

RESEARCH AND CONTEXT FOR A THEORY OF MAORI SCHOOLING

WALLY PENETITO *Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand*

ABSTRACT. This paper argues the case for introducing a Maori context for learning into mainstream schooling in New Zealand. Up to now, the system has only responded in minimal terms to such demands. The Education Amendment Bill currently before parliament and the National Administrative Guidelines have called for a new level of commitment from schools in relation to their consultation and delivery to Maori communities. This new commitment, it is argued, needs to begin with the philosophical debate to clarify what a 'Maori context' might mean. There is a need to move beyond the limitations of resistance to domination by Pakeha (New Zealanders of European origin) (Smith, 1992), and to engage in those practices that Maori¹ perceive as being "worthwhile fighting for" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998). A specific theory of schooling is suggested.

ÉLABORATION ET CONTEXTE D'UNE THÉORIE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT MAORI

RÉSUMÉ. Dans cet article, l'auteur défend l'idée de l'établissement d'un contexte d'apprentissage maori dans les programmes d'enseignement régulier en Nouvelle-Zélande. À ce jour, les autorités n'ont guère donné suite à cette proposition. Dans le projet de modification de la loi sur l'éducation dont est actuellement saisi le parlement néo-zélandais ainsi que dans les lignes directrices administratives nationales du pays, on préconise l'adoption par les écoles d'une politique renouvelée de consultation et d'intégration des collectivités maories. Avant d'élaborer cette nouvelle politique, il faut selon l'auteur tenir un débat philosophique sur ce que peut signifier un « contexte maori ». Les Maoris doivent adopter une démarche qui dépasse la simple résistance à la domination des Pakehas, c'est-à-dire des Néo-zélandais d'origine européenne (Smith, 1992), et préserver les coutumes auxquelles ils attachent de l'importance (Hargreaves et Fullan, 1998). Une théorie d'enseignement spécifique est proposée.

BACKGROUND

The values that underlie virtually everything in the current New Zealand education system are those which owe their allegiance to Western capitalist, secular, conflict-oriented history and philosophy. In Maori terms, these are the main labels that identify Pakeha culture. They have their roots in ancient Greece, in Rome and Jerusalem, in the Renaissance, in the eighteenth century period of Enlightenment, in what Weber refers to as the Protestant ethic, in the emergence of the Industrial Revolution, and in the creation of commercial classes. Out of this history comes a genius which Mazrui (1986, p. 263) refers to as "Europe's spirit of organization". Nineteenth century European colonising nations had a great deal of practice in ensuring their cultural, economic and political biases became rapidly embodied in the members of host societies wherever they chose to put down roots (Adams, 1977; Moorehead, 1979; Willinsky, 1998).

From its inception, the education system in New Zealand 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. These are essentially the same values for the public and private sectors, although emphasis or priority may vary from one area to another. What these values actually are is a matter of conjecture but again, through Maori eyes, they seem consistently to reflect ideals like the priorities of individualism, self-governance and impersonal bureaucratic administration. These values and ideals revolve around the right to private property, the nuclear family, evidence and due process, and are deeply embedded in middle-class Pakeha society and embodied in the populace at large, defining who we are as New Zealanders.

Most Maori have few problems, if any at all, with these ideals. What they object to, when they do, is the imposition of these ideals on them and the subsequent diminution of their own values. The right of Pakeha to hold fast to these ideals is not challenged, but to incorporate them into all walks of life *as though* they were universally accepted and approved is considered by Maori to be both Euro-centric and cognito-centric. The education system has played a crucial role in acculturating Maori children and their families into accepting these ideals as being right and proper for them.

The problem has not been one of simply proselytising one set of ideals until they replace the original. There has also been the accompanying perceived need to quash the 'oppositional' set of ideals, to ridicule and even legally prohibit their use, and in so doing to diminish the people and their culture as a whole. The Tohunga Suppression Act (1907),² the symbolic acts of violence against using the Maori language (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986), and the driving of Maori away from their traditional marae or institutional base have not been random acts of unthinking bias, prejudice and ethnocen-

trism, but instead a disturbingly long trail of cultural imperialism and associated institutional racism.

Individualism became opposed to collectivism, self-governance was seen as contradictory to whanau (extended family) autonomy, while the tradition of whitiwhiti korero (the nature of discussion in a meeting house) and runanga (the specific council of leaders) was treated as inferior to the democratic decision-making capability of impersonal bureaucratic administration. Rights to private property could not survive alongside communally-based tenure, while the nuclear family was seen as far more beneficial as an agency for socialisation than the extended family. Responsibility could be tied more easily to biological parents, to increased intimacy for the rearing and supervision of children, and to the private pursuit of well being.³

The dualism of Western thinking is highly frustrating to Maori. An underlying principle of dualism seems to be manicheanism; the priority of the individual is not just a *different* preference to the priority of the collective, it is also a *better* preference. This is the problem of seeing the world made up of 'goodies' and 'baddies' or, as Popper (1977, pp. 29-30) would have it, a world made up of "open societies" and their "enemies", the latter, presumably, belonging to "closed societies".⁴ It is astonishing that scholars such as Popper do not see the basic contradictions in their own claims about 'rationalism'; if you cannot or will not be like me, you must be against me.

The early colonists certainly perceived Maori tribalism as being sufficiently developed technologically, aesthetically and in terms of complexity of social organisation to consider Maori worth sharing the land with, but not to the extent of accepting their "bestly communism" (cited in Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1986, pp. 6-7). This perception persists to this day: in fact, the recently released *Review of the School of Maori Studies* (January 2000)⁵ at Victoria University of Wellington has a recommendation that requires the staff and students of the School who undertake research to "respect the 'tapu' (sacred) nature of tribal knowledge and comply with the protocols of the Human Ethics Committee of the University". The relationship between tribal knowledge and university protocols escapes me when juxtaposed in this way. The two ideas belong in different dimensions. The tribal knowledge that is tapu is not available to university study, which is why it is called tapu knowledge. It is 'closed' to the extent that it is not available to everybody, but it is available to those members of the tribe who want it and have the pre-requisite attributes to access it. History has shown that Maori were prepared to allow Pakeha who could demonstrate their knowledge of Maoritanga (Maori knowledge, language and belief) into the very inner sanctum of tapu knowledge. The remarkable nineteenth century ethnographic work of Elsdon Best (1974/1924), in the midst of the Tuhoe tribe, is testimony to the openness of Maori traditional thinking.

UNDERLYING PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS

This article argues the case for increasing the quantity and quality of 'Maori' knowledge in all New Zealand schools and through such actions creating a context which empowers Maori students and communities without disempowering or disqualifying any other. The Ministry of Education's Revised National Administrative Guidelines⁶ is an appeal for such increases but without the parallel appeal to examine contextual issues. These issues must include factors like the historical relationship between the school and the Maori communities that are serviced by the school; the social and geographical history of the communities in pre-European times; the history of colonialism embedded in local education; and, most critically, a comparison of assumptions underlying Maori/Pakeha philosophies for (a) knowing about the world and beyond, and (b) knowing about oneself and one's place in the world.

These are fundamental questions about *epistemology* (what counts as knowledge); they raise questions about *metaphysics* or first principles and how the universe is structured (*cosmology*); and they ask what it means to be and exist in the world (*ontology*). The third branch of philosophical thought asks questions about what we should value, whose values are more important, what is right and wrong, and how we might know the difference (Kincheloe et al, 2000). Closely associated with the philosophical field of epistemology is *methodology*, and although this is also concerned with how we come to know, it is much more practical in nature. Methodology focuses on how we come to know the world, and the approaches we might use to try to understand our world better (Trochim, 1999).

Theories, policies, practices and strategies to improve Maori education by improving education generally, without addressing the underlying philosophical assumptions such as those mentioned above, are doomed to failure. Planting new regulations and policies without first tilling the soil does little to improve a context which is already barren if not antagonistic to Maori aspirations. That is the challenge the mainstream New Zealand education system has to face up to. To continue in the same vein as has been the practice since the Native Schools Act 1867 will result in the same 'measured' progress for Maori as has occurred up to now. A zero sum ideology is common practice when there is a call to increase, for example, the Maori curriculum base. If we are to schedule more Maori history, what are we to take out of the curriculum? If we must increase the Maori language component, what will it replace?

FRAMING THE PROBLEM

There can be no Maori knowledge production or debate around creating a new schooling context without a rethinking of the sort of research that

would be most appropriate to support this, especially given what is known about the relationship between Maori education and the research that has already been done under that rubric. Historically, the education system has carried out research in the field of Maori education but it has mainly addressed problems relevant to the system rather than to Maori. The research methodologies have been grounded in Western philosophic thought, and the outcomes have been mainly accountable to mainstream theories and policies. Maori education has thus been moulded to fit a mainstream framework rather than a Maori one.

None of this is necessarily surprising for two reasons. There will always be a 'politics of research' because research is always about power – about whose values will be represented in the project (Stanfield, 1985), about what should count as knowledge (Guba & Lincoln, 1991), about the process for conducting research (Bishop, 1996), about whether and how the research findings will be disseminated (Weiss, 1991), and about who should benefit from the research findings (Smith, L.T., 1999). Maori, as a marginalised ethnic minority, have struggled to find a voice in the world of research. A second reason for the lop-sided representation of research in Maori education is that few Maori, historically, have graduated through the universities with research qualifications in education. From a Maori perspective, this is a highly significant point of view despite the rhetoric of scientific, hypothetico-deductive methodologies espoused by researchers, because most research undertaken by non-Maori has not worked to the advantage of Maori. Indeed, as Tahana (1980) has argued, some of the most influential research in the Maori domain did little more than justify the dominant use of deficit theories when researching Maori.

I will argue that it is critical that we begin to research Maori education in its own terms using its own criteria. The burgeoning of what has been referred to as the modern Maori renaissance (Webster, 1998)⁷ represents the ultimate resistance of Maori against the existing system continuing its hegemony over Maori culture through education.

The dramatic response on the part of the education system to the transformations occurring in Maori education represents a failure of nerve. Two recent policy developments are offered as evidence of this uncertainty. Firstly, universal initiatives to 'close the gap' in performance between Maori and non-Maori student achievements; and secondly, attempts to secure forms of modified autonomy in governance as in Memoranda of Understanding between the Ministry of Education and tribal/iwi authorities such as Tuhoë, Ngati Porou and Tuwharetoa. If this is not a failure of nerve, then it most certainly represents a new act of faith. Government departments and ministries have never been noted for enthusiastic action on the advice elicited after consultations with Maori groups.

This is not a dismissive, cynical remark but one with which the writer has had recent national experience, through being involved in a comprehensive educational exercise on behalf of the Crown in consultation with Maori parents and communities. The consultation in which I was the contracted project manager involved a team of government officials charged with three tasks. These tasks were: preparing a discussion document to inform parent, professional and community groups about the nature of the problem facing Maori education (continuing disparities in achievement between Maori and non-Maori); conducting face-to-face consultations with mainly Maori community groups (to ascertain how they perceived the problem in Maori education as well as what they thought needed to be done to rectify the problem); and analysing the consultation data and outlining the key components of a long-term strategic plan to implement change.

In a separate but related initiative, a Maori Education Commission set up by the National/New Zealand First Alliance (1998-2001) reviewed recommendations from major reports on Maori education over the last 20 years. The Commission was understandably critical of the general inaction over many of the recommendations made to improve the system's response to policy and practice in Maori education.

Why is this? Demographically speaking, Maori make up approximately 27% of the total 0-4 age group and approximately 23% of the total compulsory school-age students in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 10). The majority of those at school age attend 'mainstream' educational institutions. This has been the pattern since 1910 (Simon, 1998, p. 134), including the peak periods of the 1930s and 1950s when the Native/Maori Schools were at their most numerous. Not too much can be read into this enrolment pattern since issues of access to any school (during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) depended on where schools were built. Most Maori throughout the 1930-50 period lived in relatively remote parts of the country. The availability of Maori medium schools (over the last 30 years) has structurally determined to a significant degree the choice of schools for Maori parents who wanted their children to be educated through the Maori language and within a Maori system of values. In terms of schooling achievement and under-achievement, there is nothing that I know of that has changed substantially in this relationship over the last 50 years, yet officials are now slowly engaging with community views about how this problem might be remedied.

I have seen nothing that suggests to me that Maori are seriously contemplating establishing a separate nation state. On the contrary, what they seem to be seeking is 'true partnership' in some things (that is, power sharing), 'delegated power' in other areas (that is, where Maori have the majority decision-making influence), and 'absolute control' in those matters that

derive from their ancestral roots. Yet, up to recent times, consultation where officials seemed to have all the authority but little responsibility was the norm.⁸

RESEARCH: CRITICAL SCRUTINY VERSUS EMOTIONAL POLITICS

Some of the key value orientations that differentiate Western research paradigms from ones that see research in Maori education in its own terms need to be explored. The idea of examining variations in value orientations is not new. There are long histories of this type of research in education (Spindler, 1963; Wallace, 1973), but for the purposes of this paper I will restrict myself to those values raised in the review by the Victoria University historian, Professor Emeritus Peter Munz (1999) of Linda Tuhiwai Smith's recent publication, *Decolonising Methodologies – Research and Indigenous Peoples*. In many ways this article highlights the epistemological, ontological and methodological gaps that persist between Maori and Pakeha thinking about the world we cohabit.

The purpose of Linda Smith's text on *Decolonising Methodologies* (1999) is first and foremost "a concern to develop indigenous peoples as researchers" (p. 17). Her beginning point is to contextualise the research already done on indigenous peoples. The opening four chapters of the book are critiques of the context within which Maori and indigenous peoples have been researched. Chapter one opens with the assertion, "Imperialism frames the indigenous experience" (p. 19) and, despite her quotation from Audre Lorde, "The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house", these are precisely the tools Smith uses so skillfully to challenge the knowledge base and the value orientations of Western research in the fields of Maori and indigenous education.

The themes she explores are the familiar ones of the post-colonial, post-modernist writers such as Franz Fanon, Edward Said and Michel Foucault; contemporary indigenous scholars such as Gregory Cajete and Haunani Kay Trask; and Third World authors like Bhikhu Parekh and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. In my view Munz does have some justification in accusing Smith of being "behind the times" in that her critique of "old-fashioned positivism" does not take into account the major contributions of more recent philosophers of science such as Thomas Kuhn, Steve Fuller and especially Karl Popper. These philosophers reject the positivist agenda and its empiricist epistemology in favour of a "critical scrutiny". Following Popper, the crucial role of method is not to confirm, verify or prove scientific theories, but rather to challenge, evaluate and, if possible, refute the "conjectures" normally advanced to explain some state of affairs (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 119). It is this process, according to Munz, that leads to "genuine", "real", "proper", knowledge rather than the knowledge or, more accurately, "sto-

ries"/"narratives" that constitute the "social cement" so necessary for community solidarity which, according to Munz, is Smith's project. Proper knowledge, he claims, is subjected to critical scrutiny.

The British comparative educationist, Brian Holmes (1981, p. 50), describes Popper's criterion for the scientific status of a theory as "its falsifiability, or refutability, or testability". The idea sounds plausible, except that terms like these have to be defined and then interpreted. Indigenous peoples' experiences of this process everywhere point to the fact that the act of defining and interpreting is no longer merely a search to extend knowledge, as Munz would have it, if indeed it ever was so. Rather it is a political act in which imperialist or colonialist outcomes are the goals, tacit or otherwise. Anthropological studies like those of Margaret Mead on Samoans, and Percy Smith and Elsdon Best on Maori attest to the vulnerability of objective social science research.

The context Smith describes begins with the 'big picture' of nineteenth century European imperialism and colonialism and their manifestation in the social scientific research practices of Pakeha on Maori. These relationships are seen to be paralleled with other 'first nations' (indigenous peoples) who have shared the nineteenth century colonial experience. Her thesis is simple and utterly contemporary: despite Western researchers' best intentions, they imposed their perceptions on what they observed and what they heard. None of this is surprising to indigenous peoples, but the pretence that the application of scientific method by Western researchers in some magical way produces "real/genuine/proper" knowledge, to quote from Munz (*op. cit.*), because it is "knowledge that results from disinterested, critical scrutiny of the evidence", is a leap of faith very similar to the idea espoused by Maori that "there is no such thing as Maori knowledge; there is only tribal knowledge". Immersed in the Maori relativist position is an absolutist ethical belief: "we are all entitled to our own interpretation of the truth but collectively, through whitiwhiti korero/dialogue there is some hope for there being an agreed ultimate truth or pono. The realization of ultimate truths is dependent on politics". Munz argues that this knowledge is important as 'social cement' but is pseudo-science because it remains unexposed to criticism and the critical scrutiny of evidence.

In the final analysis, as Carr & Kemmis (1986, p. 216) maintain, "For any educational research study, what might be called a 'political economy' of knowledge is created: certain persons initiate research work, certain persons do the work, certain products are produced, and certain interests are served by the doing of the work and the use of its products". The politics involved in whitiwhiti korero is a dynamic process which calls into question assumptions underlying what counts as knowledge and what is taken for granted. It is a rigorous process conducted publicly. Quality of outcome is ascertained

using criteria like trustworthiness and authenticity rather than the scientific measures of deductive validity and their empirical testability.

Smith's thesis is that indigenous researchers already bring something to the research enterprise: an ontology which is relativist, socially and experientially-based, and supported by a constructivist epistemology where truth linked to context is embedded in the social milieu. The preferred methodology among indigenous researchers is the 'passionate participant'. Although these are the likely value orientations of the indigenous researcher, Smith does not claim that they ought to replace those of the standard scientific research model. Indeed, it is held (p. 191) that the better prepared indigenous researcher will be informed by at least these two world views on the research enterprise. This leaves us with a very difficult question to answer: how is Maori research articulated in a society where structural dominance has existed for more than a hundred years?

THE CONTEXT FOR RESEARCH IN MAORI EDUCATION

In the 1840s, Hone Heke, a famous chief of the northern tribes of New Zealand, knew something was askew when he acted in defiance of British arrogance and demonstrated his opposition to the British imposition of sovereignty by repeatedly chopping down the flagpole supporting the British ensign. The New Zealand Wars of 1845-72 left no doubt that Maori were not about to roll over because of the threats of the might of the British war machine. The Kingitanga Movement (modelled on the British sovereignty to protect the sale of Maori land to early settlers) of the late 1850s had already deduced at that time that the only way Maori could survive intact was for them to develop separately, thus their motto, 'mana motuhake' — spiritual prestige set apart.

Various prophetic movements through the nineteenth century were clearly aware that Pakeha cultural influence had already made powerful inroads into the Maori psyche. The line from the Taranaki haka (tribal posture dance), 'e kore e piri te uku te rino', clay will not stick to iron, was a reminder to their kin to remember they were Maori; the time would come when Western culture (iron) would fall from them and they would return to their Maoritanga (Maori-ness).

By 1928, the anthropologist and university professor Felix Keesing reported a statement attributed to a kaumatua (elder) which went, 'ka ngaro te tangata, ka memene ki tawhiti', lost are the people, dispersed and driven far away. The hopelessness of the struggle among Maori to find a place in the new order of things is clearly articulated in this saying.

The complexity of contextual issues around the so-called 'Maori education problem' is huge enough in itself to create a form of cognitive inertia, or

what Thomas Kuhn (1962) refers to as “paradigm exhaustion”. The establishment of a separate Native Schools System in 1867; compulsory schooling of all children between the ages of six and fifteen (extended to include Maori in 1894); policies of equality of educational opportunity (for example, the creation of denominational secondary schools for Maori); compensatory education provision (Department of Education, 1970); mainstreaming of Maori schools (transferred to state Board control from 1969); a selection of Maori cultural elements into the curriculum (Maori arts and crafts); change of focus from considerations of inputs to equality of outcomes; and increased implementation of Maori medium education have shown, according to Chapple, Jefferies & Walker (1997), that “the education gap in participation and performance between Maori and non-Maori is multi-dimensional. Maori as a group perform less well on average than the rest of society on almost all measurable dimensions” (p. x). Everything seems to have been tried, according to the system, yet equality of performance between Maori and non-Maori is just as critical an issue today as it was several generations ago.

If there has been a glimmer of hope, then the last of these policy initiatives – implementation of Maori medium education – has offered it. Even that statement needs qualification. The pressure for increased Maori medium education has arisen from Maori sources and not the system itself; yet the system is charged with the responsibility of educating ‘all’ children to the best of their abilities. Maori communities have over a long period made claims to the establishment to include their language, knowledge, history and practices into the curriculum.⁹ None of this is new but how can it have taken so long for the system to respond positively to such overpowering good sense? We might suppose that Western knowledge and Maori experience were treated as a hierarchy with the former taken as superior to the latter. As Dewey (in Jackson, 1999) has pointed out, “Western thought has systematically built its structures of social inequality out of this simplistic and spurious dichotomy between reason and experience and we are deeply influenced by it which is why so many educated Westerners believe that their ability to reason, to analyse, and to know endows them with an ability to evaluate, assess, and make decisions on behalf of those who allegedly lack these rational skills and are moved merely by emotion, appetite and instinct”.

Munz will surely be aware that texts on Maori educational research and its methodologies are non-existent outside the two recent publications by Bishop (1996) and Smith (1999). The only other research text in this field I am aware of is by Royal (1992), and it focuses specifically on researching tribal histories and traditions. Yet Munz still thinks it is advisable to take a long knife to a readable, scholarly and useful text on the field of research.

I wonder why? Not even Smith would be too upset with some of his claims, but to what end should they be defended? Is the university facing a philosophical threat? Is research conducted by indigenous researchers on indigenous peoples causing them even greater harm than hitherto? Or is it that indigenous researchers are creating knowledge that is useful in their fields and are making a difference?

Linda Smith clearly follows a different intellectual tradition from Munz, that of being value explicit, and as a social scientist there are many who advocate this principle as a necessary moral as well as methodological stance. One who accepts this view is the internationally acclaimed linguistic scholar Skutnabb-Kangas (1981, p. xiii) who said, "The only kind of objectivity one can aim for is to attempt to describe as openly as possible one's own position and the criteria one has adopted, instead of appearing to be neutral ...". I would go further and say that only those with an intellectual commitment to a discipline and no responsibility beyond the university can afford to espouse a value neutral position on research. Of course, this does not mean such researchers are neutral; what they do is claim that they are objective and again, by another feat of magic, suppose that objectivity is to be preferred to subjectivity. The crucial method for achieving objectivity is to create distance, but social science research is about people: how does one become objective without becoming detached? Detachment is the problem, not objectivity or subjectivity. At least two mystifications seem necessary in the process of prioritising objectivity: firstly, creating a set of concepts, a language that is so abstract that only other research initiates can understand it; and/or, secondly, applying complex mathematical formula to statistical data that must be studied in postgraduate courses before anyone can use them and, even then, not without the appropriate textbook.

Munz also makes it seem that at least two of his international peers, Foucault and Said, are deluded, like Smith. They are champions of the "other" and their interpretations of history or "historiography" as Foucault would have it, are "discourses", as ways of talking, thinking or representing a particular subject or topic that produces meaningful knowledge. Ransom (1997, p. x) argues that "Foucault is a philosopher of *difference*, a theorist and champion of excluded voices and suppressed identities". I cannot see Smith being disturbed by this description of Foucault, indeed, that is most likely to be the reason she, and a large number of others, find his work emancipatory. As to the issue of 'othering', Munz claims that the acquisition of knowledge about a people (for example, indigenous people) through people telling their own stories is "nothing less than emotional politics". Acquisition is not the passive, humanitarian notion Munz would have us believe. A multitude of barbs is revealed when it comes to analysing Western scholarly acquisition of indigenous knowledge, and much of this fits

under the definition of colonialism and imperialism, despite Munz's views to the contrary.

AN EDUCATION 'TO BE MAORI'

The need to evoke new 'gods' is more critical today for Maori than it has ever been. However, it is foolish to believe that after about 150 years of cultural imperialism Maori are seeking a return to the ancient *atua* (gods) for their salvation. For every one who is, there are a thousand who are not; fundamentalism is possible everywhere. The new 'gods' include secular reasoning, scientific objectivity and literacy, and an ecologically sustainable vision of our society and planet. It is about asserting what O'Sullivan (1999, p. 225) describes as "a relational totality" and what Maori have always believed to be the primal matrix, *whakapapa* /genealogy.

If Maori were ever in doubt that they would get a fair deal in New Zealand society, the last almost two decades have completely removed any uncertainty about that. The 'gaps' between 'haves' and 'have nots', between 'rich' and 'poor', between 'those who succeed' and 'those who fail', and between 'Pakeha' and 'Maori' have continued to increase despite a series of what Popper calls "piecemeal interventions" from governments over generations. According to a report from the Ministry of Maori Development (2000, p. 12), six critical factors affect the rate at which Maori economic development can expand. These are: fewer skilled managers, a low capital base, over-reliance on primary commodity exports, less familiarity with information technology, fewer skilled workers and multiple-owned land. Maori are marginalised to the extent that they suffer severely in terms of each of these factors. The report shows significant disparities between Maori and non-Maori in a variety of economic sectors such as employment and income, participation in knowledge-based industries, the percentage of Maori students who leave schools with no formal qualifications, rates of home ownership, and household income distribution, to name but a few.

If there is an emerging educational vision among Maori, it is the desire for an education that enhances what it means to be Maori; so simple and yet so profound. The sentiment behind the vision is encapsulated in the proverb:

He iti pou kapua, ka ngaro; Ka huna tini whetu i te rangi.

(Though a cloud may be small it is sufficient to obscure many stars in the sky)¹⁰

Henare (1995) uses the French statement 'plus être' (to be more) rather than 'plus avoir' (to have more) as the crucial idea behind the current 'Maori renaissance'. Maori would argue that this notion is closer to what they would aspire to as a people than the latter which could be argued is

more the inheritance of Pakeha society, of Western civilisation, of 'developed' nations, of industrialised, modernised, capitalist societies. This does not mean that Maori lack an acquisitive inclination since that is patently not true, as tribalism, disputes over territory and traditional quarrels over boundaries often attest. It is more because of the concept of cultural identity and the loss of language, religion and the symbolic significance of land that the need to 'be more' takes on a priority. The need is deeply rooted in their recent history of being a colonised people. Maori now have comparatively little arable land, their language and knowledge are at a critical stage in terms of survival, and they, as a people, are so thoroughly perplexed in their apparent inability to sustain themselves as a viable entity within the nation state that having more of anything is like temptation for 'forbidden' fruits. These fruits are available to Maori, so it seems, only as long as they accept the hegemony¹¹ of Pakeha culture.

What Maori really want and need are those fruits that originate in Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa, the Pacific Ocean and in Aotearoa, New Zealand. These are the fruits that belong to them and which they have been systematically denied for at least 150 years. This is what it means for Maori today when they assert 'we want to be more Maori'. They want to know their language (te reo Maori). They want their traditional institutions to flourish (the marae, for example). They are hungry to learn about their ancient history as well as their interpretations of colonial history. They are aware their ancestors keenly sought much that belonged to European civilisation; they want to honour that desire with at least the same amount of vigour as their tupuna (ancestors) demonstrated. They want to maintain those aesthetics that derive from the Maori world that make them unique in the world. More than anything else, they do not want to be limited in any way, in terms of where and how they regain these fruits.

With the advent of te kohanga reo (language nests, schools for early childhood), kura kaupapa Maori (Maori philosophy and language immersion primary schools), whare kura (Maori philosophy and language immersion secondary schools) and wananga (Maori tertiary institutions),¹² one could be bemused and bewildered by the way the all-powerful education system has turned its back on providing 'adequate' resources¹³ for the sorts of initiatives I have suggested in the paragraph above. Pakeha teachers and a significant proportion of Maori teachers have habitually steered away from doing anything that was too seriously Maori. Most have been content to do something like talking about the Maori creation stories, visiting a marae (traditional Maori institution), putting down a hangi (traditional cooking method), teaching some well rehearsed waiata (song/poetry) and the odd haka (posture dance), studying 'traditional' Maori ways, and introducing a few greetings and commands in the Maori language. But very few indeed

have done anything remotely Maori that progressed beyond the kindergarten level.

New Zealanders in general might benefit from a deeper cultural understanding of their country, but whether they do or not is not the primary concern of this article. Maori want a deeper understanding of their country in every way possible because to know one's own land intimately is to know oneself. They want the education system to facilitate that desire. Euripides aptly expressed the negation of that desire in 431 BC:

There is no greater sorrow on Earth than the loss of one's own native land.¹⁴

The excuse of the majority for this lack of progression is 'fear': fear of getting it wrong, fear of making a mistake, fear of making fools of themselves and fear of offending Maori. The reason for minimal progress is more sinister and is aligned with ignorance and arrogance rather than fear. The only reason these so-called fears persist is because the majority of Pakeha do not value Maori knowledge and culture themselves; they therefore only consider Maori knowledge and culture to be of exotic interest, as peripheral activities, and a distraction from the main agenda, which in today's world seems to be the identification of the New Zealander in the global market. Politicians will send Maori cultural groups overseas to accompany them in marketing some economic exchange because Maori indigeneity is a 'brand' that is uniquely New Zealand. Of course, Maori groups do not have to accept being patronised, but if you are offered a trip overseas paid for by the tax payer to do 'what comes naturally' and to be feted by international hosts, it seems petulant to refuse on the grounds that your own leadership is exploiting you.

The kaupapa Maori initiatives mentioned above have received substantial public moneys over the almost 20 years of their existence. Nevertheless they are still seriously under-resourced compared with mainstream institutions. The resourcing has not kept pace with the demand. Millions of dollars have been spent and te kohanga reo and the other kaupapa Maori initiatives have blossomed. Politicians and officials have been able to say with hands over hearts that they have been supporting the movement and can prove it. Governments have instituted legislation to enable the creation of kaupapa Maori institutions as well as the protection of their specific educational philosophy, Te Aho Matua. The Ministry of Education has been formally involved in negotiated partnerships with iwi/tribal groups to help create educational capacity at the family, community and regional levels. The Education Review Office has been working with Kura Kaupapa Maori to find a review methodology that sits comfortably with the kura while still fulfilling the Review Office obligations to the Crown. The Ministry of Maori Development has responsibilities to monitor the performance of

government departments and agencies in the delivery of services to Maori. These are all highly important activities and contribute hugely to the success of the kaupapa Maori movement.

IS JUSTICE POSSIBLE?

Early childhood institutions, primary schools, secondary schools and even universities can say, 'We will put up a "Maori option"', but if it is not of a high enough standard or does not have sufficient Maori content, the message to Maori students is, 'Then go to one of these other institutions (kohanga reo, wananga etc.) that does offer what you want'. This all sounds plausible and reasonable, but there are at least two fundamental problems that I can see. Firstly, there are not enough of these 'other' institutions around, that is, there is an access problem. Secondly, this re-direction of Maori clients suggests that the system-in-general, usually referred to as 'mainstream', has only minimal responsibility for nurturing Maori history, language, arts and crafts, knowledge, customs and so on – there is an accountability problem. The quantity of Maori content in the curriculum is determined by what Pakeha deem to be sufficient for the population at large, that is, Pakeha society.

Maori, like all other New Zealanders, have as much right to an education from the system in general as they have to any alternative such as Montessori, Catholic schools, integrated or private schools, or wharekura. Twenty years after the establishment of kohanga reo, most Maori students, by far, still tend to be enrolled in mainstream institutions. Most of those students, it could be argued, choose to be there; it is not a decision by default, although that would be an argument difficult to prove or disprove without empirical research. This point is the crux of the matter in deciding how mainstream educational institutions might respond to contemporary developments in Maori education.

A fundamental premise of this article, then, is that the epistemological foundations of the educational enterprise in New Zealand must, necessarily, incorporate the 'traditions' of Maori as well as Pakeha New Zealand. Without at least these two epistemologies and methodologies in education, we have the privileging of one culture over another. As the subordinate minority, Maori are historically and economically marginalised and as a result experience the ongoing colonisation of their culture. It is not realistic to suggest that the dual epistemologies called for should be equal since the Maori population at the time of the 1996 Census was 14.5% (523,400 people) of the total New Zealand population of 3.62 million people. At that time 83.1% of Maori were urban dwellers, 37% of them under the age of 15 compared with 20% of the non-Maori population (Ministry of Maori Development, 2000, pp. 12-13). The dualism argued for should be based on basic

principles of justice, which according to Strike (1982, pp. 227-228) must be grounded in what it means to be a person. Strike elaborates by referring to Rawls's justice as fairness.¹⁵ What Rawls calls the "difference principle" reads in part: "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged". The principle requires inequalities to work to the benefit of all, particularly the least advantaged members of society. As an example, increasing the volume of Maori language, knowledge, values and so on into the mainstream education system will likely advantage Maori in the short term but will not disadvantage non-Maori in the long term even though there could be resistance at the time of initiation.

The fact that all who call themselves New Zealanders today arrived on these shores on a waka, whether that was on a canoe (the 'Tainui' from Hawaiki), a settler ship, (the 'Tory' from England) or a plane (a Boeing 747 from Samoa) does not alter the fact that when the colonising nation arrived here, Maori were already inhabiting the whole of the country. The fact that the British were from a culture technologically more advanced than the Maori is, in social justice terms, immaterial to that prior fact. The suggestion that the British were a more enlightened nineteenth century colonising nation than some of the other European countries is immaterial. The fact that the British considered the Maori culturally superior to others such as the Australian aboriginal is immaterial. The only thing that is material is that the British took over Aotearoa, made it New Zealand and shaped it in their own image *as though those who were resident did not matter*. The education system, especially through the compulsory years of schooling, must do much better in incorporating a Maori knowledge base through pedagogies based on Maori aspirations. This paper has focused only on the first of these agendas, a Maori knowledge base within an appropriate context.

TOWARDS A THEORY OF SCHOOLING

What is needed in mainstream education, certainly for the compulsory sector, is a theory of schooling. To develop a theory of schooling we will also need theories of knowledge, of pedagogy, of child development, of learning, of assessment and evaluation, of the curriculum, and of community relations. None of this is easy to do but one would expect that a system of schooling that has been centralised, universal and compulsory since 1877 would have a coherent philosophy of education tucked away in a text book somewhere. I suppose kura kaupapa Maori, being a relatively new option, could be expected to have such a theory about itself and indeed they do; Te Aho Matua is the name they give their philosophy and it is a theory of kaupapa Maori schooling.

In considering a 'theory of knowledge', or a 'theory of pedagogy' etc., a consideration of the deep conceptual structures is called for.¹⁶ In a simple version of systems theory, for example, *inputs* like ecological factors (geographical area, parental choice and teacher-pupil ratios), school processes (academic emphasis, rewards and punishments, staff stability and expertise), and intake factors (socio-economic status and ethnicity) must be empirically related to *school outcomes* such as academic attainments, ability to converse and communicate in the Maori language, attendance, participation, acceptable behaviour, enhanced job prospects and so on. To make an empirical distinction between school 'outcomes' (those factors in the experience of pupils that are thought of as the effect or outcome of going to school) and what was done or needed to 'cause' these effects, an explicit 'theory of schooling' has to be developed. Otherwise the 'factors' that are abstracted cannot be said to represent in some faithful way the reality of school.

The reality of schooling as experienced by Maori makes schooling for the majority of them a fundamentally flawed experience to the degree that accusations of educational malpractice (Baugh, 1999) are not over-statements of their reality.

CONCLUSION

What I have to say has an historical dimension but is more about today and tomorrow than about yesterday. The discussion of the development of the Maori medium in the education system has a particular focus on the environment surrounding the emergence of the TKR, which prompted the development of *kura kaupapa* Maori, which in turn led to the creation of *wharekura*, and the re-emergence of *wananga*. The transition was far from being smooth and, indeed, was fraught with frustration and at times despair. The current debate revolves around the strengthening of Maori education in both mainstream and *kaupapa* Maori. The idea of governance issues and the notion of a Maori Education Authority are the most recent developments, but are little more than the manifestation of the continued frustration of Maori to influence the system in a way which gives them an advantage.

A constant thread throughout these developments is a 'politicisation process' where questions of 'representation', 'legitimation' and 'voice' are countered by the rhetoric of a conservative backlash arguing issues of 'separation', 'control' and 'authority'.

The existing education system will never work in the real interests of Maori so long as the central philosophical assumptions of the education system remain entrenched in the Western tradition. The *kura* and *wananga* devel-

opments are premised on the belief that 'Maori have the right to be Maori', that the existing education system will not deliver on that belief to the extent that the majority of Maori in the system will fail to gain an education, and that the only path to redress past and present injustices is to develop a 'separate' system. The focus of the kaupapa Maori initiatives keeps the debate on Maori terms and is both an educational and a political agenda. The majority of Maori students remain in 'mainstream' institutions; the introduction of at least two epistemological traditions into schools, it has been argued, can make a difference in the performance of all students in the New Zealand education system.

NOTES

1. Maori are the indigenous people of New Zealand. Maori is both singular and plural as well as being the name of their traditional language. Pakeha is the term Maori use to describe European New Zealanders who originate from the first colonizing settlers who came mainly from England and Scotland. The term Pakeha is becoming generic among the white population in describing themselves rather than European or New Zealander, although the latter term is common among both Maori and Pakeha who travel overseas and wish to distinguish themselves from the English, Scots, Americans etc.
2. See Durie (1994, pp. 45-46). The Act outlawed "every person who gathers Maoris around him by practising on their superstition or credulity, or who misleads or attempts to mislead any Maori by professing or pretending to possess supernatural powers in the treatment or cure of any disease or in the foretelling of future events".
3. See Donzelot (1980, pp. 93-94) for the way in which the family has been used historically as an object of social policy and intervention.
4. For a useful critique of Popper's brand of manicheanism, see Freeman, 1975.
5. The Wellington *Evening Post*, 13 March 2000 ran the headline 'Review faults Vic's Maori dept.' and the story-line, "Low morale and internal tensions among staff ... have been attributed to the difficulties of trying to uphold two disparate cultural traditions".
6. See Manning, 1999.
7. Webster refers to the Maori Renaissance as a "series of distinguishable social movements (which) began in the economic recession of the late 1960s, in the context of the first major unemployment New Zealand had known since the Depression" (p. 29). The social movements have been marked by ideas like ethnic mobilisation, self identification, ethnic politics, language revitalisation and the rebirth of ideologies of traditionalism. Each one of these ideas has spawned a number of on-the-ground activist 'struggles' most initiated by Maori but many also supported by Pakeha.
8. See Arnstein in Cunningham (1999) for an interesting tool for assessing the inter-related issues of participation and control.
9. See historical texts on Maori education such as Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974; Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; and Simon, 1998.
10. Marangaiparoa (a Maori chief) came to the assistance of Ngati Raukawa (a Tainui tribe) when they were very hard pressed. The latter were appalled at the small number of their allies, whereupon Marangai spoke these words. (Whakatauki – Proverbs, undated).
11. I am using the concept of hegemony as used by Gramsci to mean the exercise of a special kind of power – the power to frame alternatives and contain opportunities, to win and shape consent so that the granting of legitimacy to the dominant group appears not only spontaneous but also natural and normal. See Clarke et al (1982, p. 38) in Hall & Jefferson (eds).

12. The Te Kohanga Reo (TKR) movement began in 1982 in which volunteers who were fluent speakers of Maori, mostly middle-aged and elderly, assembled in their villages and homes to speak only or primarily the Maori language with their pre-schoolers. This was the beginning of the Maori language immersion movement. Most of the speakers were lay people who were familiar with Maori cultural values and practices, and they instituted their own philosophical ways of operating – what is now commonly referred to as 'kaupapa Maori'. Within a few short years, over 500 such kohanga reo (language nests) had sprung up around the country. As these children moved into primary schools, pressure went on the compulsory sector to create Maori language immersion classes then schools. The first kura kaupapa Maori school was established by a group of Maori parents and elders in 1985 and operated outside the Education Act because no such school was defined in legislation. By 1998, 59 such schools are situated around the country, with a further 121 schools offering either immersion or bilingual Maori/English programs. More recently, some kura kaupapa Maori (9) have extended their classes to offer secondary education through immersion Maori and following a kaupapa Maori. These schools are designated wharekura. The first tertiary level kaupapa Maori institution was established in 1978 (Te Wananga o Raukawa) and a further two have emerged, while another three wananga have been established as tertiary private training establishments (see Ministry of Education, 1999).
13. By 'adequate resources', I mean resources sufficient in quality and quantity to turn a potential into a reality and this requires a lot more than just money. Resources include decision-making powers, political will, access to influential persons, flexible work schedules, time, expertise, sound communications, and the capacity to affect other people in a direction which is compatible with their own wishes or preferences. See Rogers, 1974.
14. United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 1991.
15. See Rawls, 1971. This is far too complex a work to discuss in detail here, but an appreciation of his arguments is critical in understanding any liberal education system such as New Zealand's current system.
16. I have borrowed liberally from Michael Young (1983, pp. 29-34) and his critique of *Fifteen thousand hours* for this section.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P. (1977). *Fatal necessity; British intervention in New Zealand 1830-1847*. Auckland/Oxford: Auckland/Oxford University Press.
- Barrington, J.M., & Beaglehole, T.H. (1974). *Maori schools in a changing society – An historical review*. Wellington: NZCER.
- Baugh, J. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves – African American language and educational malpractice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Best, Elsdon (1973). *Tuhoe, children of the mist*. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed (originally printed 1925).
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Deakin University.
- Chapple, S., Jefferies, R., & Walker, R. (1997). *Maori participation and performance in education – A literature review and research program*. Report for the Ministry of Education, May. Wellington: New Zealand Institute of Economic Research.
- Clarke, J., Hall, S., Jefferson, T., & Roberts, B. (1982). Subcultures, cultures and class. In S. Hall, B. Stuart, & T. Jefferson (Eds.), *Resistance through rituals – Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*. London: Hutchinson in Association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies: University of Birmingham.

- Cunningham, C. (1999). A framework for addressing Maori knowledge in research, science and technology. A discussion paper prepared for the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology (June).
- Department of Education. (1972). *Language programmes for Maori children*. Wellington.
- Donzelot, J. (1980). *The policing of families – Welfare versus the state*. London: Hutchinson.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora – Maori health development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, M. (1975). Sociology and utopia: some reflections on the social philosophy of Karl Popper. *British Journal of Sociology*, 26(1), 20-33.
- Guba, Egon E., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1991). What is the constructivist paradigm? In D.S. Anderson & B.J. Biddle (Eds.), *Knowledge for policy: Improving education through research* (pp.158-170). London: Falmer Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there?* Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation. An Affiliate of the Ontario Teachers' Federation.
- Henare, M. (1995). Te Tiriti, te tangata, te whanau : the Treaty, the human person, the family. In International Year of the Family, *Rights and responsibilities*. Papers from the International Year of the Family Symposium on Rights and Responsibilities of the Family, Wellington, 14 -16 October.
- Holmes, B. (1981). *Comparative education: Some considerations of method*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jackson, M. (1999). Refugee experience, displacement, and the critique of cultural fundamentalism. *Sites*, 37, 3-16
- Jenkins, K., & Matthews, K.M. (1995). *Hukarere and the politics of Maori girls' schooling, 1875-1995*. Hukarere Board of Trustees with Te Whanau o Hukarere.
- Keesing, F.M. (1928). *The changing Maori*. London: Thomas Avery & Sons.
- Kincheloe, J.L., Slattery, P., & Steinberg, S.R. (2000). *Contextualising teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manning, R. (1999). History never repeats itself? Colonial historical trends confront National Administrative Guidelines. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 9, 63-81. In I. Livingstone (Ed.), School of Education, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Mazrui, A. (1986). *The Africans – a triple heritage*. London: BBC Publications.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare (1986). *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (Day Break) – Appendix*.
- Ministry of Education (1999). *Nga Haeata Matauranga – Annual Report on Maori Education 98/99 and Direction for 2000*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Maori Development (2000). *Maori in the New Zealand Economy*. 2nd edn. (June). Wellington.
- Moorehead, A. (1979). *The fatal impact – An account of the invasion of the South Pacific 1767-1840*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books in association with Hamish Hamilton.
- Munz, P. (1999). Open and closed research. *New Zealand Books – A review*, 9(5), 6.
- O'Sullivan, E. (1999). *Transformative learning: educational vision for the 21st century*. London: Zed Books.
- Popper, K. (1977/1945). *The open society and its enemies*. Vol.2. *The high tide of prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the aftermath*. London & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ransom, J.S. (1997). *Foucault's discipline: the politics of subjectivity*. Duke University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Research and Context for a Theory of Maori Schooling

- Rogers, M.F. (1974). Instrumental and infra-resources: The bases of power. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 79(6), 1418-1433
- Royal, Te Ahukaramu C. (1992). *Te haurapa: an introduction to researching tribal histories and traditions*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd. and Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs.
- Simon, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Nga kura Maori – The Native Schools' system 1867-1969*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Bilingualism or not: the education of minorities*. Multilingual Matters.
- Smith, G.H. (1992). Tane-nui-a-Rangi's legacy ... Propping up the sky – Kaupapa Maori as resistance and intervention. Paper presented at NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Deakin University, Australia, 20 November.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Spindler, G.D. (Ed.) (1963). Education in a transforming American culture. In *Education and culture – Anthropological approaches*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stanfield, John H. (1985). The ethnocentric basis of social science knowledge production. *Review of Research in Education*, 12, 387-415, Ch. 10. E.W. Gordon (Ed.). American Educational Research Association.
- Strike, K.A. (1982). *Educational policy and the just society*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Tahana, A.W. (1980). A critical analysis of some studies of Maori schooling. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Education Department, University of Auckland.
- Trochim, W.M.K. (1999). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). New York: Cornell University.
- United Nations High Commission for Refugees (1991). *Images of exile*. United Nations Organisation.
- Waitangi Tribunal (1986). *Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori and a claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Nga Kaiwhakapimau i Te Reo Inc. Soc*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.
- Wallace, A.F.C. (1973). Schools in revolutionary and conservative societies. In F.A.J. Ianni & E. Storey (Eds.), *Cultural relevance and educational issues – Readings in anthropology and education*. New York: Little, Brown & Co.
- Webster, S. (1998). *Patrons of Maori culture – Power, theory and ideology in the Maori renaissance*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Weiss, Carol H. (1991). The many meanings of research utilisation. In Anderson and Biddle (pp.173-182). See above.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). The educational politics of identity and category. *Interchange*, 29(4), 385-402
- Young, Michael F.D. (1983). A case study of the limitations of policy research. In B. Tizard et al. *Fifteen thousand hours – Secondary schools and their effect on children*. London: University of London School of Education.

WALLY PENETITO is a Maori New Zealander of the Tainui confederation of tribes. He has taught in primary schools, been an advisor to schools on the education of Maori children, been a senior manager in the public service, and as an academic for the last four years expects to complete his PhD this year on the 'Sociology of Maori Education'.

WALLY PENETITO est un néo-Zélandais Maori de la confédération des tribus Tainui. Il a été professeur du primaire, conseiller en éducation des enfants Maori auprès des écoles, cadre supérieur dans la fonction publique, et après avoir repris ses études depuis quatre ans, il espère terminer cette année son doctorat, intitulé 'Sociology of Maori Education'.

