Māori to wake up to the transforming potential of literacy as ‘technology’, as something that can be used to do something else and not merely to be a Western cultural artefact. The idea that literacy could also be a tool for liberation, as a pedagogy for conscientisation (Freire and Macedo, 1987) and where they could develop a deepening awareness of their socio-cultural reality was stirring in the imagination of Māori teaching professionals through the 1970s. It needed the inspiration of something much closer to home such as the impending loss of te reo Māori highlighted in the research undertaken by Dr. Richard Benton (1979) and his colleagues at the New Zealand Council of Educational Research in the 1970s and 80s that provided the necessary spark, the catalyst to take this agenda onto marae and into whānau throughout the country, into government departments and into schools.

Mana Māori and te reo

Te reo Māori is the primary radical hope or vibrant ideal for the restoration of mana Māori. “What makes this hope *radical*”, quoting again from Lear (2006, p. 103) “is that it is directed toward a future goodness that transcends the current ability to understand what it is. Radical hope anticipates a good [eg. kaumatua understood what whānau would gain in the long term by being involved in kohanga reo even though]..... those who have the hope as yet lack the appropriate concepts with which to understand it”. This does not hold true for many of the Māori advocates because they were in fact native speakers of the language which, in most cases also meant they were raised within a relatively traditional context. They understood to some degree what they were advocating and what the consequences would be for their whānau. Most adults by far, and certainly all the children targeted to benefit from continuous exposure to this ideal were part of a conspiracy of faith. Kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori would not have happened if it was not for this universal act of courage and self-belief.

Changing attitudes, changing practices

Benton’s research created a moral panic for teachers, schools and especially whānau. But they were not the only ones crying out for the restoration of kaupapa Māori as an identity marker. In 1984 a Māori telephonist, Naida Pou said “kia ora” in a public capacity and was

roasted for an indiscretion. Some years later Hinewehi Mohi followed suit with “E Ihowa Atua...” as the national anthem in Māori when the All Blacks played at Twickenham and was accused of racism being prejudiced and taking an unnecessary advantage of the situation. Māori political parties, the magnificent work of the Waitangi Tribunal, a national Māori radio network, Māori television and now, even that colourful old Ngāti Toa haka “kamate! kamate!” are all passé. These and many more everyday occurrences are having a major influence on Māori thinking on what possibilities lie ahead for them and their children. The message is simple – there are no inherent limits to what is possible, or in current Ministry-speak (2008) the focus has shifted from Māori under-performance to “realising Māori potential”. Secondly, Pākehā thinking about MM education seems to be happening as though through processes of osmosis. All they needed to do, so it seems, was to drop their attitudinal safe-guards and MM was not only possible but could be quite enjoyable. As the late John Tahuparae put it, ‘Ko koe te taupā ki tou moemoeā’ (You are the barrier to your own aspirations).

Resilience and collective consciousness

The transition from a restorative project to a transformative one requires, at the least, some extremely important ingredients, such as resilience, perseverance and large doses of confidence and courage. Resilience could be seen as the embodiment of these other qualities. Māori society has proven its resilience beyond doubt. They have survived a “European invasion” of settlers intent on acquiring land by whatever means yet, today their population has never been larger, they retain a cultural integrity that belies generations of cultural imperialism, they maintain many of their ancient traditions albeit in contemporary form, their native tongue is being revitalised, and they are today a vibrant culture with exciting future possibilities.

Resilience comes about when there is a realisation that Māori need not rely on Pākehā ways of knowing in order to know themselves. As Lavalley and Clearsky (2005) explain, “In essence, we must ‘turn the gaze back’ to the system in order to enlighten ourselves about its insidious influence upon our collective identity” (p. 5). In truth, I think Māori have always had a strong self-belief, especially being able to adapt despite the presence of conditions that posed a threat to their Māoriness. Collectively, Māori resilience has been under serious threat for some decades as the result of sweeping changes as in the migration from rural to urban communities, as in the consequent de-construction of the tribal marae, as in the emergence of an economic under-class and the inevitable break-down of traditional forms of social organisation, and in the cultural domination exercised through modern educational institutions and the ignoring of sacred spaces, places and traditional knowledge. The cumulative loss of these mainstays of resilience have weakened the collective consciousness of Māori. A Canadian law scholar uses the concept of ‘self-collection’ to convey something of the notion I’m trying to understand at this point. Johnson (1989) writes,

“In contrast to aggregates, collectivities are ‘self-collecting’ in the sense that the members engage in rule-following activities of a sort that constitutes the collectivity. The notion of ‘self-collection’ is intended as an analogue to ‘self-reflection’. If self-

reflection is basic to individual identity, self-collection is basic to collective identity” (pp. 22-23).

Significance of the individual in Māori terms

There is no denying the centrality of the collective in Māori consciousness. This raises the question of the meaning and place of the individual in Māori thinking and behaving. History tells us that from the very beginning of the colonial process Māori were open and welcoming to the idea of schooling. They were even prepared to establish their own schools, seemingly to learn to read and write as a priority but also to familiarise themselves with European custom, technology and economic life. There was no inherent problem with schooling per se. Education as experienced and understood through the ancient *wānanga* (Best, 1959), although ethically inconsistent with 19th century European schooling nevertheless held some things in common: there were teachers and students, there was a curriculum, pedagogies were matched depending on the knowledge transfer, learning was assessed and evaluated, acquisition of different kinds of esoteric knowledge was perceived as *mana* enhancing, while being selected to participate was viewed as a virtual moral imperative; what you learn is not yours – it belongs to the collective.

Up to now you might be excused for thinking that Māori have only themselves to consider. I want to turn now to a third purpose of education.

3. An overlapping relationship

Picking up again from Levi-Strauss, [T]he arithmetic of cultures is *one plus one equals three*. The two encountering cultures remain (albeit mutually influenced) but a third and new culture gradually appears alongside them”. Taking my own Whakapapa as an example, I have Tainui, Scottish and French ancestry but I am not part Māori and part European. I am fully fledged in both and deeply influenced by an emergent imbricated culture, a hybrid version. I am not half-caste, nor am I Kiwi, or a New Zealander yet I am all of those things. Some of you might remember that classic poem by Henare Dewes, ‘Tihei Mauriora’ (1982, p.195-196) about Māori identity in the turbulent times of early urbanisation. I’ll read it to you.

Strange thing happened today
applied for a flat in Remuera
got knocked back
cause I’m a maori, funny that!
Hell! I can’t even speak the lingo
don’t even know my maoritanga
whatever that is.
Once I spoke Maori
but the teacher strapped me

and made me learn pakeha so hard,
I'm really good at it now
got papers to prove it too
yet I still couldn't get this flat
cause I'm a maori
funny that!

I should've bowled that landlord
but I'd have gone to Paremoremo
bugger that!

that's where lots of maoris go,
funny that!

I'd go back to my marae
If I knew where it was
and prove, I'm not
an Uncle Tom
Aue!

I wish those pakehas
would make their minds up
about who I belong to
that's the worse of being half 'n' half,
the pakeha half is always
getting the Maori half in trouble
funny that!

In my next reincarnation
I'm coming back as a full blooded maori,
that'll scare the tutai
out of all those
pakeha statisticians.
I'm going to Ponsonby tomorrow

gonna get another flat,
this time,
I'm gonna be a Samoan
Tihei mauriora!
whatever that means.

Participation and the individual

The shifting emphases in the purposes of schooling and the way in which schools have gone about their business from the early missionary day schools, through the 100 years of the Native/Māori schools to today's schools has seen huge changes in virtually everything and none more so than that which fits under the umbrella of 'participation'. The system wants participation to be universal (available to everybody), compulsory (one must attend between certain ages), and secular (abstract, rational-oriented). It is assumed that through the doctrine of participation in schooling people will engage, respect, accept, feel included, gain a sense of belonging, be empowered, and experience active agency. But to what end? If what counts as valid knowledge to you, and what counts as the appropriate pedagogy to enable you to acquire that knowledge is not made available then it can be argued that much of what is made to count as education is 'empty of intellectual cogency and moral force'¹. This is what kohanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori, wharekura and wānanga have been trying to build into their institutions and practices for the last 30 years. The problem of the 'mirror image', as some see it, is that the Māori alternative to the system is a separatist move. Others see Kaupapa Māori schools as being the flip side of mainstream schools and therefore tending to be equally sterile, limiting and unimaginative hence (1 + 1 = 2). If there is a common ground between the two systems representing two cultures then both can be viewed as inauthentic and denied cultural validity. Inclusion of Māori knowledge and custom into the education system has traditionally been criticised by Māori because what was selected was often seen as piecemeal (a part of some often unexplained whole), an end-in-itself (not connected to anything else), and out of context (lacking coherence). Kaupapa Māori schools put those ingredients back in, or at least that is what they set out to do.

NOTE: Sorry for those who have already seen another version of this slide at the Teaching for Sustainability Conference in Wellington last week; there are a couple more.

Positioning theory

From the moment we had a dual education system operating, one mainstream philosophically and ideologically supportive of Western values and practices and another, Kaupapa Māori, philosophically and ideologically supportive of Māori values and practices, problems of positionality or standpoint became evident. I began this talk with a 'storyline' and now it is time for me to own up about where we are now in Māori education and where I think we are

¹ see C.Wright Mills. (1977). *The Marxists*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, p. 23)

headed. In a very interesting chapter by Tan and Moghaddam (1999, p. 193) , they maintain that,

“The major issues in intergroup behaviour, such as justice, discrimination and collective rights and obligations, are all in one way or another based on the power of storylines. Similarly, the stability or change brought about in minority-majority relations depends on certain storylines being accepted or rejected”.

Māori have always been wary of the legacy of colonialism and its manifestation in cultural imperialism. We inherited the problem of how to resolve the two conflicting intuitions of moral absolutism and moral relativism (Lukes, 2008). This was not a problem for the colonialists. There is a kind of moral absolutism at play when operating in the Māori way of being, knowing and doing. “Ki a Ranginui e tū iho nei, ki a Papatūānuku e takoto ake nei” (The Sky Father above, Earth Mother below) are narratives perceived as right and immutable. What is the difference between that and the belief among the first Pākehā that they were superior in every way to Māori and then behaved as though ‘that was the way things were’ and ‘that is the way things ought to be’. Moral relativism on the other hand, presupposes that universal actions and modes of behaviour are not acceptable when operating under a rational way of being, knowing and doing. Europe was involved in several revolutionary movements over several centuries fighting this battle of moral absolutism versus moral relativism and they were not about to give in on that score to Māori, who the early colonists believed, were not far removed in evolutionary terms from the Dark Ages of ancient Europe. From a Māori point of view if they were to make this shift from absolutism to relativism it would require something at least as vibrant and inspirational as the restorative project of kohanga reo, kura kaupapa Māori, wharekura and wānanga of the 1980s and 90s. What was needed was a ‘transformative project’ one that is intended to build on and capitalise on the restorative gains. Again the message is unambiguous – Māori are seeking through education and every other means at their disposal, the best of all worlds but can they have their cake and eat it. The Australian scholar, Nakata (2007, p. 12) provides a challenging steer by arguing three principles for a standpoint theory. Firstly, that “indigenous people are entangled in a much contested knowledge space at the cultural interface”. I presume our entanglement is with the dominant culture. The second principle is “to recognise indigenous agency as framed within the limits and the possibilities of what I can know from this constituted position – to recognise that at the interface we are constantly being asked to be both continuous with one position at the same time as being discontinuous with another”. His third principle is the idea that “the constant “tensions” that this tug-of-war creates are physically real, and both informs as well as limits what can be said and what is to be left unsaid in the everyday”. The point I want to make is that the intersection of mainstream and Māori is a dynamic interface and one where dialogic relations, the contest of ideas, is played out according to the rules of justice and fair play not who has the most toys or the biggest resource base or who was here first. There is an ethic of responsibility on all sides, for mutuality.

I will now say something about the components of a ‘culturally explicit context for learning’. I have used this quote from Watson (1967, p. 40) on multiple occasions over the last few years.

Not in New Zealand or anywhere else does there appear to have been a systematic, carefully-disciplined effort to test whether a teacher’s knowledge of the local scene or his [sic] participation in it, has any significant effect upon his interest or capacity to integrate his knowledge into the scholastic work of his classroom, or into the emotional toning of his relationships with pupils.

The question he raises remains unanswered. Place-based education has a role to play in this regard.

Co-constructing the knowledge base through critical place-consciousness

Mainstream education

New Zealand schools are fundamentally middle-class Pākehā institutions. They were invented by Pākehā, organised and run by Pākehā, along lines familiar with Pākehā ways of doing things in terms of values and expectations that derive from that culture. They are the majority, they have control over the resources both material and symbolic; they are the most socio-economically powerful group in the country.

I am of course, in favour of a stable education system and such a system needs to operate in the interests of the majority in any society. Where these interests become problematic is when families come from cultures which share only in part the values and practices of the powerful group. These minorised groups (Bishop, O’Sullivan and Berryman, 2010, p. 10) often find themselves in what is called the ‘double bind’ situation (Sampson, 1976, p. 234); they need to be a part-of, in order to share in the material wellbeing of the society and in most instances that means being on-side with the powerful group. Equally important, from the perspective of the minoritized group, however, is the psychic gratification, a spiritual wellbeing that nurtures them in their everyday lives. This gratification derives from the values and practices of their own cultural base. In Māori terms there are lots of ways of describing the roots of this gratification such as *ngā tāonga tuku iho* (the treasures handed down to us from our ancestors), and *ngā kakano i ruia mai i Rangīātea* (the seeds sown from the ancient marae at Rangīātea). These sayings are another way of naming what it means to be Māori.

Co-constructing learning through a critical pedagogy of relations

In Latin ‘educato’ is a metaphor from the feeding of infants until they can feed themselves independently. ‘Te kai mānga a ngā tūpuna’ (Royal, 2001) is about knowledge handed down by ancestors as though it was food that needed to be masticated before being passed on. I have to think about this for a while. I think ‘masticated’ refers to processes of ‘socialisation’ rather than education. The first time mothers feed babies ‘solids’ with a spoon they put it in their own mouths first to test the temperature of the spoon, and the food, I presume. I don’t think they are trying to communicate a more meaningful message to the baby like, ‘see what mummy’s doing now you can do that next time’. On the baby’s part this is all instinctive, for

example, see food coming, open mouth, blow hard as you can, have a good tummy giggle at mummy's funny face, then swallow. Keep doing this for the first couple of years and then you've got it.

The work by Bishop, Berryman et al. (2006, 2010) is beginning to shape as the best thing that has happened in mainstream secondary education, in the interests of Māori learners, ever, in my view. As a starter :

- (a) Teachers need to recognise the fact that there are lots of ways to be Māori.
- (b) Teachers must not treat all Māori students the same i.e. they are Māori but need to be recognised as individuals in their own right.
- (c) Teachers need to accept the idea that a Māori student's Māoriness makes him or her different from non-Māori and that this difference is a strength (Sleeter, 2011,160).

Co-constructing the context through an analysis of the middle-ground

The middle ground is the place in between: in between cultures, peoples, and in between empires and the nonstate world of villages...[D]iverse peoples adjust their difference through what amounts to a process of creative, and often expedient, misunderstandings.... but from these misunderstandings arise new meanings and through them new practices – the shared meanings and practices of the middle ground (White, 1999, p. x).

Mediating structures (Penetito, 2010) are potential devices for negotiation. I go along with Marx on this one when he argues that “the world is always a mediated world, for there is no automatic or unilinear relationship between economic and ideological-cultural realities” (Agger,1979, p. 343). In this case, educational and ideological-cultural realities. The Treaty of Waitangi is a mediating structure as were the Native/Māori Schools. Māori education policy and practices are full of such mediating devices but in most if not all cases, they only work partially if at all because they are imposed rather than negotiated policies and practices.

Historic separations from land, knowledge, ancestral marae and the threatened loss of *te reo*, needed something traditional to be reinstated in order to revitalise *mana Māori* and in time establish a base line by which the culture would endure . Psychic gratification among all peoples is derived from the internalisation of vibrant ideals which in turn require the formation of a culturally enriched ego ideal. It seems as though one's culture, one's way of being, has to be under threat before there is sufficient motivation to do something constructive. But what are these ego ideals? In the Māori world they include daily use of *te reo*, they include the regular practice of *tikanga*, they include *hui ki te marae*, they include *mahi a rehia, karakia, whakapapa*, recognition of *Matariki, te mea, te mea*. Compared with many other indigenous peoples Māori are fortunate that most of these ideals are still in existence and still practised but at the *whānau* and *hapū* level many of these ideals are not part of the ego make-up of the self-collective. They reside if at all in the memory of a few selected isolated individuals .

The mainstream system is where cultural transformation has the most gains to be made in terms of radical change and by that I mean change that can accommodate a challenge to mainstream values and practices. A challenge to the whole idea that education agendas for example must necessarily be top-down, must as a matter of course be driven by the centre, must be explicitly Eurocentric, must be secular-oriented, must be scientific and rational and so the list goes on. And then to argue that a system cannot be democratic and based on social justice principles unless these values constitute the norm if we are to believe Rata (2004) is arguing the same case as those who claim separate development, biculturalism, multiculturalism etc. are unjust, undemocratic and irrational because they don't place the majority at the centre.

The potential for promulgating radical ideals through the notion of 'hope' can be thought of in two senses. Moisi (2009), like Lear, another Harvard scholar, speaks of a secular meaning of hope as "trust in one's identity, in one's ability to interact positively with the world...Hope is the opposite of resignation, according to Moisi, a form of trust that pushes us to move towards others, to accept how they differ from us without fear" (p. 30-31). Cornell West (in Boynton, 2007, p. 116) takes a critical position on Moisi's secular construct which he sees as akin to optimism, as a "calculation of probability". As a Black American he asks, "what have we had to be optimistic about?...What hope does, is that it "generates this energy to be courageous, to bear witness". This testimony seems to me to parallel what the original advocates of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa experienced. West says, "I'm going to die full of hope. There's no doubt about that, because that is a choice I can make". Rather than being anti-democratic I think Māori 'Kotahitanga Movements' have from the beginning been extremely important catalysts for democracy because they have without exception refused to accept the aphorism that there can only be one God, one flag, one way to be educated.

In thinking about where to from here I am reminded of David Hume, the 18th century Scottish philosopher's aphorism, '*ought*' is not implied by '*is*', that is, there are no deductive steps from saying how things are to saying how they ought to be, nevertheless that is precisely what I intend doing. My interpretations of how things are in Māori education and how they got to be that way is *my story* which means I also get to say *what ought to be*, if things are to change in the everyday life in the learning of Māori students in our schools.

The te reo Māori movement has been seen by some, as being catalytic in nature to the degree that the period has been described by some as the 'Māori Renaissance' (Webster, 1998). If progress continues to be manufactured in the similar spirit of organisation that occurred within Europe several centuries back, then we have yet to experience the 'Te Wairua Reformation' (cf. the Protestant Reformation) launched by the socialist-oriented parties and their protest that neither 'free market ideologies' nor 'neo-liberals' were the true salvation. Rather, the act of 'communitarianism' to reduce interferences across boundaries would become the ruling ideology of society. The final revolution would be 'Te Wānanga-tanga' (cf. The Enlightenment), the ages of tuakiri tangata (the emergence of a new imbricated consciousness), within a context of turangawaewae (a place to stand, a place to belong). Te Wānanga-tanga would be about the nature of relationships between Pākehā and Māori,

relationships between teaching and learning, relationships between universalism and particularism and between individuals and collectives.

References

- Agger, Ben. (1979). *Western Marxism: an introduction – Classical and contemporary sources*. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2008). *Te Kotahitanga using research and development to make a much bigger difference for our children and society*. Keynote address presented at the inaugural Te Kotahitanga conference, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Baugh, John. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves – African American languages and educational malpractice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Benton, R. A. (1979). *Who speaks Maori in New Zealand?* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Best, Elsdon. (1959). *The Māori school of learning – Its objects, methods, and ceremonial*. Wellington: R.E.Owen, Government Printer.
- Bishop, Russell; O’Sullivan, Dominic; & Berryman, Mere. (2010). *Scaling up education reform: Addressing the politics of disparity*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research.
- Bishop, Russell & Berryman, Mere. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationship and classroom learning*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Boynton, Robert S. (2007). *Cornell West – Professor of Religion*. In Rolling Stone – Fortieth Anniversary, November 15, p.116.
- Frame, Alex. (2002). *Grey and Iwikau – A journey into custom*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Freire, Paulo & Macedo, Donaldo. (1987). *Literacy – Reading the word and the world*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Johnston, Darlene M. (1989). Native rights as collective rights: A question of group self-preservation. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence: Vol.ii,(1)*, 19-34.
- Lavallee, Barry & Clearsky, Lorne (2006) ‘From woundedness to resilience’: A critical review from an Aboriginal perspective. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 3(1):6-14
- Lukes, Steven. (2008). *Moral relativism*. London: Profile Books.
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Ka Hikitia: Managing for success: Māori education strategy 2008-2011*, Wellington.

- Nakata, Martin. (2007). The cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36 Supplement, pp. 7-14.
- Penetito, Wally. (2010). *What's Māori about Māori education?- The struggle for a meaningful context*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Penetito, W.T. (2009). The struggle to educate the Māori in New Zealand. In James A. Banks. (Ed.) *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*. New York & London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 288-300.
- Rata, Elizabeth. (2004). Ethnic ideologies in New Zealand education: what's wrong with Kaupapa Māori? Paper presented to Teacher Education Forum of Aotearoa New Zealand Conference (TEFANZ), Auckland College of Education, July.
- Royal, Charles Te Ahukaramū. (2001). Recent developments in Māori knowledge – Thoughts from Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa. Paper presented to a seminar conducted at the Stout Research Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, 21 March.
- Sampson, Edward G. (1976). *Social psychology and contemporary society*. 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Tan, Sui-Lan & Moghaddam, F.M. (1999). Positioning in intergroup relations. In Rom Harre & Luk van Langenhove. (Eds.). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Oxford & Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Waitangi Tribunal Report. (1986). Finding Of the Waitangi Tribunal Relating to Te Reo Māori and a Claim Lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Ngā Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo Inc. Soc. Wellington
- Watson, John E. (1967). Horizons of Unknown Power – Some Issues of Māori Schooling. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research
- Webster, S. (1998). *Patrons of Māori culture – Power, theory and ideology in the Māori Renaissance*. University of Otago Press
- White, Richard. (1999/1991). *The middle ground – Indians, empires, and republics in the Great Lakes region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yoon, Kwang Suk; Duncan, Teresa; Lee Silvia Wen-Yu; Scarloss, Beth & Shapley, Kathy L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. *ies National Centre for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. Institute of Education Sciences, REL 2007- No. 033-1300 studies.