

Massey University

**Te Mata o Te Tau
Hokowhitu Lecture**

**The Development of Cultural Standards in Education.
What are the Issues?**

Huia Tomlins-Jahnke

**Te Uru Maraurau
School of Māori and Multicultural Education
Massey University**

23 August 2006

The Development of Cultural Standards in Education: What are the Issues?

If there is a single motivating factor for the establishment of tribal education strategies it is an overwhelming desire and ambition by tribes to advance tribal aspirations. These include the development and enhancement of tribal capacity and identity; the revitalisation and maintenance of tribal reo me ona tikanga; and ensuring positive outcomes in terms of successful educational achievement levels of Māori children in their rohe.

The perceived efficacy of kohanga reo, Kura kaupapa, wharekura and wananga on the lives and wellbeing of Māori children and their whānau are held as the benchmark against which tribal aspirations are determined. In the past Māori have had little say in decisions that have helped shape schooling in Aotearoa, and overtime this system has not worked for Māori children. Some tribes have moved to develop iwi specific cultural standards in education as a further strategy to outline and make clear to the education community, policy makers and politicians alike, what tribal expectations are for students, the whānau, the community, the teachers, curriculum and the operation of schools. There are at least three assumptions underpinning the development of iwi-specific cultural standards that reflect tribal expectations.

First is a commitment by tribes to ensure access to and the transmission of tribal knowledge in relevant contexts and institutions. This is often referred to as the 'iwitanga' factor (Kahungunutanga, Tuhoetanga) which includes the revitalisation of te reo me ona tikanga, especially the maintenance and active usage of distinctive tribal dialects.

Second is an assumption that as tangata whenua tribes have a role in facilitating stakeholder relationships with the state that contribute to mutually beneficial outcomes in terms of access and participation in education, and increasing educational achievement and retention rates. There is also concurrence across tribes of a responsibility to uphold the interests of all children and their whānau who reside within their rohe besides their own tribal beneficiaries.

Third, is the capacity at the whānau, hapū or iwi level, to offer schools relevant frameworks to engage with whānau, hapū and the wider Māori communities. This can include access to cultural resources from which schools might otherwise be excluded.

This is an important consideration where aspects of tribal history are regarded as priorities by tribes for inclusion in school programmes.

The process of developing iwi specific cultural standards in education is a complex one. On the one hand tribes are aware of the challenges they face on a number of levels in terms of gaining the commitment of schools and the education community to advance tribal aspirations. Māori have a long history and experience of schooling in a colonial and neo-colonial era and of dealing with and responding to the hegemonic consequences of the will of the State. To some extent this has resulted in an ability, and political savoir-faire at reading, interpreting and dealing with the Eurocentric mindsets of politicians, policy makers and institutional bureaucrats. As Michael King observed thirty years ago, “Māori opinion is now sufficiently articulate and mobilised to impede public policies when they do not invite such consideration” (King, 1978:8).

On the other hand there is also the challenge of accounting for diverse tribal interests, points of view and personal agendas that are not always in unison and not letting these distract from the pursuit of the bigger goal by maintaining a unity of purpose and clear processes.

Inevitably, tribal expectations in terms of cultural standards raise questions regarding definitions of culture, who defines such definitions, what constitutes standards, how they will be measured, by whom and on what basis? Some tribes have elected to substitute the term cultural standards and to adopt Māori terms that describe more precisely what they understand cultural standards to mean.¹ The notion of standards associated with state schooling is highly contested generally and is particularly contentious for Māori. This is because standards are inextricably linked with measurements. Standardised tests and public examinations are among the chief sorting mechanisms for evaluation and assessment procedures in schools that are usually set against highly selected, often taken for granted sets of ‘acceptable norms.’ The outcomes of such procedures have tended to pathologise Māori educational achievement thereby raising questions about whose interests have really been served. Evaluations and assessments per se may not be the problem, but what counts as ‘acceptable norms’ and faulty or inappropriate measures may well be.

¹ See for example, the Whanganui Iwi Education Authority.

Invariably standards are about knowledge which bring to bear those critical questions regarding what knowledge counts, how knowledge should be organised (the curriculum) and/or packaged (as textbooks) for transmission? Transmission is concerned with pedagogy, with learning, with the curriculum and its construction. Which raises further questions regarding how learning will be facilitated and by whom? What criteria are necessary in pre-service selection and training of teachers? What are the implications of this for Colleges of Education and other pre-service providers? What do teachers need to know in order to ensure successful outcomes for Māori children? Schools serve to act as key agents of cultural and ideological hegemony and of selective traditions. The cultural capital that is enshrined in the schools habitus operates to reward and fail students in accordance with the cultural capital they bring (Bourdieu, 1999).

Most Māori children in Aotearoa are located in schools where there is often a cultural discontinuity and dissonance between home and school, between the lived realities of whānau and what Bourdieu describes as the habitus of the school (Bourdieu, 1999). These schools are generally described as mainstream. The term mainstream is a euphemism or code word for schools that are oriented within a western /Euro-centric tradition. When we think of mainstream schools we think of schools that are controlled by those who have political, economic and cultural power and which position western values, knowledge, culture and the English language as the central focus of the total school habitus. Incorporation of aspects of Māori language and culture, the 'taha Māori' factor, are either 'add-on's' to the core curriculum or can be found superficially expressed as Māori/English signage for school buildings and offices².

For many Māori children mainstream schools are sites of alienation reinforced by the disjunction between home and a Eurocentric school milieu. In this context what counts as school knowledge, the way school knowledge is organised, resourced, taught and evaluated, the underlying codes that structure such knowledge, access to and legitimation of school knowledge is determined by the dominant culture (Giroux & Aronowitz, 1985). Underpinning these epistemological concerns, knowledge transmission and what constitutes the curriculum, are values. What values count and how values are understood, practiced and legitimised are important considerations when we think about what the purpose of education ought to be.

² For a more indepth discussion on the failure of state schools to capture Māori interests see Smith, G. H. (1990). *Taha Māori:Pakeha Capture. Political Issues in New Zealand Education: Second Edition*. J. Codd, R. Harker and R. Nash. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press: 183-197.

In the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, an overwhelming premise among Māori generally is that Māori cultural values, customs and worldview are essential elements that distinguish the people, this land and our identity as a nation from any other place on earth. They are the defining characteristics and values that make us unique. There are indications that the wider New Zealand public might think so too. When I began writing this presentation I intended to reference several examples to demonstrate my point.³ But these have been overshadowed by the extraordinary events that have unfolded as a consequence of the passing of Te Arikini Dame Te Atairangikaahu. This marks a defining moment in the history of this nation for many reasons most notably the loss of someone who demonstrated the ultimate measure of great leadership; the ability to lead the people of Tainui and the Kingitanga by following them with wisdom, dignity and humility.

Over the six day period of the tangi the media coverage exposed many glaring gaps in the understanding between Māori and Pakeha. It seems inconceivable that such a small minority of Pakeha could share Māoridom's sense of loss. The lack of knowledge about Māori history among the general New Zealand public was palpable.

The live television broadcast of the final day, demonstrated significant changes in thinking by mainstream television powerbrokers around cultural standards and the media. In particular, recognising that the locus of knowledge and ability to document and explain Māori life, customs, histories and traditions and do so with integrity lay with Māori members of the media. The result was a production that in my view was an outstanding and sensitive coverage of a significant moment in history. Māori television's decision to broadcast live may well have been the leverage that held the Nation's premier television station to account and trust the expertise and experience of a substantial team of Māori journalists to deliver. It was obvious during the live broadcast that at every bend Māori controlled the flow of information, who had access, who were appropriate to anchor the programme including locals with insider knowledge. Māori determined the scope regarding what was applicable and culturally appropriate to be filmed for public consumption and what was not. These were recorded with the eyes and sensibilities that only an intimate knowledge of the Māori world could conceive. In matters of cultural standards, there is a fine line between journalistic voyeurism on the

³ An example is the decision by the NZ Olympic and Commonwealth Games committees to enlist the services of Amster Reedy as the cultural advisor for the teams. As an expert in cultural matters, his role was to ensure the appropriate standard of conduct of cultural values, customs, and icons specific to Māori and New Zealand in providing for the wellbeing of the New Zealand team.

one hand, and sharing publicly what is an otherwise profoundly personal time while recording for posterity history in the making. For the general public the result was a unique and rare insight into the values and customs, associated with the most significant of institutions that have sustained Māori culture since time immemorial.

Overall, the cultural divide exposed by the media at this time and from other events in recent years, suggests that in the main the New Zealand public are still relatively ignorant of Māori culture, customs, history, knowledge, values and institutions. And in this we are a nation still coming of age.

Yet State recognition of the importance of Māori custom and values is reflected in their inclusion in New Zealand law, particularly since 1984 when bicultural / Treaty of Waitangi jurisprudence emerged. Influenced by the work of the Waitangi Tribunal (Law Commission, 2001), the Māori Language Act 1987 accepted the Māori language to be a 'taonga' and subsequently Te Reo Māori was declared an official language of New Zealand. The State Enterprises Act 1988 recognised the importance of returning alienated waahi tapu to the appropriate tribe in lieu of transferring title to a state-owned enterprise. The Resource Management Act 1991 recognised the significance of Māori custom, values and attitudes associated with ancestral lands, natural resources and other taonga as a matter of national importance (Durie, 1998).

There are signs that the call to eliminate race-based policies by stripping away all references to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi from legislation, social sector contracts and policies, in favour of a needs based 'one law for all' approach is evident in the education sector. Redirecting funds from programmes that specifically target and benefit Māori students (such as access to tertiary education) to support teachers of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools⁴ is an example. Current figures show 7% of secondary teachers are Māori so the redistribution of benefits from one group to another simply maintains the status quo unless the flow-on effect of supporting teachers' results in positive educational outcomes for Māori students.

The notion of race-based policies is a myth, a misleading categorisation aimed at political point-scoring. It is misleading because the term obscures the genuine concerns of Māori, Pakeha and other non-Māori experts in education, health and social policy based on equity and justice. The problem with labelling equity-based programmes and policies as race based is that it confuses race with ethnicity rather than seeing such

⁴ Current figures show that 7% of Secondary school teachers are Māori compared to 79% who are Pakeha..
<http://educationcounts.edcentre.govt.nz/>

programmes as a systematic approach to presenting Māori as the subject. It attempts to deflect attention away from the facts and ignore the burgeoning body of empirical evidence which highlights the link between ethnicity on the one hand and poor health and education outcomes including access and participation (M.O.H., 2004), on the other.

The newly released draft curriculum is a case in point where references to the Treaty of Waitangi are absent and biculturalism replaced by an emphasis on diversity. In the United States, the notion of diversity has been a favourite of corporate CEO's, education administrators and politicians. The preoccupation among these groups with diversity is a proclivity to consider it as cultural when in fact diversity is a matter of identities (Appiah, 2005:114). Accounting for diversity suggests measures to preserve the authentic character of subsidiary identities of a community that, in the absence of references to the Treaty, implicitly includes Māori thereby undermining the status of Māori as tangata whenua. Diversity of identities as subsidiaries can only be understood by their relationship to the majority.

If the principle of diversity is simply spectatorial, that is to support what African philosopher Kwame Appiah suggests as “the vista of diversity...the spectacle of the emperor's zoo so to speak” then it is essentially there for our appreciation (Appiah, 2005:150) or as token gestures. Programmatic promotions of diversity as outlined in the draft curriculum, while upholding differences may well entail imposing uniformity. In the real world, entrenchment of uniformities happens through the mobilization of state resources and regulative mechanisms in line with government economic and social objectives. As Kwame Appiah maintains “...many value diversity not because it is a [*public or cultural*]⁵ ‘good’ but because we take it to be a correlative of liberty and non-domination”(Appiah, 2005:153). If this is so, then the curriculum simply masks the status quo keepers who want to maintain a Eurocentric framework “...because they have no faith in cultural pluralism without hierarchy”(Asante, 1993:193).

Those who defend the status quo have often argued a position of territoriality, that there is no time in the curriculum or school year for including Māori language, culture and history as core components for example. The assumption is that there is little cultural information to speak about or is worthwhile knowing. In so far as the draft curriculum is concerned, it is almost an oxymoron to think of diversity in a document

⁵ Words in italics and parenthesis are the authors emphasis.

that promotes the individual in a society where liberal values such as the autonomy of the individual are paramount⁶.

Different approaches

Iwi education plans and strategies are not new. In 1975, Ngati Raukawa developed and implemented an iwi development plan Whakatipuranga Rua Mano as an intervention measure aimed at ameliorating the critical decline in the number of Māori language speakers in the iwi. A focus on tertiary education and the development of Te Wananga o Raukawa emerged as part of the overall tribal strategy (Waaka, Hapeta, Kuiti, & Royal, 2000).

More recently, an increasing number of tribes have agreed to partnership arrangements with the Ministry of Education. These are a response by iwi to the Ministry to work collaboratively “...towards a more shared understanding what each might contribute to the partnership...and how this might influence improving Māori education outcomes” (M.O.E., 2005). The partnership arrangements are established in varying configurations of tribal authority such as tribal councils (Gerritsen 2000), education authorities (Thomson 2001) or company’s (Tau 2001)⁷. Overall it has been a flax-root approach in the hope of negotiating durable solutions. As a result the various tribal strategies do not subscribe to a ‘one size fits all’ approach. The ‘Iwi Education Plans’ or ‘Iwi Partnerships’ have evolved out of tribal aspirations, needs and concerns (Gerritsen 2000; Thomson 2001) many of which parallel national priorities. These include increasing the levels of student achievement, developing quality education relevant to the community, ensuring good school governance and management, and making certain teachers and principals are well prepared.

Iwi partnerships with the Ministry of Education and the development of iwi education strategies have encouraged a number of foci to evolve.

Community Focus

One is a community focus where the process of tribes identifying the priorities in education for their community is as important as the priorities themselves because it has involved extensive consultation. Some communities are located in isolated rural areas

⁶ See (Asante, 1993).

⁷ Te Tapuae o Rehua has partnerships with tertiary institutions. MOE is therefore indirectly involved as the government funding agency for tertiary institutions.

where high unemployment and low income are the norm. Coming together to set the overarching education goals for their community has led to increased interest, participation and expectation.

Education provider Focus

Increasingly tribal communities have looked to education providers to assist in driving their initiatives. This has encouraged schools, teachers and boards of trustees to identify their professional needs and to initiate relevant professional development. In some cases school structures have been reorganised to meet community needs. Where this has occurred, increased collaboration between schools has led to the rationalisation of teacher strengths and experience, the sharing of resources, expertise, knowledge and skills. National Internet Communication Technology (ICT) networks between Māori immersion schools, Māori boarding schools and rural secondary schools has offered online teaching through high speed internet connections and video conferencing (MOE 2001:40).

Iwi/hapū Focus

An iwi/hapū focus recognises that the strength of an education initiative grounded in the community is not isolating the ideas and thoughts about education from tribal realities and aspirations. Education is considered within a broad tribal development framework, a holistic and integrated method to planning that avoids the fragmented sectorial approach favoured by governments. One North Island tribe for example has aligned the development of their education plan alongside their Treaty of Waitangi claims process⁸. In other tribal areas, strong linkages have been maintained between tribal councils and schools evident in education strategies that correspond with tribal aspirations and manifest in school programmes. Often the strategies are linked to incorporate the local environment - (coast lines, rivers, lakes, mountains) and community economic ventures (fisheries, agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture). Thus tribal education plans are framed in a long-term vision that is generational, rather than the short-term politically inspired durations favoured by governments.

⁸ Walley Penetito, Nga Pae O Te Maramatanga International Writing Retreat, Solway Lodge, 7-13th June 2006.

Relevant curriculum Focus

Education strategies that correspond with tribal aspirations are also expressed in a focus on the curriculum. In the past the national curriculum offered a framework so that tribal knowledge, language (local dialect and idiom) and cultural values (Kahungunutanga) could be incorporated to better reflect the community goals. The new draft curriculum promises to offer the same. In some districts schools have been encouraged to utilise local assets as part of the school resources such as tribal experts and the natural environment. As one Principal of a rural school explained,

“If you want to talk about native bush or Tane Mahuta⁹ or Tangaroa¹⁰, it is right at our back doorstep...when we talk about maunga (mountains) it is right there...when we talk about awa it is right behind the school”¹¹(Gerritsen 2000).

Governance Focus

Some tribal communities have overcome difficulties with recruiting and selecting suitable Board of Trustee’s members by having schools form clusters served by a single board. This seems to work where commonalities exist in the schools and community through tribal membership. In this context there are instances where parents have had some of their children enrolled in the local kura kaupapa (Māori medium) and others enrolled in the local mainstream (English speaking) school down the road (Gerritsen, 2000).

Accountability Focus

Where there is a substantial level of tribal and community involvement this has contributed to a sense of ‘buy-in’ or ‘ownership’ in terms of supporting and/or implementing their decisions contained within education plans. Although the extent to which this has happened differs between tribes. Tribes consider themselves accountable in so far as making decisions regarding the education pathways for their constituency and wider community. The Ministry of education is held accountable to ensure that community initiatives prevail and to minimize official barriers that threaten to undermine them. However, the extent to which the Ministry has supported community

⁹ Māori deity of the forest

¹⁰ Māori deity of the sea

¹¹ Reference by tribes to the names of the local mountain, river, ocean or forest are used as a metaphor for identity as a member and descendant of that tribal group.

education initiatives is dependant on whether the initiative corresponds with government priorities.

Crown/Iwi relationship focus

The focus on Crown/Iwi relationships in education tends to be described in terms of the principle of partnership. Traditional leadership has provided a significant leverage for Crown /Māori interaction and partnership in the development of education imperatives. Since 2001 Tumu Te Heu Heu and Ngati Tuwharetoa, have hosted several national and regional Māori education forums, Hui Taumata Matauranga, aimed at planning pathways for Māori education advancement. In 2001 the Forum unanimously adopted a framework for the advancement of Māori education proposed by Professor Mason Durie based on three broad but concurrent goals; to live as Māori, to actively participate as citizens of the world and to enjoy good health and a high standard of living. A set of guiding principles suggests how these goals might be reached in terms of best outcomes, integrated action and the principle of indigeneity (Durie 2001).

Perhaps influenced by these goals and other events at national and regional Hui Taumata at least nine tribes have entered into formal arrangements with the Ministry of Education by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.E., 2005)¹². This is a relationship viewed by iwi as one that reflects the partnership principle they consider critical to the long term success of iwi education initiatives (Gerritsen 2000). Each partnership has its own approach and plan and offer opportunities to coordinate and integrate education services. For example, all the partners are piloting the Community Based Language Initiative, others are variously involved in computers in homes, implementing the Youth Mentoring initiative, locally based schooling improvement initiatives and improving teaching practice (M.O.E., 2005).

Some tribes, however, have chosen to remain outside of any formal arrangements with the Ministry preferring instead to argue that since the Treaty is the key instrument that defines Crown/Iwi relationships, an MOU is therefore unnecessary. Others suggest that by developing education plans and other strategies, tribes are simply assisting the government with their core business¹³ so an MOU makes little difference. In any event, the Ministry's role is considered by tribes to be one that supports a tribal focussed

¹² As at August 2006 the nine partnerships are- Te Reo o Te Taitokerau; Tuwharetoa Māori Trust Board; Te Runganga o Ngati Porou; Te Runanga o Turanganui a Kiwa; Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu; Tuhoē Education Authority; Hauraki Māori Trust Board; Te Runanga o Te aw Tupua o Whanganui; Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua.

¹³ I would like to acknowledge Kym Hamilton for her insights around this discussion.

approach to education through assisting with resourcing, accessing technology, providing expertise and adjusting accountability measures that take account of tribal perspectives. Such accountability measures include supporting the development and implementation of iwi cultural standards in schools.

Development of iwi cultural standards – what are they?

What exactly are iwi cultural standards and what is the process involved in generating them? Cultural standards have always been held as a significant value within Māori tradition associated with quality and excellence. Te Hau ki Turanga provides a 19th century benchmark for art against which contemporary practices in whakairo rakau and kowhaiwhai may be measured. Biennially Te Matatini offers an opportunity for tribes to demonstrate excellence and quality in the art of contemporary composition and practice in language, music and dance. For rangatahi, Te Manu Korero sets a contemporary measure of standards in the art of oratory. The Māori made mark is a standard of peer review across all the creative arts associated with the Māori language, composition, oratory, art practice and literature.

Like the approach taken by tribes in initiating education plans, there is no single approach adopted by iwi in the development of cultural standards in education. Nor is there a single definition regarding what constitute cultural standards for any one tribe. That is the task of each iwi according to their priorities and in light of other tribal imperatives. The processes tribes have used and the pathway to developing iwi cultural standards differ and are at various stages of development or implementation. Some tribes have chosen to adapt international models to inform their processes, or as a basis for their plans. In particular, the work of the Assembly of Alaska Native Educators.

Over a period of a decade Alaska Native educators have produced sets of standards that offer schools and their communities' ways to measure their effectiveness in providing for the educational and cultural wellbeing of the students in their schools. The standards are predicated on the assumption that grounding in the heritage language and indigenous culture specific to a place is fundamental to the cultural health and wellbeing of students and communities who live or are associated with that place.

Rather than producing standardization in the manner of the Bush governments 'No Child Left Behind' policy (Bracey, 2005; Margaret Maaka, 2005; Margie Maaka, 2006). Some of you here may recall last years Hokowhitu Lecture by Professor Margie Maaka and her team from the University of Hawaii where they described the detrimental effects

of this policy that subjects every child in America including Hawaiian children to Eurocentric standardised tests formulated in mainland USA; by contrast Alaska schools and their communities are encouraged to develop appropriate standards that accommodate local circumstances. Such circumstances include the rich and varied cultural traditions still practiced in communities throughout Alaska. In other words, there is an emphasis on connecting what students experience in their lives out of school with what they experience in school (Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 1998). Rather than prescriptive, the standards are described in ways approximating guiding principles with sets of indicators that can be adapted to fit local needs. By way of example, one of the cultural standards is the principle of culturally knowledgeable students. The expectation is that these students are well grounded in the cultural heritage and traditions of their community. Among seven listed indicators that measure whether students have met this cultural standard is their ability to recount their family genealogy and history (Alaska Native Educators, 1998)

I have already mentioned that tribes involved in developing or implementing iwi cultural standards for schools are at various stages along the way. For example, Whanganui are well advanced and in the process of implementation (Whanganui Iwi Education Authority, 2005). In consultation with the Ministry of Education, Ngati Kahungunu is in the early stages having just completed a scoping exercise and Project Plan aimed at developing Kahungunu cultural standards specifically for primary schools. There are a number of factors the team charged with scoping and drawing up the Project Plan had to consider and keep in mind. The first was that the Project Plan should link with the Kahungunu strategic direction as outlined in the 25 year Plan the integrated principle Professor Mason Durie talks about. This means integrating the cultural standards Project with other tribal imperatives such as the Kahungunu health strategy, the language strategy and government initiatives like the Community Based Language Initiative (CBLI).

A second factor to consider is what is already known about the status of Māori education in Ngati Kahungunu and what is not known. For a start what is known is that approximately 4% of all Māori children in the rohe are enrolled in 7 Kura kaupapa and there are 167 primary schools within which the other 96% are located. In the primary

sector the dearth of information regarding the participation and achievement levels of Māori children is a concern.¹⁴

According to NCEA results, Hukarere and St Josephs Māori Girls College (where an identity as Māori is a primary value) are among the top 3 secondary schools in Hawke's Bay¹⁵. However, participation and achievement rates of students in mainstream secondary schools mirror national statistics and there is evidence of a crisis in public secondary school retention rates from Y9 (Tomlins Jahnke, 2003; Tomoana, 2005).

A third factor to keep in mind is what is known about the role of whānau, their aspirations and realities. A decade of consultation within Ngati Kahungunu has consistently highlighted the importance Māori parents and whānau place on the benefits of a dual heritage. They are adamant their children should be exposed to the best of all worlds and that Ngati Kahungunu language, culture and history should be the basis by being included in the school curriculum (Jackson, Pitman, & Ruru, 1999). Whānau aspirations are no different to those found elsewhere; that their children do well, finish school and go on to tertiary education. It is for this reason that strengthening whānau/school relationships is a priority identified as a key platform of the Kahungunu Cultural Standards Project Plan. The realities of whānau within the rohe are represented across the full spectrum of Māori society from whānau who are highly dysfunctional to whānau strong and healthy, from those alienated from marae and or other Māori contexts to those who remain fully involved.

An important consideration is keeping in mind the major aim which is an outcome whereby schools in the rohe are delivering education programmes that are infused with Ngati Kahungunu history, language and culture. This alone raises many of the questions I raised earlier about knowledge, access to knowledge, what counts as knowledge and who decides? What would a relevant curriculum look like? What are the implications concerning the availability of resources and the intellectual property rights of hapū? Other questions include what is the role of the whānau, local marae and hapū? Are teachers culturally competent? If not what professional development would be required and whose responsibility would that be? Are pre-service teachers culturally competent, and if not what is the responsibility of Colleges of Education to prepare teachers for schools in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand generally, and Ngati Kahungunu in

¹⁴ The Ministry of Education is implementing the collection of iwi affiliations of students in early childhood centres, schools and tertiary education organisations. This information will also be attached to schools using a computerised student management system.

¹⁵ Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated Maturanga Board Meeting, 28 July, 2006 Hastings.

particular? All of these issues and many more will have to be worked through as the strategy develops and takes shape.

In any event the formulation of an iwi cultural standards strategy must take account of; the role of tribal experts and other relevant advisory groups; the need for multiple stakeholder and end-user consultations (teachers, whānau, education sector, hapū etc.); the importance of research and analysis; managing curriculum and resourcing issues and a timeframe that is realistic.

Sir Robert Mahuta once said ‘any process that does not take Māori values and attitudes into account will have a long, slow road to travel’(King, 1978:8). The process of deliberations around policies and programmes that shape education in Aotearoa depends on ensuring a Māori voice is heard and how we walk the tightrope between Pakeha expectations and tribal aspirations. For the most part cultural standards are being devised to complement rather than necessarily replace what it is we expect Māori children to know, to do and to be in the context of this nation. It is a strategy that seeks, among others, to infuse the curriculum and incorporate the experiences of a Māori/ iwi way of life. A way of life that includes, as Pat Hohepa explains “... a way of acting, thinking and feeling; of attitudes to language, traditions and institutions; of shared values and attitudes to people, places and things, to time, the land and sea, the environment, life and death ”(Hohepa, 1978:99).

So what are the challenges? At a regional Hui Taumata held in Palmerston North recently, one of the local principals of a school renowned for the positive contributions this school makes to Māori education asserted that the advancement of Māori education requires honesty and courage. Being truthful she suggested takes courage. It takes courage for schools to admit the truth about what they do, the extent to which they account for Māori children and, if need be to commit to doing something about it. It takes courage for whānau who are experiencing it, to admit dysfunction, seek help and devote time to supporting their children and local school by active participation. And it takes courage for the large number of teachers in our schools to be truthful about their lack of knowledge about Māori children and commit to making a difference.

The implications for Colleges of Education across the country are profound. Demographic trends point to a significant Māori population by the year 2050. Māori numbers are growing at a faster rate than non-Māori and it is projected that by then Māori will make up about 21 percent of the total New Zealand population (HBDHB, 2005). Combined with estimated growths in Polynesian populations there will literally

be a ‘browning’ of the nation. How we prepare for the future of this nation in the education sector requires courage, truth and vision. Indigeneity in terms of Māori language, culture, history, flora and fauna are the features that define Aotearoa New Zealand from any other place on earth. They are the things that make us unique. The challenge is whether there is the maturity and the will to take cognisance of a substantial Māori population in the near future and the implications of this for the way we prepare our teachers; to recognise the importance of Māori language, culture and history which define us from the rest of the world by infusing these in school programmes; and whether we have the vision and fortitude at this moment in time to plan for such a future.

References:

- Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Asante, M.-K. (1993). Multiculturalism without Hierarchy: An Afrocentric Reply to Diane Ravitch. In F. J. Beckwith & M. E. Bauman (Eds.), *Are You Politically Correct? Debating America's Cultural Standards* (pp. 185-194). Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Authority. (2005). *Te Kaupapa Ahurea Taumata*. Wanganui: Whanganui Iwi Education Authority.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). Site Effects. In *The Weight of the World: Social suffering in contemporary society* (pp. 123-129). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bracey, G. W. (2005). The Seven Deadly Absurdities of No Child Left Behind: Arizona State University.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiora: Māori Health Development* (Second ed.). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Educators, A. N. (1998). *Alaska Standards for Culturally-Responsive Schools: Cultural Standards for students, educators, schools, curriculum, community*. Anchorage: Alaska Native Knowledge Network.
- Gerritsen, J. (2000, 7 August 2000). Whaia te iti kahurangi: Strive for the ultimate, is happening everyday. *Education Gazette, Vol.79*.
- Giroux, H., & Aronowitz, S. (1985). *Education under siege*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- HBDHB. (2005). *Māori Health Quarterly Monitoring Report*. Hastings: Hawke's Bay District Health Board.
- Hohepa, P. (1978). Māori and Pakeha: The One-People Myth. In M. King (Ed.), *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Māoritanga*: Methuen Publications Ltd.
- Jackson, M., Pitman, M., & Ruru, M. (1999). *Ma te Rango te Waka ka Rere: The Report of the Ngati Kahungunu Constitutional Review Committee*. Hastings: Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated.
- King, M. (Ed.). (1978). *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Māoritanga*: Methuen New Zealand Ltd.
- Law Commission. (2001). *Māori Custom and Values in New Zealand Law*. (Study Paper 9 ed.). Wellington: The Office of the Law Commission.
- M.O.E. (2005, 08 Dec 2005). Iwi Education Partnerships Fact Sheet. *Strengthening the Ministry's response to the education needs of Māori* Retrieved 4/8/06, 2006, from http://www.minedu.govt.nz/print_doc.cfm?layout=document&documentid=7394&index=1.
- M.O.H. (2004). *Child and Youth Health Toolkit. Ensuring access to health care services including well child and family health care, and immunisation*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.
- Maaka, M. (2005). Reading, 'Rithmetica, and Raccoons': The Reality of NCLB in Hawaii. *The June Issue of No Child Left. Vol III, Number 6*
- Maaka, M. (2006, May 8). Please Say No To SB 3059 (and any future manifestation of it!). *The Honolulu Advertiser*.
- Tomlins Jahnke, H. (2003). *Ko te Amorangi ki mua: Profile of Māori Education in Ngati Kahungunu & Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Matauranga Plan 2003-2005*. Hastings: A report to the Ministry of Education for Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated.
- Tomoana, J. (2005). *Ngati Kahungunu Education Profile*. Hastings: Peak Learning.
- Waaka, R., Hapeta, D., Kuiti, N., & Royal, T. (2000). *Whakatapuranga Rua Mano: Generation 2000 celebrating 25 years*. Otaki: Resource Centre Te Wananga o Raukawa.