Mana Ōrite versus a common education for all

(draft to end - 9 214 words 1 72 are references)

Mere Berryman and Jay Haydon-Howard

Abstract

This paper reflects on the increasing school and cross-sector appropriation of the term *mana ōrite* (according equal respect to each other's power, influence or status). This comes at a time when we, as a nation, have clearly not enacted mana ōrite through any of the Ka Hikitia Policy iterations. Today, changes to the 2020 Education and Training Act and the cross agency strategy Ka Hikitia - Ka Hāpaitia could lay the foundation for new relationships between Māori and non-Māori. However, this calls for radical changes to the way we have largely perceived each other to be; a relationship that has permeated throughout society and been reinforced through our colonial schooling system.

Will telling us that we must enact Te Tiriti o Waitangi be sufficient to bring about this radical change? We contend that if we are ever to move beyond our current state of brown frills brought on by power, appropriation and manipulation we first need to understand our joint past. When we can open the hearts and minds of our nation to understand our shared history, the principles from Te Tiriti o Waitangi; of kawanatanga, tino rangatiratanga and ōritetanga could provide the roadmap from appropriation to reconciliation. This is needed if we are to implement a system based on mutual understanding and respect.

Introduction

For years, as a nation we have claimed that the Treaty of Waitangi was our founding document, promising partnership, protection and full participation in all the benefits the country has to offer. However, a quick look at our national statistics shows the education disparities for Māori, first statistically identified by Hunn (1961), have not disappeared. Rather the gaps between Māori and non-Māori have continually widened (Chapple, Jeffries & Walker, 1997; Ministry of Education, 2022a, b, c.) with teachers' implicit biases and prejudices being identified as influential (Peterson, et al., 2016; Pihama & Lee-Morgan, 2019). For Māori and Pacific peoples, these disparities have been entrenched across the range of our social indices (Marriott & Alinaghi, 2021).

This paper begins by discussing historical schooling in Aotearoa. This is a legacy of the Doctrine of Discovery and the long-term effects of colonisation since the Treaty of Waitangi through education policies aimed at assimilating Māori (Penetito, 2010; Pihama &

Lee-Morgan, 2019; Simon, 1992). It considers aspects of intergenerational harm experienced by Māori, to their language and culture (Ngaamo, 2019; Skerrett & Ritchie, 2021), before new policy directions were called for in 2008 through the Ka Hikitia Māori Education Strategy. This policy is layered alongside the current expectations of the 2020 changes to the Education and Training Act. An Act, potentially intended to decolonise and indigenise the structures and culture of schooling so that the aspirations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi can become a lived reality. We conclude that this must happen if the culture of this generation of Māori learners is to be better understood in education and we can begin to respect and learn from each other. It is only then that ōritetanga, the principle from Te Tiriti o Waitangi, might begin to be implemented so that Māori can finally have their full rights and citizenship as Māori respected. With mutual respect and learning from each other we can be better positioned to achieve an education system that holds greater relevance for all learners.

Historical Schooling in Aotearoa

In common with other Indigenous peoples, the survival then resurgence of the Māori population in the face of colonisation and assimilation has been described by Durie (1998), as “a story of struggle, challenge, threat, adaptation and adjustment” (p. 214). From the 1790s, in Aotearoa, those impacts included introduced diseases that had a devastating effect on a population that had been isolated from outside contact for centuries. They also included the impact of the musket that destroyed the delicate balance of power in a tribal nation. Diseases, warfare and perhaps the greatest impact, the appropriation of land, led European commentators in the late nineteenth century to consign the remnants of the Māori race to inevitable extinction (Consedine & Consedine, 2012; Lange, 1999).

While the early Pākehā missionaries and traders had learned Māori language for their own purposes, this began to change dramatically with the formalisation of schooling by the coloniser. In 1858, the Native Schools Act introduced funding to mission schools on the conditions that schools were connected with a religious body, English was the language of instruction and pupils were both boarded and educated (Openshaw, Lee, & Lee, 1993). The assimilatory function of these schools, according to Simon (1992), was paramount. More alarming was her conclusion that schooling served “...to reinforce their [Māori] subordinate status in their own land. It was a means of furthering Pakeha economic and political interests” (p.85). Māori were viewed as subsistence farmers rather than entrepreneurs with an innate inability to cope with the impact of the more complex and culturally superior way of life of the colonisers. Taylor, a school inspector wrote, “Native habits of filth and laziness also

impede the progress of civilization" (AJHR, 1862, p.6). Māori language itself was seen as being:

> …another obstacle in the way of civilization, so long as it exists there is a barrier to the free and unrestrained intercourse which ought to exist between the two races, it shuts out the less civilized portion of the population from the benefits which intercourse with the more enlightened could confer. The School-room alone has power to break down this partition between the two races.
>
> (AJHR, 1862, p.35)

The Education Act of 1867 established a separate Native School system, mainly to educate Māori children who lived in remote tribal areas and who had little contact with Europeans; public schools were for everyone else. The Native Schools Bill highlighted three principles that were underpinned by an ongoing pathology of Māori that was to dominate education for years to come (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). The first principle was that the Europeanisation or assimilation of the Māori population, in order to civilise Māori, was appropriate government policy. Second, social control was seen as the purpose of schools and third, schools would be provided only in those areas where Māori had asked for schools and would commit their own resources (Openshaw, Lee & Lee, 1993) or in other words their own land. Thus according to Simon (1992), education of Māori was the means to assimilate Māori students into European society while also establishing British law, and, strengthening "the power of the government, to facilitate alienation of Maori land and to secure social control" (p.81).

By the 1870s and 1880s the Māori population was outnumbered and in decline. However, from a low point of approximately 42,000 in 1896 the Māori population began a slow but steady increase (King, 1992). The 'adaptation' and 'adjustment' by Māori society to the impacts of colonisation showed an amazing resilience that confounded the predictions, and perhaps the wishful thinking, of late nineteenth century European commentators. It is from this point at the beginning of the twentieth century, as Māori battled to survive their drastically changed circumstances and struggled to reassert their identity as Māori within an increasingly European dominated society, that the resurgence of Māori society can be charted.

Between the World Wars: The 1920s to the 1940s

Although the 1920s to the 1940s was a time of economic difficulty for many New Zealanders, Māori were at the very bottom of the socio-economic scale. To survive in a cash economy people had to either work for wages or produce products for sale. The ongoing acquisition of

ancestral lands, deliberate benefit exemptions for returning Māori soldiers and an education system that had prepared Māori to be manual workers, meant that paid employment was at best seasonal. Many Māori males worked as itinerant rural labourers while their female counterparts raised the family.

With the Depression, rural employment was increasingly difficult to find. While work schemes were made available for unemployed Pākehā, Māori were expected to live off their land. However for many Māori communities the ravages of enforced sales and *raupatu* or land confiscation during and after the wars meant that there was insufficient land to survive on let alone produce surpluses for sale. Te Puea (King, 1977), reveals interesting insights into life in Aotearoa during the interwar period, exposing much about Māori and their ongoing conflicts with Pākehā. Perhaps the most overwhelming impression is of the poverty and hardship that Māori in the Waikato had to endure during this period. Similar stories of the poverty and hardship of this era are also recounted in Ngā Morehu: The Survivors (Binney & Chaplin, 1986), the stories of eight Māori women who grew up in the Bay of Plenty, East Coast, Poverty Bay regions of Aotearoa. From the devastating 1918 flu epidemic to the uneasy relationship with the new Labour Government of the late 1930s. Similar conditions would have been experienced in other Māori communities throughout the country.

By 1900 the Māori population had climbed from a low point in 1896 to 45 000, while the Pākehā population had expanded to 770 000 (Pool, 1991). Most Māori lived in isolated rural locations (Hill, 2005), and according to Consedine and Consedine (2012), in “makeshift camps without sanitation…” where they suffered “high infant mortality…” and “succumbed easily to infectious diseases” (p.99). A pervading sense of racism by the colonial settlers was captured by Stenhouse (1996) in his reference to Dr Alfred Newman, an influential doctor and businessman of the day who suggested that “the disappearance of the race is scarcely a subject for much regret. They [Māori] are dying out in a quick easy way, and are being supplanted by a superior race” (p.126).

Although the 1918 flu epidemic certainly dealt a devastating blow to the Māori population, King (1997) suggests that many of the effects of the epidemic on Māori went either unreported or under-reported. Other concerns with Māori health, that reflected their poor living conditions, included tuberculosis, typhoid and high infant mortality. However, for authorities, the concern was that Māori communities would become a reservoir for infectious diseases that could infect the Pākehā population (Lange, 1999).

Government and local body officials’ handling of Māori issues during this period showed general indifference with little interest towards Māori aspirations. Any moves by Māori communities that did not advance the government policy of assimilation were actively

discouraged. Assimilation as social policy may well have grown out of 19th century European beliefs about races of the world being ranged, in hierarchical terms, from civilised and superior to savage and inferior (Simon, 1992; 1994). Education, within this context, failed to address any aspirations of the ethnic minority (Spoonley, 1990; Ramsay, 1972). Māori knowledge, language and culture were demeaned and at the same time Western knowledge was held up as useful and superior. As such Māori were deemed to be inadequate and were blamed for their subsequent failure; a situation which exacerbated the demise of their language and culture and thus their mana. According to Tame Iti (TedxTalks, 2015), "mana comes from knowing who you are; where you come from; and your connections to your land." However, state controlled education resulted in Māori being educated within a system that devalued them as a people by socialising "mythtakes" about Māori and their knowledge base (Jackson, 2019, 2021; Mutu, 2018) while simultaneously removing them from their land, culture, language and identity.

Significant political and social changes from the 1920s to 1940s were to have long lasting effects on all of society. These included the economic and social impacts of World War 1, the 1930s depression, the faltering growth of socialism and the New Zealand Labour Party's adaptation of its ideology. In this period, as far as Māori were concerned, the country was divided due to their largely rural, communal lifestyle (King, 1992), however, it was a division that many non-Māori were unaware of. This separation was to change with the rapid urbanisation of Māori that commenced during World War Two and continued through the economic growth period of the 1950s and 1960s.

The 1935 Labour Government saw increased social spending and dramatic improvements to the socio-economic status of many in Aotearoa thus improving the welfare of poorer sectors of society including Māori. Influenced by the increasing political weight carried by Ratana and his supporters, welfare benefits previously denied to Māori, were made available. However, because of the assimilation policies, Māori society continued to be threatened by cultural annihilation. Consistent with the previous political agenda, Labour, and the governments that were to follow, firmly pushed a mono-cultural, egalitarian social agenda that espoused everyone as being the same and eligible to the same benefits. Māori aspirations of autonomy and control continued to find little room for expression in the 1920s to the 1960s (Walker, 2016). Māori society during this period essentially looked to *hapū* (subtribe) and *iwi* (tribe) as their source of identity, including language and culture.

Mana Rangatira

While the poverty and hardship of the inter war period is mentioned in many commentaries it is also important to note that the 1920s onwards saw glimmers of recovery for Māori. This recovery saw an end to conjecture that Māori would become extinct but also marked a period of increased struggle to maintain identity and culture. Durie (1998) refers to an era of 'Mana Rangatira', a period during which the population decline had ceased and influential Māori leaders played a key role in the recovery of Māori society. Leaders like Maui Pomare, Te Rangihiroa, Wiremu Ratana, Apirana Ngata and Te Puea Herangi all had significant roles. Māori politicians worked within the 'establishment' where they believed the greatest gains for Māori could be made. Te Puea Herangi and Wiremu Ratana sought greater independence and self-determination for their followers, undoubtedly influenced by the common belief of "the potential of Māori social systems and Māori leadership" (Durie, 1998, p. 46).

Education policy for Māori however did not change in terms of its perceived outcomes for the next 100 years and only then, in the 1970s and 1980s was concern increasingly expressed for the 'failure' of Māori children within the education system (Hunn, 1961). While it is clear that government policy and especially education policy contributed greatly to the demise of Māori language and identity, what is less clear, because much was effectively silenced (MacDonald, 2018), is where these racialised beliefs came from.

Doctrine of discovery

We contend that the relationship between the coloniser and Māori started as early as the 1400s when a series of decrees or papal bulls was issued by a succession of Popes. These papal bulls allowed European explorers to "discover" and seize lands inhabited by Indigenous peoples, on behalf of those who maintained power in Europe (Harjo, 2014; Mutu, 2018; Watson, 2010). For example, Pope Nicholas V gave permission for King Alfonso of Portugal to search out and reduce any "Saracens and pagans and any other unbelievers" to perpetual slavery (Harjo, 2014; Watson, 2010). Under the same pope, various papal bulls allowed full seizure of non-Christian lands and the enslavement of native, non-Christian peoples in Africa and the Americas. Other decrees followed, further endorsing the rights of "discoverers" to seize land and enslave Indigenous peoples in the name of European, Christian monarchs.

In 1496, King Henry VII, issued a decree to allow explorers to claim lands occupied by "heathens and infidels" on behalf of England (Davenport & Paullin, 1917; Miller et al., 2010; Mutu, 2018). This decree connects colonisation to the Indigenous peoples in Australia,

Canada and New Zealand. In 1769, Captain Cook claimed the North Island of New Zealand for King George III. An opportunity to formalise this relationship occurred in 1840 with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between Māori tribal leaders and the British government on behalf of the Crown, thus establishing Aotearoa as a British colony. However, even today many in Aotearoa have different views of what happened and as long as only one story is told, while the others' story is silenced, this situation will remain. Some might say our most enduring historical entanglements concern the 'discovery' and claiming of Aotearoa then the development and implementation of our 'founding document'.

Two Treaties with conflicting views

Two conflicting versions of the Treaty were prepared, one in English and one, prepared by Henry Williams, in *te reo Māori* (the Māori language). The English text acknowledged collective Māori *sovereignty* over New Zealand which Māori agreed to cede to the British Crown. The Māori language text on the other hand was much more acceptable to Māori for it only gave the Crown *kawanatanga* (governance) over the land, while according to Consedine and Consedine (2012), promising to Māori "*tino rangatiratanga* (the unqualified exercise of authority) over their lands and villages 'and all their treasures'" (p.88). Māori were also promised *protection* and the same rights and duties of citizenship. To better understand the Māori language treaty we need to understand what preceded it.

From He Whakaputanga to Te Tiriti o Waitangi: A silenced view

During the late 18th century and early 19th century there was increasing interaction between Māori and Europeans who were trading successfully in a range of home-grown and imported commodities (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). This unregulated activity created profits for entrepreneurs on both sides. While valuing their extensive global connections, tribal leaders were intent on being able to determine and effectively manage their affairs. In 1835, to support this, a group of Northern tribal leaders sought and won an alliance gaining protection from King William IV.

The British Resident James Busby requested that Missionary Henry Williams facilitate the drafting of this document, *He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni* (an emergence of [tribal] self determination/highest chieftainship/sovereignty in New Zealand) that became known simply as He Whakaputanga. He Whakaputanga was signed by iwi leaders throughout Northland, Waikato and from Ngāti Kahungunu. It declared Māori tribal sovereignty; that the British would never give law-making powers to anyone else; and this was formally acknowledged by the British (Mutu, 2004; Waitangi Tribunal, 2014).

The Treaty of Waitangi and Te Tiriti o Waitangi

However, despite He Whakaputanga and because of the rapid expansion of immigration, Britain sent William Hobson as consul representing the Crown to negotiate a treaty between the Crown and representatives of Māori (Orange, 1987). According to Moon (1998), Hobson's specific instructions from Lord Normanby and the Colonial Office were to negotiate a treaty that would be fully understood by both sides and with the "free and intelligent consent of chiefs". Moon (1998), contends that Māori "title to the soil and to the sovereignty of New Zealand is indisputable and has been solemnly recognised by the British Government" (p.48). Hobson was to obtain sovereignty only if Māori were willing to cede it, and obtain land only if Māori were not disadvantaged.

While this may have been the intent of those who conceptualised this treaty, the parties who were involved came from quite different views. One could conclude that those representing the Crown were strongly influenced by the beliefs within the Doctrine of Discovery and the resulting colonisation of Aotearoa became a process of the "violent denial of the right of Indigenous peoples to continue governing themselves in their own lands" (Jackson, 2021, p.1).

The Māori text, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, was eventually signed by some 512 Māori over a period of seven months and some 39 Māori signatures were appended to the English version. That is, most Māori signatories had neither seen nor signed the English version. British sovereignty was imposed with both sides operating from different texts, different understandings and different worldviews (Consedine & Consedine, 2012). The Treaty was seen by the coloniser as a transfer of administrative authority from Māori to British control, while Te Tiriti was seen by the Māori signatories as building from a formal declaration of their independence granted in 1835. Te Tiriti was therefore a partnership between two nations. On this basis, iwi leaders undoubtedly understood that their signing would determine how they would continue to care for Māori people and their possessions while the British would take care of the settlers.

The dishonouring of Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Iwi leaders believed that their signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi would enable them, as the Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, to participate equally in future decision-making processes that would help determine Māori futures. However, almost from the point of signing, the relationship between the Crown and Māori has been one of master - servant and neither Treaty has been honoured (Jackson, 2021; Mutu, 2004, 2018). Dishonouring of these Treaties was demonstrated in an 1853 court case, Parata vs The Bishop of Wellington just over a decade later. The presiding judge, Judge Prendergast, declared the Treaty of

Waitangi “a simple nullity” and citing the Doctrines of Discovery he found that the only valid title to land was Crown title (Katene & Taonui, 2018). More recently, the Doctrine of Discovery was cited in the 2003 Foreshore and Seabed case (*Ngati Apa vs Attorney General*) and upheld in the subsequent 2004 Foreshore and Seabed Act (Katene & Taonui, 2018; Ngata, 2019).

Without the protection of Te Whakaputanga or Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the establishment of New Zealand’s first Parliament in 1852, where Māori had no representation, Māori increasingly fell victim to the “democratic” processes of colonisation. Two early notable examples were the New Zealand Settlements Act of 1863 and the Native Lands Act of 1865. However, the systemic diminishing of the rights of Māori was, and continues to be, ongoing and persistent. Consedine and Consedine (2012), conclude that “the colonial history of New Zealand since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 was a history of dishonoured promises, fraud theft and violence against Maori by the government through a process of systematic colonisation” (p. 22).

Undoubtedly, Māori, like other Indigenous peoples globally, suffered grievously from the impact of colonisation, including exposure to disease, confiscation of land, conflict, warfare, linguicide, and disruption to cultural and social structures. At the same time, there continues to be a strong voice from Māori communities calling for autonomy, self-determination, anti-colonisation and decolonisation (Elkington et al., 2020). It is clear that changes must also come through our formal education system given that, as in other countries, racist values and paradigms, unintended or otherwise, are regularly reproduced within the curriculum and through the political and social life of schools (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Penetito, 2010; Pihama & Lee-Morgan, 2019) and into wider society (Berryman, 2022). Since the signing of the Treaty in 1840, these competing discourses and practices, founded on unequal power relations, have continued to pathologise the condition of Māori and these discourses have continued to strengthen.

The influence of colonisation on our schooling system

Like the two versions of The Treaty, the culture of schooling has emerged from two distinctly different views of the world, one that has grown more powerful through the belittlement, overpowering and assimilation of the other. These worldviews have come together in what some refer to as a clash of cultures perpetuated by colonial power imbalances and centuries of talking past each other (Metge & Kinloch, 2014). In Aotearoa, despite Māori having a range of effective methods for knowledge construction and transmission long before colonisation began (Berryman, 2008), it is clear that the mass schooling system arrived with

the early colonial settlers from Great Britain. Western ideology drove settler and societal beliefs with both the structure and culture of schooling in Aotearoa, for Native and settler learners, being set on racialised and deficit beliefs about each other (Penetito, 2010). An important feature became known as the Factory Model of schooling and this continues unabated in its many guises to privilege very few Māori while undermining most.

Factory Model of Schooling

Large formal schools were first introduced in Prussia in the early nineteenth century, when the responsibility for education moved from families to that of the state (Melton, 2001). The Prussian system introduced compulsory attendance, specific training for teachers, national testing and a prescribed national curriculum for each grade level – factors which have remained features of mass schooling across the Western world. The underlying philosophy was that learning should be a regimented activity that occurs in ages and stages. According to Penetito (2004), Aotearoa was an early adopter of mass schooling, and "from its inception took on board a set of 'values', 'ideals' and 'standards', more or less coherent with the cultural history of Britain and Europe, that had evolved over several hundred years" (p. 90).

Within mass schooling, education ceased being a family-based activity and became impersonal, efficient, and standardised. Learners were placed in grades according to age, and moved through successive grades as they mastered the curriculum. The term 'factory model of schooling' was adopted to describe this system (Callahan, 1962; Labaree, 2010; Leland & Kasten, 2002) and, in the early stages of industrialisation, it was a term used with pride. In 1916, an influential educator E. Cubberly (cited by Kliebard, 1971) said: ''our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life'' (p.75).

Sleeter (2015) suggests that "core practices and structures for this purpose, still used today, include grouping students by age, distributing them into 'egg crate' buildings, standardising curriculum, measuring student learning for purposes of comparison, and standardising teacher work" (p.112). She reports many criticisms of the model, highlighting three in particular. Firstly, she suggests the model is "highly inequitable, reproducing social stratification based on race and class" (p.112). Murphy and Zirkel (2015) concur, asserting that learners who are more disadvantaged than others in this system are "stigmatized students of color" (p. 28). Meyer (2001) and Morris (2002) suggest those with special learning needs are another disadvantaged group. Sleeter's (2015) second point is, "its curriculum is standardised, based on a White upper-middle class worldview that limits perspectives, funds of knowledge, and intellectual inquiry, and bores the diverse students in

schools" (p.113). And, her third, it is "oriented around compliance with and maintenance of the status quo, rather than social transformation" (p. 114).

In Aotearoa, the impact of the factory model of schooling on Māori students has been particularly disadvantageous (Pihama & Lee-Morgan, 2019). Compulsory mass schooling was imposed with little evidence of consultation with the Māori population. This, despite the Māori population then, considerably outnumbering the non-Māori population. As Pihama and Lee-Morgan (2019) say:

> Education was both a target and tool of colonialism, destroying and diminishing the validity and legitimacy of Indigenous education, while simultaneously replacing and reshaping it with an 'education' complicit with the colonial goals. Schooling as a colonial structure served as a vehicle for wider imperialist ideological objectives (p. 21).

While pride in the 'factory model of schooling' is no longer part of our rhetoric, there remains a residual theme of pride in schools' efficiency and effectiveness in shaping students to meet goals of the State-mandated achievement outcomes for students (Eley & Berryman, 2020).

The Ka Hikitia strategy

Our collective opportunity and responsibility to change this system to ensure that Māori students enjoy and achieve educational success as Māori was clearly outlined in the launch of a major and ground-breaking strategy and vision: *Ka Hikitia: Managing for Success 2008-2012* (Ministry of Education, 2008). This strategy challenged educators to collaboratively focus on making the difference by ensuring that Māori students, "in their early years and first years of secondary school are present, engaged and achieving, and strong relationships with educators, whānau and iwi are supporting them to excel" (p.5). The term Ka Hikitia, defined as a means to "'step up', 'lift up', or lengthen one's stride'" (Ministry of Education, 2008, p.10), was positioned as "a call to action" (p.11) in order to step up "the performance of the education system to ensure Māori [students] are enjoying education success as Māori" (p.10). For the first time, rather than problematising Māori students and whānau, this was an attempt to prepare the system to work more effectively with and for Māori. Within this strategy was a challenge to educators, communities and the education system itself to step up so as to more effectively ensure the potential of its Māori learners. However, our failure to achieve these aspirations saw this strategy refreshed and relaunched as *Ka Hikitia: Accelerating Success 2013–2017.* The Ministry of Education (2015) identified this as "our strategy to rapidly change how the education system performs so that all Māori students gain the skills, qualifications and knowledge they need to enjoy and achieve

education success as Māori" (p.9). At the time the Ministry website spelled out that, when this vision is realised, all Māori students will:

- have their identity, language and culture valued and included in teaching and learning, in ways that support them to engage and achieve success;
- know their potential and feel supported to set goals and take action to achieve success;
- experience teaching and learning that is relevant, engaging, rewarding and positive, and;
- have gained the skills, knowledge and qualifications they need to achieve success in *te ao* (the world) Māori, New Zealand and the wider world.

The effectiveness of Ka Hikitia was evaluated by the Office of the Auditor General who concluded that: "overall, I found reason to be optimistic that Ka Hikitia will increasingly enable Māori students to succeed" (Office of the Auditor-General, 2013, p.7). The Auditor General reported that Ka Hikitia holds the potential for making a difference for Māori because it "reflects the interests and priorities of Māori well, is based on sound educational research and reasoning, is widely valued throughout the education system, and has Māori backing" (p.7).

However, the report was critical about the launch and introduction of the policy:

> The Ministry of Education (the Ministry) introduced Ka Hikitia slowly and unsteadily. Confused communication about who was intended to deliver Ka Hikitia, unclear roles and responsibilities in the Ministry, poor planning, poor programme and project management, and ineffective communication with schools have meant that action to put Ka Hikitia into effect was not given the intended priority. As a result, the Ministry's introduction of Ka Hikitia has not been as effective as it could have been. (Office of the Auditor-General, 2013, p.7)

The report was also critical of the loss of opportunity for transformation, seeded within the Ka Hikitia policy but never realised: "There were hopes that Ka Hikitia would lead to the sort of transformational change that education experts, and particularly Māori education experts, have been awaiting for decades. Although there has been progress, this transformation has not yet happened" (Office of the Auditor-General, 2013, p.7).

We are currently in the third iteration of this strategy Ka Hikitia - Ka Hāpaitia (Ministry of Education, 2020), launched in 2020, therefore, it is timely to understand and review our influence as educators on the schooling of Māori today.

The outcomes of colonial schooling on Māori today

Today, most learners in Aotearoa are educated through the country's state schooling system. Under the Education Act, enrolment in a State school is both a right: "every domestic student is entitled to free enrolment and free education at any State school during the period beginning on the student's fifth birthday and ending on 1 January after the student's 19th birthday" (Education and Training Act, 2020, s 3), and a compulsion: Every domestic student must, during the period beginning on the student's sixth birthday and ending on the student's sixteenth birthday, be enrolled at a registered school (Education and Training Act, 2020, s 3). The curriculum can be accessed through English (English medium) or Māori (Māori medium). Māori medium involves Māori language immersion levels 1-2 which requires teaching the curriculum for at least 53 percent of the time through Māori language (Ministry of Education, 2022a). Māori immersion level 1 (81-100% immersion) are likely to be mainly Kaupapa Māori pathways.

According to StatsNZ (2022) Māori made up about 17.1% of the national population in 2021, however, in schooling they make up 25.02% (Ministry of Education, 2022c) with only 3% in Māori medium. Unfortunately, according to Education Counts, 5.1% of Māori learners are stood down or suspended from schooling before their sixteenth birthday, a further 0.5% of Māori learners are excluded or expelled and 57% of learners ending up in Alternative Education settings identify as Māori. In addition, 51% of all early leaving exemptions approved in 2021 were granted to Māori learners aged 15 or younger (Ministry of Education, 2022c). Add to this the National Certificates of Education Achievement (NCEA) data (Ministry of Education 2022b), which continues to position Māori students in English medium schools as the lowest achievers at every level, and our current story becomes even more alarming. Rather than Ka Hikitia achieving a level of ōritetanga for Māori learners, we are failing, yet another generation of Māori learners.

Achievement of Kaupapa Māori learners

The Kaupapa Māori learning pathway has always told a significantly more positive achievement story. For example, pre-Covid 19, 79% of learners in Kaupapa Māori gained National Certificate of Education Achievement (NCEA) Level 2 while only 64%, less than two thirds of Māori, gained NCEA across the wider State sector. This trend continues across all NCEA levels (News Hub, 2023, April 30). However, while Māori medium has seen substantial funding and growth this decade, in 2023 the Kaupapa Māori Waitangi Tribunal's claim for more equitable funding for their own parallel pathway continues (News Hub, 2023, April 30). Graham Smith challenges us to consider the extent to which their claim has been

forced on Kaupapa Māori as the result of ignorance or ignoring. It is clear from the evidence above that despite our treaty agreements and policies that have the potential to make a difference, the State continues to fail disproportionate numbers of Māori learners. We also know that there are other learners being minoritised by a system that was arguably, set up to help them reach their potential. This will not change if we continue to silence or ignore intentional political acts-of-power that have occurred throughout our shared history. The roots of this silencing may well be in the Racial Contract discussed by Mills (1997); a contract that he suggests, guarantees and regulates a social contract which designates economic, social and political privileges based on race.

Settler silencing

Mills (1997) suggests this Racial Contract demonstrates and reinforces the tenacity of racial inequality. He argues that a sociopolitical system of white supremacy allows whiteness to ignore the impact of historical racial injustice. Furthermore, Mills asserts that white normative assumptions about the superiority of the white race have been used to legitimate colonisation and the subjugation of indigenous people across the world. Bonnett (1998) contends that as the terms European-ness and whiteness became synonymous; the construct of whiteness expanded from a marker of status for an elite few, to a racial identity for all settlers, regardless of class, which represented white Britishness in colonised countries such as Aotearoa.

In relating this to the education system in Aotearoa, MacDonald (2018) argues that a "settler manifestation" (p.v) of the Racial Contract operates through systems, structures and processes of silencing. She contends that silencing is a racial discourse consistent with state ideologies about biculturalism that support ignorance. Terruhn (2015) suggests that the fundamental argument against the idea of acknowledging the past is that in settler societies, becoming postcolonial cannot be tantamount to anti-colonisation. Likewise, MacDonald (2018) infers that the state narrative of biculturalism, widely endorsed within schools through policy, promotes the rhetoric of congenial, settler-colonial race relations by denying violent settler histories of colonisation and their ramifications to the present day. Kidman, Ormond and MacDonald (2018) espouse that the New Zealand education system is based on a Settler Contract that aims to codify a system of settler domination. They adduce that historical and cultural fugue[1] is diligently built into the policy, curriculum and pedagogy of schooling in order to maintain ignorance about the structuring effects of colonisation. Milne (2017) highlights the 'hidden curriculum' making connections between ideologies,

[1] fleeing from your own identity in an attempt to develop a new one.

institutional structures and classroom interactions with the maintenance of state control thus extending this construct of silencing. She contends that this occurs through processes that privilege, protect and reinforce a national identity of oneness yet perpetuates social inequalities.

Connecting some dots

Changes to our historical relationship under our Treaties may well have been signalled in 2010 when the New Zealand Government announced its support for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. However, like the three events that we conclude this paper with, we question how effectively these events were shared more widely, especially with others who would need to take up influential roles such as educators and representatives on school boards. In maintaining silence we wonder how power is continuing to influence fugue; for Māori but also beginning to influence fugue for non Māori.

Event 1: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)

The 46 articles of UNDRIP cover all areas of human rights including equality and non-discrimination, protection of lands, culture and linguistic identity, and self-determination. Article 37 specifically relates to the honouring of treaties. In international law where there is any ambiguity between versions of a treaty the *contra proferentem principle* applies, which means that a decision is made against the party that drafts the document and the indigenous language text takes preference.

It is important to note that this happened at a time when the first Ka Hikitia policy was introduced and as many educators were voicing their concerns about not understanding their responsibilities within a policy that called for Māori enjoying education success as Māori. Despite some research and professional development to understand the implications of Ka Hikitia (Berryman, 2016; Berryman, Eley & Copeland, 2017; Berryman et al., 2016), Māori language and iconography were largely used less critically in many schools; as brown frills so that Māori learners could see themselves in their learning environments. Unfortunately while the brown frills might have pleased the uninitiated, Māori learners could feel the lack of authenticity in this response; despite the auditing of Ka Hikitia our combined failure to implement two iterations of this policy caused barely a stir and as a nation we moved on. Intergenerational harm to Māori was silenced and we turned our policy focus to Investing in Education Success: a bold step for all learners (Education Gazette Editors, 2014); our response would be evidence driven and for all learners not just Māori.

Event 2: Education Summit 2018 - Kōrero Mātauranga

In 2018 the Ministry of Education hosted two education summits to lay the foundation for the future of learning in Aotearoa over the next 30 years. Hearing the voices of groups previously unheard; students, whānau, Māori, Pacifica, people with disabilities, employers, were explicitly emphasised. In his opening address the then Minister of Education (Hipkins, 2018) was educationally connected, clear and persuasive:

> We want a high quality public education system that provides all New Zealanders with lifelong learning opportunities so that they can discover and develop their full potential, engage fully in society, and lead rewarding and fulfilling lives…

He concluded:

> We want these Summits to give us a strong, clear, and ambitious vision for the future of New Zealand education.
>
> One that will help guide us as, together, we go from good to great by building the world's best education system.
>
> We also want you to leave here as the guardians of, and advocates for, that vision. In your institutions, your schools, in your communities and workplaces, and with your friends and colleagues.
>
> This is your chance to set the future for New Zealand education.

It is unclear what these previously unheard voices would identify, from their own aspirations, as being present across the system today. Teachers appear to be more concerned with the changes to the curriculum or NCEA while school leaders might identify the changes to their reporting requirements. Few identify how UNDRIP article 37 was used to signal potentially the most major change across the system and how these initiatives could be all interconnected.

Event 3: 2020 Education and Training Act

Through the Education and Training Act, Section 127 now requires schools, through their Boards, to give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi by:

- working to ensure its plans, policies and local curriculum reflect local tikanga Māori, mātauranga Māori and te ao Māori
- taking all reasonable steps to make instruction available in tikanga Māori and te reo Māori
- achieving equitable outcomes for Māori learners.

In addition, a primary objective of all school Boards is to take all reasonable steps to eliminate racism, stigma, bullying, and any other forms of discrimination within the school.

By the Act now explicitly referring to Te Tiriti o Waitangi we have a different set of principles to contend with. Phase 3 of Ka Hikitia - Ka Hāpaitia was also launched and although these two events could significantly impact schooling for Māori, the silence by which they have been socialised across the system has been deafening. Although school leaders are now having to report against the National Education Learning Priorities (NELPs) the extent to which these events interconnect is unclear.

Conclusion

Today, Māori comprise approximately 17 percent of the total population, with 26 percent of Māori being under the age of 15. This is a significant and increasing proportion. As in other colonised countries, Western dominance has resulted in the over-representation of Māori in almost all of our nation's negative social indicators and this undoubtedly remains a major national challenge. This has resulted in many responses - some well-intentioned and others guided by spurious objectives - to 'fix the Māori problem'. The resulting deficit pathologising, particularly within the state's education system, continues to have a devastating impact on Māori youth. In the formal education system, principles derived from colonial images have served to guide teachers' actions and explain the basis for those actions. From this pattern of images and principles, education policies and rules of practice were developed that required Māori students to metaphorically leave their culture at the school gate in order to participate in education (Bishop & Berryman, 2006); to show tolerance of, or be forcibly removed by a system that does not want to hear them (Berryman et al., 2023). Indigenous languages, values, beliefs and practices have been given little or tokenistic space within classrooms and State schools in Aotearoa. This has resulted in the education provided by the state playing a major role in destroying Māori language and culture and undermining the mana and identity of Māori as Māori; many Māori turning to other identities for affirmation. The historical experience received from the Crown's response to the Treaty of Waitangi for Māori has seen the intentional imposition of the colonial worldview and the belittlement of their own. The Crown's half of the partnership has continued to receive greater privilege while Māori have continued to have their own knowledge, identity and ways of being in the world minoritised and undermined.

Perhaps if the hearts and minds of our nation were able to hear both sides of our stories and be able to join the dots for themselves rather than being told what to do, then we might move past the rhetoric of honouring The Treaty of Waitangi to a point where we can reconcile our differences and begin to understand what implementation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi

requires. When this happens, the principles from Te Tiriti, of *kāwanatanga* (governance and more recently co-governance), *tino rangatiratanga* (ability to exercise authority) and *ōritetanga* (interdependent relationships, bringing rights and responsibilities to both groups) could provide a better roadmap for a relationship based on understanding and respecting each other.

Perhaps a better future begins with each of us taking personal responsibility to understand and acknowledge our histories, how binding agreements unravelled and undertakings were undermined through colonisation. This ruthless and one sided process generated a legacy of inequity that is inconsistent with a society that outwardly claims to value fairness and equal opportunity. Exploring how colonisation has privileged some voices while silencing others can be uncomfortable but is essential if we are to stop talking past each other and enter into a national conversation to ‘re-right’ our histories and relationships. We conclude that rather than the factory model of education that provides a common education of assimilation for all who can keep up; a Tiriti o Waitangi model of education would, at the very least, invite us all to bring our own cultural toolkit into schooling as foundational to further learning.

Reform requires taking seriously the personal and public responsibility to use power, privilege and position to promote social justice and enlightenment for the benefit of society as a whole. This requires spaces to understand and reconcile how the colonial history of our country has been intentionally manipulated so that some discourses are amplified to normalise cultural bias, blindness to difference, fugue and historical amnesia. Once we know and understand these factors, as educators, as whānau and as members of wider society, implementation towards our shared humanity, may finally be in our hands.

References

Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR) (1862). Native schools. Reports of inspectors, (E-No.4) https://atojs.natlib.govt.nz/cgi-bin/atojs?a=d&d=AJHR1862-I.2.1.6.4&e=-------10--1-----0--

Berryman, M. (2008). *Repositioning within indigenous discourses of transformation and self-determination*. [Doctoral thesis]. University of Waikato Research Commons. https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/2565

Berryman, M. (2016). *Kia Eke Panuku: Final Milestone 8.* Unpublished report to Ministry of Education, New Zealand. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Berryman, M. (2022, July 8-10). *Understanding historical events - leaders building stronger future connections for 'all' learners* [Paper presentation]. British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (BELMAS) and Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM) Leadership for Global Citizenship conference.

Berryman, M., Egan, M., Haydon-Howard, J., & Eley, E. (2023, April 13-16). *Triangulating student, teacher and family perceptions to guide theory-based reform for engaging Indigenous students* [Paper presentation] *AERA Conference,* Chicago.

Berryman, M., Eley, E., & Copeland, D. (2017). Listening and learning from rangatahi Māori: The voices of Māori youth. *Critical Questions in Education (Special Issue), 8*(4), 476–494.

Berryman, M., Eley, E., Ford, T., & Egan, M. (2016). Going beyond the personal will and professional skills to give life to Ka Hikitia. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice, 30*(2), 56–68.

Binney, J., & Chaplin, G. (1986). *Ngā morehu: The survivors.* Oxford University Press.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Dunmore Press Ltd.

Bonnett, A. (1998). Who was white? The disappearance of non-European white identities and the formation of European racial whiteness. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(6), 1029-1055.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. University of Chicago Press.

Chapple, S., Jefferies, R., & Walker, R. (1997). *Maori participation and performance in education: A literature review and research programme.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2012). *Healing our history.* Penguin Books.

Davenport, F. G., & Paullin, C. O. (1917). *European treaties bearing on the history of the United States and Its dependencies.* (Vol. 1). Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Durie, M. (1998) (2nd ed.), *Whaiora: Māori Health Development.* Oxford University Press.

Education and Training Act (2020). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2020/0038/latest/LMS280244.html

Education Gazette Editors. (2014, May 5). Investing in education success: A bold step for all.

Elkington, B., Jackson, M., Kiddle, R., Mercier, O. R., Ross, M., Smeaton, J., & Thomas, A. (2020). *Imagining decolonisation*. Bridget Williams Books.

Eley, E. & Berryman, M. (2020). Paradigm Lost: The loss of bicultural and relation-centred paradigms in New Zealand education and ongoing discrepancies in students' experiences and outcomes. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education, 25:* 95-114 DOI: https://doi.org/10.26686/nzaroe.v25.6962

Harjo, S. S. (2014). *Nation to Nation: Treaties between the United States & American Indian Nations*. Smithsonian Books.

Hill, R. S. (2005). Crown-rangatiratanga relations in the 20th century. Stout Research Centre for New Zealand studies.

Hipkins, C. (2018, May 5). *From good to great: Building the world's best education system together* [Paper presentation]. Education Summit 2018 0 Kōrero Mātauranga.

Hunn, J. (1961). *Report on The Department of Māori Affairs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.

Jackson, M. (2019). He tohu: Interview with Moana Jackson. [interview transcript], Youtube He Tohu website, accessed 13 May 2020.

Jackson, M. (2021, May 9). *Decolonisation and the stories in the land*. E-tangata. https://e-tangata.co.nz/comment-and-analysis/moana-jackson-decolonisation-and-the-stories-in-the-land/

Katene, S., & Taonui, R. (2018). *Conversations about Indigenous rights: The UN declaration of the rights of Indigenous People and Aotearoa New Zealand.* Massey University Press.

Kidman, J., Ormond, A., & MacDonald, L. (2018). Everyday hope: Indigenous aims of education in settler-colonial societies. In J. E. Petrovic & R. M. Mitchell (Eds.), *Indigenous philosophies of education around the world* (pp. 228-245). Routledge.

King, M. (1977). *Te Puea: A Biography*. Hodder and Stoughton.

King, M. (1992). Between Two Worlds. In G. Rice (Ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (pp 285-307).Oxford University Press.

King, M. (1997). *Ngā iwi o te motu, 100 years of Māori history*. Reed.

Kliebard, H. (1971). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In V. Haubrich (Ed.), *Bureaucracy and schooling* (pp. 74–93). ASCD.

Labaree, D. F. (2010). How Dewey lost: The victory of David Snedden and social efficiency in the reform of American education. In *Pragmatism and modernities* (pp. 163–188). Brill Sense.

Lange, R. (1999). *May the people live: A history of Māori health development 1900 – 1920*. Auckland University Press.

Leland and Kasten (2002)Leland, C. H., & Kasten, W. C. (2002). Literacy education for the 21st century: It's time to close the factory. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *18*(1), 5–15.

MacDonald, L. (2018). *Silencing and institutional racism in settler-colonial education*. [Doctoral thesis].Victoria University.

Marriott, L., & Alinaghi, N. (2021). Closing the gaps: An update on indicators of inequality for Māori and Pacific people. *Journal of New Zealand Studies* NS32, 2-39.

Melton, J. van H. (2001). *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Metge, J., & Kinloch, P. (2014). *Talking past each other!?* (2nd ed.). Te Herenga waka University Press.

Meyer, L. H. (2001). The impact of inclusion on children's lives: Multiple outcomes, and friendship in particular. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *48*(1), 9–31.

Miller, R. J., Ruru, J., Behrendt, L., & Lindberg, T. (2010). *Discovering indigenous lands: The doctrine of discovery in the English colonies*. Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract.* Cornell University Press.

Milne, A. (2017). *Coloring in the white spaces: Reclaiming cultural identity in whitestream schools.* Peter Lang.

Ministry of Education. (2008) *Ka Hikitia-Managing for success: The Māori education strategy 2008-2010*. Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2015). *Ka Hikitia-Accelerating success: The Māori education strategy 2013-2017.* Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2020). *Ka Hikitia - Ka Hapaitia - The Maori education strategy refresh.* Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2022a). *Māori language in schooling.* https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/maori-language-in-schooling

Ministry of Education. (2022b). *School leaver's attainment.* *https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/school-leavers*

Ministry of Education. (2022c). *Stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions from school.* https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/stand-downs,-suspensions,-exclusions-and-expulsions

Moon, P. (1998). *Hobson: Governor of New Zealand 1840-1842*. David Ling Publishing.

Morris, S. (2002). Promoting social skills among students with nonverbal learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *34*(3), 66–70.

Murphy, M., & Zirkel, S. (2015). Race and belonging in school: How anticipated and experienced belonging affect choice, persistence, and performance . *Teachers College Record, 117*(120304), 1-40.

Mutu, M. (2004). The humpty dumpty principle at work: the role of mistranslation in the British settlement of Aotearoa He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni and The Declaration of Independence, in Fenton, S. (Ed.), *For better or for worse: translation as a tool for change in the Pacific*. St Jerome.

Mutu, M. (2018). Behind the smoke and mirrors of the Treaty of Waitangi claims settlement process in New Zealand: No prospect for justice and reconciliation for Māori without constitutional transformation. *Journal of Global Ethics, 14*(2), 208–221.

News Hub. (2023, April 30). *Why Kura Kaupapa is telling government it needs equitable funding, doesn't want to be assimilated into mainstream.* [Video]. News Hub. https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/politics/2023/04/why-kura-kaupapa-is-telling-government-it-needs-more-funding-doesn-t-want-to-be-assimilated-into-mainstream.html

Ngaamo, R. (2019). Through the eyes of whānau: Destruction of cultural identity through education. Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Waikato.

Ngata, T. (2019, June 1). *James Cook and the Doctrine of Discovery: 5 things to know. The Non-Plastic Maori.* https://thenonplasticmaori.wordpress.com/2019/06/01/james-cook-and-the-doctrine-of-discovery-5-things-to-know/

Office of the Auditor-General. (2013). *Education for Māori: Implementing Ka Hikitia: Managing for success*. https://oag.parliament.nz/2013/education-for-maori/docs/education-for-maori.pdf

Openshaw, R., Lee, G., & Lee, H. (1993). *Challenging the myths: Rethinking New Zealand's educational history.* Dunmore Press.

Orange, C. (1987). *The treaty of Waitangi.* Allen & Unwin.

Penetito, W. (2004). Research and context for a theory of Maori schooling. *Intercultural Communication*, 89–109.

Penetito, W. (2010). *What's Māori about Māori education?: The struggle for a meaningful context*. Victoria University Press.

Peterson, E., Davies, C., Osborne, D., & Sibley, C. (2016). Teachers' explicit expectations and implicit prejudiced attitudes to educational achievement: Relations with student achievement and the ethnic achievement gap. *Learning and Instruction*, 42. 123-140.

Pihama, L., & Lee-Morgan, J. (2019). Colonization, Education, and Indigenous Peoples. *Handbook of Indigenous Education*, 19–27.

Pool, I. (1991). *Te iwi Maori: A New Zealand population past, present and projected.* Auckland University Press.

Ramsay, P. D. K. (1972). A question of control: The administration of Māori schools. *NZJES, vol. 7, no. 2*, (pp. 119-129).

Simon, J. (1992). European style schooling for Maori: The first century. *Access Contemporary issues in Education.* 11(2) 77-87.

Simon, J. A. (1994). Good intentions but… . *National Education,* 66 (4), 61-65.

Skerrett, M., & Ritchie, J. (2021). Te rangatiratanga o te reo: Sovereignty in indigenous languages in early childhood education in Aotearoa. Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online, 16(2), 250-264. DOI:10.1080/1177083X.2021.1947329

Sleeter, C. (2015). Multicultural Education vs. Factory Model Schooling. In H. Baptiste, A. Ryan, B. Arajuo, & R. Duhon-Sells (Eds.), *Multicultural education: A renewed paradigm of transformation and call to action* (pp. 111–130). Caddo Gap Press. https://www.academia.edu/16483957/Multicultural_Education_vs._Factory_Model_Schooling

Spoonley, P. (1990). State: policy and Practice. Racism and Ethnicity, (Second Edition), Auckland, Oxford.

StatsNZ. (2022). *Education.* https://www.stats.govt.nz/topics/education

Stenhouse. J. (1996). A disappearing race before we came here: Doctor Alfred Kingcome Newman, the dying Māori, and Victorian scientific racism. *New Zealand Journal of History,* Vol. 30, No. 2.

TedxTalks. (2015, June 18). *Mana: The power in knowing who you are* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qeK3SkxrZRI

Terruhn, J. (2015). *Being Pākehā: White settler narratives of politics, identity, and belonging in Aotearoa/New Zealand* [Doctoral dissertation] University of Auckland.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). (2007). https://social.desa.un.org/issues/indigenous-peoples/united-nations-declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples#:~:text=It%20establishes%20a%20universal%20framework,specific%20situation%20of%20indigenous%20peoples.

Waitangi tribunal. (2014) *He whakaputanga me te tiriti, the declaration and the treaty, The Report on Stage 1 of the Te Paparahi o Te Raki Inquiry.* Legislation Direct

Walker, R. (2016), Reclaiming Māori education. In J. Hutchings & J. Lee-Morgan (Eds.), *Decolonisation in Aotearoa: Education, research and practice* (p.19-38Press.

Watson, B. A. (2010). The impact of the American Doctrine of Discovery on native land rights in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. *Seattle UL Rev.*, *34*, 507.