

This article was downloaded by: [Ingenta Content Distribution - Routledge]

On: 5 November 2008

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 791963552]

Publisher Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Comparative Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title-content=t713410081>

Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Ma ̄ori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand [1]

Russell Bishop

Online Publication Date: 01 May 2003

To cite this Article Bishop, Russell(2003)'Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Ma ̄ori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand [1]',Comparative Education,39:2,221 — 238

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/03050060302555

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03050060302555>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Changing Power Relations in Education: *Kaupapa Māori* messages for ‘mainstream’ education in Aotearoa/New Zealand [1]

RUSSELL BISHOP

ABSTRACT *Drawing on the example of indigenous Māori pedagogical and research principles in Aotearoa/New Zealand, this paper explores how still widely held ‘deficit’ notions of Māori students can be addressed and replaced by an alternative model that emphasises empowerment, co-construction and the critical importance of cultural recognition. This model constitutes the classroom as a place where young people’s sense-making processes (cultures) are incorporated and enhanced, where the existing knowledges of young people—particularly Māori—are seen as ‘acceptable’ and ‘official’, and where the teacher interacts with students in such a way that new knowledge is co-created. Such a classroom will generate very different interaction and participation patterns and educational outcomes from a classroom where knowledge is seen as something that the teacher makes sense of and then passes onto students.*

Introduction

Since European colonisation in the late eighteenth century, the educational and wider social experiences of the indigenous Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand have been characterised by consistent inequality and disadvantage. In contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand, the major obstacle to addressing these ongoing issues of inequality and disadvantage for Māori—in the wider society in general and in relation to educational achievement in mainstream institutions, including classrooms, in particular—is the ongoing purchase of cultural deficit theories. Current educational policies and practices, in Aotearoa/New Zealand, as in most western countries, were developed and continue to be developed within a pattern of power imbalances which favours cultural deficit explanations.

This pattern of power imbalances is one of dominance and subordination and has developed as the result of the heritage of colonial dominance in Aotearoa/New Zealand, a colonial history that was formalised in 1840 when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed between representatives of the British Crown and some 512 Māori leaders. It was supposed to be the formulation of a new nation-state. However, commitments to Māori in the Treaty were all too quickly ignored, and it soon became clear to the Māori people that the Treaty, and the wider colonial governance of Aotearoa/New Zealand, were established primarily to benefit the excess population that Britain sought to relocate as settlers there. This settler dominance was firmly cemented in place in 1852 when these Pākehā (European) settlers were empow-

Correspondence to: Russell Bishop, School of Education, University of Waikato, Te Whare Waananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand. Email: r.bishop@waikato.ac.nz

ered to take over direct control of governance from the British, and over ensuing decades by the means of armed invasion of Māori lands (which have subsequently been proven to have been illegal) and the passing of legislation specifically aimed at marginalising Māori ownership of land, Māori political participation, and a Māori share in the benefits of the wider society. These activities were aided by the agents of the churches, the mass media, and (especially) the education system (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; May, 1999a; Simon, 1999; Walker, 1990). As a result, the now Pākehā majority in Aotearoa/New Zealand have benefited enormously, while Māori have been politically and socially marginalised and economically impoverished.

Today Māori people are over-represented in most negative social, educational and economic indices and under-represented in positive indices (Te Puni Kokiri, 1998). For example, the dominance of Pākehā knowledge codes and the monoculturalism and monolingualism attendant upon a long history of assimilationist education have resulted in the near death of the Māori language. Only 6% of Māori remain in the high fluency language speaking category, a drop from some 18% in the 1970s (Te Taura Whiri: Māori Language Commission, 1995), and this is mainly among the elderly. Māori prison, hospital and mental institution population figures are far above their demographic proportion. The Māori unemployment rate is much higher than the national norm (16% compared to 7% respectively). Māori school credentialising is low. Forty-one percent of Māori males and 34% of Māori females continue to leave school without any formal qualifications, compared to 15% and 11% for non-Māori males and females respectively (Ministry of Education, 1998). Suspension rates for Māori are three times that of non-Māori and grew exponentially in the 1990s, following education reforms that gave much of the control of schooling to parent-elected Boards of Trustees.

Over the years, a string of attempts has been made to mediate this relationship—Assimilation, Integration, Multiculturalism and Biculturalism (see Bishop & Glynn, 1999, for an extended discussion here)—but, given the indices outlined above, with little obvious success. The failure of these various policies only further illustrates the impact of the ideology of cultural superiority, fundamental to colonialism, on the indigenous population of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Their failure to address, among other things, the educational achievement of Māori also provides a striking example of the outcomes of ongoing subtractive bilingualism and hegemonic domination within modern nation states (see May, 2001) [2].

In this understanding, it is the patterns of dominance and subordination and their related classroom interaction patterns that perpetuate the non-participation of many young Māori people in the benefits that the education system has to offer. Such an explanation stands in contrast to many theories promoted by mainstream educational theorists in Aotearoa/New Zealand (as elsewhere). Many of these theorists locate the problems of Māori development and educational achievement with the learners themselves. Among these are the adherents to genetic theories that suggest Māori are inherently, that is genetically pre-disposed to, for example, psychiatric disorders. On this view, Māori are bound to make up more than their fair share of mental institution inmates and, by extrapolation, to suffer greater schooling problems. Such a belief must have an enormous effect on the interactions between most members of this profession and their clients [3].

In contrast, within education, theorists tend to identify ‘cultural deficiency’ explanations for the non-participation by Māori in education. For example, a very influential piece of research conducted by Lovegrove in 1966, concluded that Māori problems at school were more to do with ‘the generally deprived nature of the Māori home conditions than to inherent intellectual inferiority’ (1966, p. 31). Harker and Nash (1990) refined this analysis by suggesting that it was in fact limited literacy resources in Māori homes that meant the

children were not adequately prepared for the 'scholastic necessary' of the modern classroom. Nicholson (2000) continues this line of theorising by conflating socio-economic status with culture and suggesting that children from lower socio-economic homes are linguistically disadvantaged as soon as they enter school. Nash (again supported by Chapple *et al.*, 1997) concluded that 'family resources both material and cultural, are the big transmission mechanisms of educational disadvantage rather than the structure of the education system' (Nash, 1993, p. 124).

These theories collectively can be labelled 'deficit theories', in that they blame the victims and see the locus of the problem as either lack of inherent ability, lack of cultural appropriateness or limited resources; in short, some deficiency at best, a 'pathology' at worst. The general pattern of the solutions that they propose suggests that the 'victims' need to change, usually to become more like the proponents of the theories. Further, these are 'cul-de-sac theories', in that they do not offer any way out that is acceptable to Māori people. Māori theorists tend to reject these theories as being reductionist, in that they ignore Māori aspirations for the education of their children and also ignore the inherent power imbalances attendant upon colonisation and its consequences. However, theorists, who are not connected with or accountable to Māori, identify Māori 'problems' and make suggestions for Māori children as though they were somehow simply objects of experimentation.

Therefore, the potential for addressing development and educational achievement for Māori and other minority groups from within current mainstream educational models leaves much to be desired. An alternative source of experience is necessary to inform mainstream educational practices in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Māori people's experiences of colonisation, resistance and educational initiatives are one such context. In particular relation to education, this has been demonstrated by the highly successful development of Māori-medium language education since the early 1980s (see Bishop & Glynn, 1998, 1999; May, 1999a). This development has been based on the wider principles of indigenous self-determination and local control, and the theory and practice of *Kaupapa Māori* (Māori philosophy).

Kaupapa Māori

This paper contends that it is through the reassertion of indigenous Māori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices, here termed *Kaupapa Māori* theory and practice (after Smith, 1997, and Smith, 1999), that historical and ongoing power imbalances will be addressed. This paper suggests that the solutions to marginalisation do not lie in the culture that marginalises. Rather solutions to structural issues of power and control—initiation, benefits, representation, legitimisation and accountability (Bishop, 1996)—can be addressed in mainstream classrooms by reference to Māori experiences of colonisation, resistance and educational initiatives in ways that will eventually benefit all students.

Kaupapa Māori theory, which builds on experiences in educational settings (Smith, 1997) and research (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999), focuses on the centrality of an analysis of power relations and offers an alternative approach to interpersonal and group relationships and interactions to that commonly promoted. This approach, arising from Māori aspirations and Treaty of Waitangi guarantees for the revitalisation of Māori language, culture and identity, is part of a wider process of creating new power relationships, based on the self-determination of Māori people as equal partners in the formation of the modern nation-state of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In *Kaupapa Māori* contexts, the interrelationships and interaction patterns that develop draw on Māori cultural aspirations and sense-making processes (ways of knowing) rather than on those imposed by another culture. Further, in most cases, these interrelationships and interactions in *Kaupapa Māori* contexts are 'successful in Māori eyes' (Smith, 1992, p. 1).

In this respect, the analysis that this paper is based upon may appear to promote essentialism through a binary, oppositional process that presupposes 'rooted' identities (see Freeland, this issue; May, 1999b). Essentialism in this sense is taken to mean the process whereby 'particular groups come to be described in terms of fundamental, immutable characteristics. In so doing, the relational and fluid aspects of identity formation are ignored ...' (May, 1999b, p. 34). Others from outside the lived realities of Māori people may well contend that this is indeed the basis of this analysis and therefore too limited, ignoring the fluidity of boundaries and possibly creating a 'romanticised' Māori past and present. Such questions raise issues of the usefulness of such an approach to the lived realities of Māori people today.

In response, the *Kaupapa Māori* analysis adopted in this paper is broadly similar to May's (1999b) definition of 'critical multiculturalism', and it is in this concept that potential solutions lie. May addresses the questions raised above by suggesting that

a critical multiculturalism needs both to recognize and incorporate the differing cultural knowledges that children bring with them to school, *while at the same time* address and contest the differential cultural capital attributed to them as a result of wider hegemonic power relations. (1999b, p. 32; emphasis in original)

In other words, the effects of power imbalances as played out in the lives of Māori children need to be recognised and addressed by the school. This then will allow Māori children the opportunity, currently only open to majority (Pākehā) children, to make choices for themselves from a secure cultural framework (May, 1999b). Moreover, this cultural framework is not necessarily that of the distant 'romanticised' past but is part of a living, contemporary culture that, to its members at least, remains distinctive.

And yet, as May (1999b) asserts, this approach may still not remove the problem of essentialism since 'an emphasis on distinctive cultural boundaries may lead in turn to a further (unhelpful) implication of cultural *boundedness*' (p. 33; emphasis in original). However, the contention here is that it is the dynamic nature of culture—in this context, Māori culture—that allows for an ongoing process of cultural reference and reconstruction that

recognises and incorporates the ongoing fluidity and constant change that attends its articulation in the modern world.... In other words, the recognition of our cultural and historical situatedness should not set the limits of ethnicity and culture, nor act to undermine the legitimacy of other, equally valid forms of identity. (May, 1999b, p. 33)

The issue here, of course, is who defines the modes of identification. In this paper, it is argued that the Māori student is highly capable of doing just this, given an appropriate recognition of interpersonal and structural power imbalances inherent in a 'settler-society' generated education system.

The question is then raised about how new power-sharing relationships and interaction patterns could address Māori aspirations for self-determination in mainstream educational institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Elbaz (1981, 1983) has an interesting conceptual device that can aid this analysis. This device demonstrates the relationship between the images that education teachers hold (as expressed in the metaphors they use) and the principles and practices they then develop as a result. She suggests that images are the personal mental pictures of how, for example, we see relationships and interaction patterns and that these images are often expressed in metaphor.

As Heshusius (1996) argues, metaphor in this sense is not merely an analogy, a likeness between things, but rather 'a deeply creative act, an act that gives rise to our assumptions about how reality fits together, and how we know' (p. 4). Heshusius (1996) proceeds to explain that as 'we make sense out of reality and construct reality, [and] people's lives, their

thoughts, actions, and experiences, are generated by metaphorical images, the very vehicle for shaping the content of consciousness' (p. 5).

The principles that are derived from these images are a combination of reflections with purpose that guide the teacher's actions and also explain the basis for the actions. These principles are derived largely from teacher experiences and remain useful as a locus for reflections. From this pattern of principles, teachers develop rules of practice. These are concise, clearly stated prescriptions for action.

This paper will now consider how we can 're-image' education to address Māori aspirations for self-determination and what principles and practices we can develop and implement to promote the realisation of this image within mainstream educational institutions within Aotearoa/New Zealand. Such principles and practices may have implications for other indigenous educational contexts as well.

Images: *Kaupapa Māori* schooling creates metaphors for power sharing

In a detailed study of *Kura Kaupapa Māori* (Māori medium primary/elementary schooling), Smith (1992, 1997) builds a picture of culturally effective Māori-medium schooling by identifying some of its constituent metaphors and their particular meaning(s) in these settings. In this section, these metaphors are extrapolated into mainstream educational settings in Aotearoa/New Zealand where, despite the attested success of Māori-medium education, the vast majority of Māori students (over 90%) continue to be educated. Here it is suggested that the pictures/images that are created by using these as constituent metaphors allow us to develop markedly different modes of theorising and means of addressing educational relationships for and with Māori students in these mainstream settings, in contrast to those based upon the dominant 'deficit' discourse.

Tino Rangatiratanga (Relative Autonomy/Self-determination)

This is perhaps the most fundamental issue associated with the whole *Kaupapa Māori* movement. Māori-medium education institutions at pre-school, primary, secondary and tertiary levels have all been established upon this principle. Literally it means chiefly control and increasingly it has taken on its figurative meaning of self-determination, that is the right to determine one's own destiny, to define what that destiny will be and to define and pursue means of attaining that destiny. Bruner (1996) suggests that this type of participation, that is on one's own terms, brings commitment. Applebee (1996) explains that commitment brings learning.

A further implication of this understanding for classroom contexts is that just as parents need to be involved in the decision-making processes of the school, so too do children. Involvement in this sense allows students to take part in the process of decision-making about curriculum planning, to the extent of participating in a pedagogy of power-sharing over decisions about curriculum content and the directions that learning will take.

Taonga Tuku Iho (Cultural Aspirations)

Literally meaning the treasures from the ancestors, these messages provide a set of principles by which Māori should live their lives, such as notions of community-focus, respect for age and wisdom, the importance of genealogy and family, and the integrity of Māori ways of knowing. However, this phrase nowadays is almost always used in its metaphoric sense as

meaning the cultural aspirations Māori people hold for their children, and includes those messages that guide our relationships and interaction patterns.

As a metaphor therefore, *taonga tuku iho* teaches us to respect the *tapu* (specialness) of each individual child (McCudden, 1992) and to acknowledge their *mana* (their potentiality for power), rather than ascribe cultural meanings to the child. Above all this message means that Māori language, knowledge, culture and values are normal, valid and legitimate, indeed are a valid guide to classroom interactions. The major implication of this principle for mainstream educational contexts is that we need to create contexts where to be Māori is to be normal; where Māori cultural identities are valued, valid and legitimate; in other words, where Māori children can be themselves.

There is however, a danger in stereotyping Māori students if teachers deny students' self-determination. Instead of subscribing to dominant perceptions about Māori children, we need instead to create classroom contexts whereby Māori students can determine their own diverse positionalities in classrooms. This often-ignored factor means that images teachers hold of classroom relationships must allow for the many realities within which children might live and grow up; urban/rural, tribal/non-tribal, rich/poor, single-parented/dual-parented/extended families.

A further dimension that needs consideration here is the realisation that individual identities are multifaceted and multi-generative. Māori students are no longer, if they ever were, monocultural (see also Freeland, Sarangapani, this issue). Indeed some will have experiences of many cultural settings. Kalantzis and Cope explain the implications of this realisation. 'Just as there are multiple layers and facets to everyone's identity, so too there are multiple discourses of identity and multiple discourses of recognition to be negotiated' (1999, p. 270). Further, Kalantzis and Cope explain the pedagogic implications of these interaction patterns by suggesting that in order to recognise the diversity of lifestyles and their discursive practices 'learning processes need to recruit, rather than attempt to ignore and erase, the different subjectivities students bring to learning'. In this sense, '[individuals] have at their disposal a complex range of representational resources, never of one culture, but of many cultures in their lived experience, the many layers of their identity and the many dimensions of their being' (1999, pp. 270–271).

In short, we need a pedagogy that is holistic, flexible and complex, that will allow Māori students to present their multiplicities and complexities and their individual and collective diversities, rather than a pedagogy that perpetuates teacher images (often wrong) of these students.

Ako (Reciprocal Learning)

Literally meaning to teach and to learn, this term metaphorically emphasises reciprocal learning, where the teacher does not have to be the fountain of all knowledge, but rather a partner in the 'conversation' of learning. Teachers and students can take turns, as in the metaphor of the conversation, when storying and re-storying their realities, either as individual learners or within a group context. Reciprocal learning also promotes a learning of knowledge-in-action as related to the traditions of the various cultural elements being taught. One implication of this principle is that active learning approaches are preferred because in this way the processes of knowledge-in-action can be brought to the interaction, indeed for the interaction. This means that students can participate, using sense-making processes they bring to the relationship, and share these with others, as of right.

Kia Piki Ake i Nga Raruraru o te Kainga (Mediation of Socio-economic and Home Difficulties)

Participation in Māori-medium schools reaches into Māori homes and brings parents and families into the activities of the school. There are at least two main outcomes of this relationship. The first is that where parents are incorporated into the education of their children on terms they can understand and approve of, then children do better at school. This feature also has implications for better and less problematic home to school transitions. In other words, the closer the classroom experiences and the home experiences are for students, then the more likely it will be that students will be able to participate in the educational experiences designed at the school. This understanding addresses the preferences Māori people have for their problems to be dealt with in culturally familiar ways. Such understandings have major implications for the ways in which schools and teachers deal with peoples of all cultures.

Whānau (Extended Family)

Whānau is a primary concept (a cultural preference) that contains both values (cultural aspirations) and social processes (cultural practices). The implications of this principle are immense for mainstream education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. When imaging or theorising classroom interactions in terms of, for example, metaphoric *whānau* relationships, classroom interactions will be fundamentally different from those created when teachers talk of method and process using machine or transmission metaphors to explain their theorising/imaging.

The clear implication for mainstream classroom relationships is that where the establishment of *whānau*-type relationships in the classroom is primary, then a pattern of interactions would develop where commitment and connectedness were paramount, where responsibility for the learning of others was fostered and where the classroom becomes an active location for all learners to participate in decision-making processes through the process of collaborative storying termed *spiral discourse* (Bishop, 1996; see also below).

Kaupapa (Collective Vision Philosophy)

The collectivist philosophy of achieving excellence in both languages and cultures that make up the world of Māori children is central to Māori-medium schooling. In addition, the experiences of the *Kura Kaupapa Māori* (Māori-medium primary schools) movement demonstrates that students achieve better when there is a close relationship between home and school in terms of aspirations, languages and cultures. These understandings can be extrapolated to mainstream learning environments to suggest the need to develop a common set of goals and principles and practices which seek to ensure that all children will benefit from education.

Summary

This analysis of *Kaupapa Māori* educational settings creates an image for mainstream educational institutions of an educational setting where Māori students are able to participate on their own terms; terms that are determined by the student because the very pedagogic process holds this as a central value. Further, these are to be culturally determined in terms of promoting the primacy of the sense-making processes (cultures) of the learners themselves. Learning is to be reciprocal and interactive, home and school learning is to be interrelated,

learners are to be connected to each other and learn with and from each other. Finally, a common set of goals and principles should guide the process.

Kaupapa Māori Educational Research as a Model for Power Sharing

Metaphors from another *Kaupapa Māori* education setting, this time research, are also useful for suggesting ways of developing mainstream educational settings wherein Māori students can participate successfully. In a meta-study of five research projects conducted within Māori settings (Bishop, 1996), it was shown that by using Māori metaphors for research, researchers were repositioned from the discursive space traditionally occupied by researchers into Māori sense-making contexts. In this way, using new metaphors for pedagogy could reposition teachers into contexts where learners could bring their sense-making processes to bear. In these contexts, learners' experiences, representations of these experiences and sense-making processes may be legitimated.

Whakawhānaungatanga as Research: implications for pedagogy

In Bishop (1996, 1998a, 1998b), *Whakawhānaungatanga* (the process of establishing relationships in a Māori context), was used metaphorically as a research strategy to address concerns about research initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability as a result of the imposition of the researcher's agenda, concerns and interests on the research process. This approach was also connected with the Treaty of Waitangi, the foundation document of Aotearoa/New Zealand, through giving voice to a culturally positioned means of collaboratively constructing research stories in a 'culturally conscious and connected manner'. Within the research domain of *Kaupapa Māori*, the central theme of *whakawhānaungatanga* focuses on the researcher's (and by implication the teacher's) connectedness, engagement and involvement with others in order to promote self-determination, agency and voice.

There are three major and interrelated factors in employing the metaphor of *whakawhānaungatanga* as a research strategy. These three factors can also indicate how classroom interactions might be different, given a different mode of consciousness.

The first factor is that establishing and maintaining *whānau*- (literally, an extended family) type relationships is a fundamental, often extensive and ongoing part of the research process. This involves the establishment of 'whānau of interest' (metaphoric *whānau*) through a process of 'spiral discourse'. This means establishing a *whānau*-like relationship among the research group and using collaborative storying and restorying (spiral discourse) as a means of creating a collective response. In establishing *whānau* relationships in the classroom, such settings would be seen as an active location for all learners, and this includes the teachers, to participate in the decision-making processes through the process of spiral discourse. *Whānau* processes may also be used, literally or metaphorically, to give substance to a culturally positioned and understood means of collaboratively constructing learning objectives, as opposed to predetermined learning objectives, and thereby developing a commitment in learners and teachers to these objectives in a culturally conscious and connected manner.

The second factor of *whakawhānaungatanga* as a research process is that researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in the research process; that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually and not just as a 'researcher' concerned with methodology. Such positionings are typically demonstrated in the language/metaphor used by researchers. Similarly, in the classroom context, teachers' involvement with their students would be characterised by trust, connectedness and commitment. Ladson-Billings' (1995) study on

culturally relevant teaching in the USA, for example, established how significant commitment and participation was among successful teachers of Black American children.

The third research factor is that establishing relationships in a Māori context addresses the power and control issues fundamental to research, through participatory research practices (in this context, termed ‘Participant Driven’ research) in a manner that facilitates the sharing of power and control. The implication of this factor for classroom interactions is that there needs to be established a means of power sharing [4].

Principles: *Kaupapa Māori* messages for mainstream institutions

What sorts of educational principles would such images suggest? Here it is suggested that from these two pictures of *Kaupapa Māori* schooling and research (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1997) we can derive a set of principles to guide the construction of practices that will address the five issues of power—initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy, accountability—as these impact on Māori students in mainstream schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

We must attempt to create learning relationships within classrooms wherein learners’ culturally generated sense-making processes are used and developed in order that they may successfully participate in classroom interactions. Such relationships must promote the knowledges, learning styles and sense-making processes of the learners as ‘acceptable’ or ‘legitimate’. Teachers should interact with students in such a way that new knowledge is co-created. In this way, learners are able to be co-inquirers, interact and exchange notes and take part in the whole process of learning, from goal setting to assessment and evaluation. Learning is seen as active, close to real-life, problem-based, integrated, critically reflective, creative, and lifelong. Teachers seek to create sociocultural contexts wherein learning takes place actively, reflectively, and where learners can not only use a variety of learning styles, but also have the power to determine which learning styles they need to use. In other words, creating contexts where they can safely bring what they know and who they are into the learning relationship. Teachers and community interact, and home and school aspirations are complementary. Further, what students know—who they are and how they know what they know—forms the foundations of interaction patterns in the classroom. In short, where *culture counts*. Such a position stands in contrast to traditional positions where knowledge is determined by the teacher and children are required to leave who they are at the door of the classroom or at the school gate.

Practices: means of implementation

The question then remains: how do we develop a set of practices that will implement such images and principles in mainstream classrooms? Here it is suggested how narrative pedagogies, integrated curriculum and problem-focused methodologies can be used to implement such practices [5].

Narrative Pedagogy

Narrative pedagogies provide one means of creating power-sharing relationships in classrooms. Narrative pedagogies are based on the notion that people lead storied lives and that it is the process of storying and re-storying that we term learning. Rather than learning being seen as a gathering of knowledge from other people, or the learner being a recipient of transmitted knowledge, narrative pedagogies mean that we see learning as the outcome of interactions between individuals and/or groups, teachers/pupils, individuals and groups and

text/resources and so on. Such an approach to learning addresses the self-determination of the learner in that such practices recognise 'that each learner has to construct an understanding for her or himself, using both incoming stimuli and existing knowledge' (Bell & Cowie, 2001, p. 4). This means that both students' existing knowledges and sense-making processes are central to the pedagogic process and influence the learning outcomes. Thus, in a culturally diverse classroom, there are a great variety of possible interactive relationships. Such practices operationalise principles that seek to promote an active, learner-centred education, where learning is problem-based and integrated, and where an holistic approach to curriculum is fundamental to the practices developed.

Lauritzen and Jaeger (1997), in a book entitled *Integrating Learning Through Story: the narrative curriculum*, use narrative pedagogy as a practice for co-constructing curriculum. They suggest that this approach will allow children of culturally diverse backgrounds to participate in learning by bringing their own sense-making processes to bear on stories. Lauritzen and Jaeger suggest that a rich compelling story with a universal theme is an ideal medium for containing and organising the curriculum so as to address the diversity of learners in modern classrooms. Theirs is an approach that actively acknowledges diversity and identifies how cultural diversity may indeed be central to curriculum development. They maintain that 'each learner, regardless of gender, ethnicity, regional orientation, developmental need, or prior knowledge has the opportunity to act within the narrative curriculum and make sense of the universal themes embodied in story' (1997, p. 25).

In this approach, Lauritzen and Jaeger (1997) suggest learners are empowered/facilitated through stories to grow from their own prior knowledge to new understandings appropriate to their own experiences. Further, such an approach allows students to co-construct curriculum content through negotiation between themselves and their teachers. In this way, students and teachers learn to negotiate ways and means of developing strategies for investigation and exploration, as well as ways of interpreting and representing their findings. In classrooms employing narrative storying, learners do not all have to arrive at the same point or understanding and a diversity of learning styles and approaches is always admissible.

This approach is a prime example of a powerful and inclusive teaching and learning strategy. Such strategies are vital components of a pedagogy designed to: (a) maximise participation by all students (irrespective of cultural or academic and social diversity); and (b) to minimise the exclusion of students from classrooms or schools, on the grounds that they are lacking in 'pre-requisite' knowledge, understanding or achievement for participating in learning activities.

Lauritzen and Jaeger (1997) explain the process of story and re-storying that takes place within a unit of work as being based on notions of active participation by learners in the construction of knowledge rather than their being passive recipients of knowledge-out-of-context. In this constructivist approach, learners are seen as coming to an educational experience with a wealth of information and experience and it is 'in the interaction of this prior knowledge and current experiences that learning takes place' (1997, p. 55). Prior knowledge forms the foundation, the stepping stone, the bridge to further conceptual developments. New ideas are incorporated by being linked to prior knowledges. Hence the importance of creating learning contexts where students' prior knowledge is welcome and indeed essential. Such notions explain why children who are not socialised into the culture of the teacher in the traditional classroom are unable to learn in these classrooms (see also Cahill & Collard, McCarty, this issue). Any places they have to position the new ideas, or any 'hooks' or 'linkages' to their family and cultural experiences are neither recognised nor validated in the classroom. Narrative pedagogy is an educational practice that draws together the experiences of the home and school in ways that culturally connect.

The notion of storying and re-storying also provides us with a clear means of seeing knowledge not as finite, static and complete, but constantly in a process of reformation, as an organic process of invention rather than a process of passive accumulation through the receipt of transmissions. Learning takes place through continual reflection on past knowledge and the resolution of cognitive conflicts and in this way builds on earlier, incomplete levels of thinking. Narrative pedagogy is thus a means of creating interaction patterns that position teachers and students within co-joint reflections on shared experiences (the narrative as stimulus) and co-joint constructions of meanings about these experiences (narratives as meaning constructions). From this interaction, the stories of the classroom participants merge to create new stories and understandings. Fundamental to this interaction pattern is the relationship created on the basis of the self-determination of each of the parties. In this relationship the pedagogies are not used as a means of control but rather as a location where the learner can control his/her destiny with the help of a teacher as co-learner.

A further benefit of this approach is that such interactions are located within what Vygotsky (1978) terms the zone of proximal development, that area of development between what the student can do alone and what they can achieve with assistance. Applebee (1996) explains this as when learning knowledge-in-action we must do what we do not yet know how to do. Learning what we do not yet know is therefore a social process, not an accumulation of social products determined by others. We learn to do things by doing them with others. To Vygotsky (1978), such a process of learning therefore allows learners to bring themselves into the interaction; their experiences, their knowledges and aspirations and above all, their variety of sense-making and meaning-constructing processes which will come from and be part of the cultures in which they participate.

Narrative pedagogy, in allowing students to create meaning through using their own sense-making processes within a socially interactive context, addresses the concern of allowing the cultures of the child to enter the classroom. This interaction will necessarily take place within the cultural world views and discursive practices within which the learner functions. Such an approach requires the teacher to be attentive to the variety of explanations learners will create. Being silent, waiting, being attentive as in a state of abeyance, are all means whereby the teacher does not swamp the conversation. Young (1991) reports that in most modern classrooms, the teachers are the active participants, often questioning, probing and constantly talking, giving students little time to reflect and consider what has been said previously. In the narrative approach to classroom conversations, the initiative is with the learner. In this way, the story the learner creates gains precedence and sets the pattern of subsequent interactions which take the form of a re-telling of this story by those who are experiencing the story. Rather than an adversarial and thereby exclusive interaction, the interaction is cumulative (spirals) and inclusive, in short, a spiral discourse. Meanings are contextually grounded and shift as the discourse is shaped by the participants in the conversation. Such an approach does not suggest that the teacher be mute, but that s/he needs to be a skilled listener and commentator rather than a skilled transmitter of subject matter. However, this is not a matter of the teacher being solely an adjudicator, ignorant of subject matter. The teacher still needs to be able to guide students in their searches for content or find others from other cultural experiences who can assist.

The concept used by narrative therapists of 'not knowing' is a useful tool that teachers could use. Not knowing just what the 'not-yet-said' consists of is a powerful strategy and provides an impetus for other participants in the conversation to speculate, elaborate, guess, infer or question; all higher level thinking skills seemingly so difficult to develop, yet vital for further learning. The promotion of a position where learners can question must surely be our ultimate goal, particularly if they can raise questions from a position of being safe in that their

cultural integrity and identity is unquestioned, that is, that they themselves are acceptable. How often do we hear of strategies where student questioning is the goal, yet where practitioners proceed with a series of teacher- (or textbook-) generated questions? We tend to agree nowadays that it is more important that a student learns to answer their own questions rather than those in a textbook. Then why do students spend so much time on the latter activity, if it is the former that they really need to practise?

Narrative pedagogy is therefore an approach in which young people are able to recollect, reflect and make sense of their experiences from within their own cultural context and preferably in their own language. In such ways their interpretations and analyses become 'normal' and 'accepted' as opposed to those of the teacher, the teacher taking a 'curious', 'not-knowing', 'wait and see' position. Further, alternative ways of knowing set the pattern for subsequent interactions where the participants engage in an interactive, complex, holistic approach to pedagogic interactions. This involves mutual telling and retelling of stories by people who are living those stories. The major implication for teachers is that they should be able to participate in the sense-making contexts of the students rather than simply expecting the students to engage with theirs, as is so often the case.

Problem-Based Active Methodology

Fundamental to narrative pedagogies is the notion of problems being central to inquiry. Here it is suggested that problems that are significant in the lives of the learners can be brought to the process of meaning identification and the construction of new meanings. Indeed, such a pedagogy actively engages the learner in identifying and classifying the problem, in seeking resolutions and in assessing and evaluating what difference participation in the activity has made for the learner.

It is important to emphasise this wider meaning of the term 'active'. Being 'active' does not just mean learners moving bodily through space, but rather moving toward sharing the power of talk, and participating in a process of conversation and reflection. This stands in contrast to many current classroom practices where the teacher is generally the supplier of active curriculum content (i.e. knowledge), and is also the designer and controller of the discourse.

Problem-based learning places the learner at the centre of the learning process and aims to integrate learning with practice (Alavi, 1995, in Howell, 1997). It is a way of constructing and teaching courses using problems as the stimulus and focus of student activity (Boud & Feletti, 1991, in Howell, 1997). Students are required to find out, bring or generate important knowledge in the process of tackling problematic situations. Problem-based learning also involves continuous evaluation through peer support and critique, self-reflection by the teacher and the learner. Self-direction, cooperative learning, collaboration and reflection are core elements of a problem-based, narrative pedagogy that characterises fully inclusive classrooms.

The tendency of problem-based learning approaches to 'spill out' of the classroom, requiring students to seek help and guidance from others, enables students to understand how their work is relevant to the wider world. Conversely, this real world contact ensures that what is taught at school is understandable to the wider community, mediating the tendency of many 'new' curricula to become foreign to parents, for example. A further benefit is that research in Aotearoa/New Zealand by McNaughton and Glynn (1998), along with developing *Kaupapa Māori* practice, show clearly that where parents are engaged and involved in the education of their children, children achieve better at school. However, problem-based learning on its own is not sufficient to ensure this engagement. Rather it is a necessary

condition in the matrix that constitutes and facilitates improved achievement for children from non-dominant cultural groups, by creating a context whereby linkages between the knowledge of the children's home and family and their schooling is valued and legitimated as a part of the formal schooling process. Assessment proceedings with a problem-based learning approach are similarly understandable, predictable and matter of fact, not something divorced from the flow of learning for the benefit of the teacher. In the context of assessment, teaching becomes supportive dialogic and often consists of interactive feedback to students, rather than the exercise of power of pass and fail.

Problem-based learning focuses on real-life situations and real conversations, utilising in the learning context the same skills for coping with a rapidly changing global community and economy. This is preferred to learning rapidly out-dated and out-dating knowledges-out-of-context, the outcome of which is to perpetuate the imbalance in the classroom through continuing the non-involvement of young Māori in educational interactions. This, in turn, serves to maintain the current structural pattern of dominance and subordination for Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Curriculum Integration

Naturally following from a problem-based learning focus is the notion of curriculum integration. This approach is not new, indeed it is one of the approaches to teaching and learning that is encouraged in the new Aotearoa/New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993) and the recent Curriculum Development Update (Ministry of Education, 1997). However, it is an approach that has been somewhat sidelined and misunderstood in the last decade where there has been an increasing focus on subject specialisation. James Beane (1997), a proponent of integrated curriculum approaches, explains that in curriculum integration, 'ongoing themes are drawn from life as it is being lived and experienced' (p. xi). In other words life as it is storied, and re-story(ed). Learning is related to questions and concerns that have personal and social significance. Themes developed in such a manner are a means of promoting and actioning critical inquiry into real-life issues, the pursuit of social action, collaborative teacher-student curriculum planning, and above all 'opens the way to redefining power relations in the classroom *and* to challenging the idea that important knowledge is only that named and endorsed by academicians and bureaucrats outside the classroom' (Beane, 1997, p. xi).

In this approach, curriculum is co-constructed by the questions and concerns collaboratively developed by teachers and students. Knowledge in this sense becomes related to problem-solving, and the ongoing process of critical analysis of society (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Beane (1997) sees the idea of planning *with* rather than planning *for* young people as central to curriculum integration, where connecting new experiences to prior ones and 'personally contextualising knowledge must sooner or later involve direct participation by young people themselves' (p. 50).

Whatever the approach taken to curriculum integration, there needs to be an assurance that curriculum content and pedagogy does not preclude the development of collaborative learning partnerships which respond to the specific cultural needs and interests of the learner. A narrative pedagogy, of the type that Lauritzen and Jaeger (1997) suggest, presupposes that the teacher will be able to facilitate curriculum integration that goes beyond teacher-imposed integration models, such as *pre-set* themes or topics, and allows the integration to arise from the 'conversation' about the story. This will in turn reflect the multiple experiences students bring to the classroom from the multiple traditions into which they have and are being socialised. In this sense, curriculum integration allows students to explore interrelationships

across all curriculum elements and to use higher thinking skills, so rarely evident in classroom learning. Integrated curricula in turn provide structural support and a meaningful context for the discursive interactions that are fundamental to the narrative pedagogy. This process of 'conversation' that is fundamental to narratives as pedagogy is similar to that identified in *Kaupapa Māori* educational research contexts (Bishop, 1996), where interviews that addressed researcher imposition were constructed as 'conversations'. These conversations were sequential, in-depth and semi-structured; in short they created collaborative stories through a process of spiral discourse. The process of storying and re-storying in classroom contexts may also result in collaborative stories being created through the same process.

The notion of sequences is important for developing spiral discourse. Sequences allow participants to revisit the meanings they construct of their learning experiences as they continue the discourse with others and refer to new resource materials. Applebee (1996) explains this process.

As new elements enter the conversation, they provide not only new contexts for exploring or redefining the established topic, but new perspectives on other elements in the conversation, and on the topic itself. (p. 77)

The notion of sequencing then, or rather spiralling of the conversation as re-storying, is a process of coming back and reassessing the meaning we have created out of an interaction. Such fluidity may appear to be problematic to teachers, but it is closer to how real life contexts operate, how scientific discoveries are made (for example, see Kuhn, 1970) how children learn according to Vygotsky (1978), and most resembles Applebee's (1996) concept of 'knowledge-in-action' rather than the artificial abstraction of 'knowledge-out-of-context' that is so common in our classrooms.

Conclusions: *Kaupapa Māori* messages for mainstream schooling

One significant message for mainstream education in Aotearoa/New Zealand (and elsewhere) from this analysis of *Kaupapa Māori* educational experiences is that new images and their constituent metaphors are needed to inform and guide the development of educational principles and pedagogies. This paper has identified just some of the metaphors that are fundamental to *Kaupapa Māori* educational contexts; schooling and research might well be such metaphors and could help guide the development of new principles and practices that in turn would create power-sharing relationships and classroom interaction patterns within which young Māori people could successfully participate.

Further, the implication of Elbaz's (1981, 1983) model is that a technical approach that focuses simply on changing practices is inadequate in addressing, for example, achievement levels in schooling, because the powerful imagery educators may hold may not necessarily change. Similarly, it is not simply a matter of teachers changing or even critically reflecting on the principles that guide their practice. Rather it is a matter of critically reflecting both on the imagery we hold about the teaching process as well as the metaphors we use to conceptualise this process (see also Cahill & Collard, this issue). Simply put, if the imagery that teachers hold of Māori children (or indeed of any children), along with their interactions patterns, continues to be one of deficit, then their principles and practices will reflect this, and will thereby perpetuate the educational crisis for Māori children.

Indeed, as with indigenous students world-wide, teachers in mainstream contexts have traditionally denied the authenticity of Māori experiences and voice, through control over curriculum and pedagogy, and by means of control over the dominant images and metaphors. In this manner, epistemological racism (Scheurich & Young, 1997) is perpetuated. Māori imagery and aspirations, as expressed in Māori metaphor as well as Māori lived

experiences, and the meanings of these experiences, have been marginalised and interpreted by the 'authoritative' voice and directions of the 'expert' to suit ends other than those desired by Māori peoples themselves. To add insult to injury, everyday 'acceptable' myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand have been created and perpetuated by such a process. Sadly today many of these myths are believed by Māori and non-Māori alike. Such practices perpetuate the ideology of cultural superiority that is fundamental to colonisation. This ideology precludes the development of power sharing processes, and the legitimation of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.

In the classroom context, cultural domination and preconceptions by teachers means that teachers expect students continually to adjust their understanding to that of the teacher. Indeed in many ways this continual adjustment is seen as successful learning and teaching because it 'brings out' the student's knowledge, it works from the 'known to the unknown'. However, what is not understood is that it is not the teachers who move into the unknown but the students who work in this unknown, which is actually the teachers 'known'. Where there is a cultural match between teacher and student, such shifting by children is usually accomplished. However, where there is a cultural mismatch then problems arise. In contrast, where a teacher continually adjusts his/her understanding to that of the student's narrative, there is potential for the student's narrative to develop and not to dry up (see, for example, Clay, 1985).

Kaupapa Māori educational experiences have identified that the use of impositional methodologies, whether they be in research contexts or classrooms, means that participants will experience having something done *to* them, rather than *with* them. As a result they will feel left out of the learning interactions and conversations with other participants. To develop and use a strategy that leaves people out of the conversation is to perpetuate a system that is hierarchical, that repeats the pattern of dominance and subordination that has characterised Māori/Pākehā relationships in Aotearoa/New Zealand for far too long. It denies Māori people legitimate representation and participation as guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi. Monocultural pedagogies, predicated on largely unchallenged Pākehā metaphors, have also dominated classroom practice for too long during the history of its schooling.

These pedagogies have been successful for the dominant culture, but are increasingly being tested and rejected by even the most compliant of students. A major message from *Kaupapa Māori* educational experiences is the need for an approach whereby teachers can engage in 'conversations' with all of their students that go beyond rhetorical questions that already have answers, or pedagogical questions that imply the required direction of the answer. In both these approaches questioning becomes a means of directing children to pre-determined answers. For children from different cultural groups, these predetermined answers may lie outside their experiences and often outside their understanding or ways of knowing. Questioning becomes a process of checking to see if children know what the teacher knows or what the teacher is thinking. Further, paradigm shifting compounds the problem because the dominant discourse reinforces its own narrative cohesiveness in preference to any other cultural narratives. Therefore, in effect, the traditional position of the teacher has been that of the person who determines the shape and scope of what constitutes the classroom narrative, that is the agreed-to-descriptions and explanations of what has been arrived at through classroom interactions. Indigenous peoples, such as the Māori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand, are increasingly vocal in their concern about such power and control having traditionally been determined by the imposition of the teacher's agenda, interests and concerns on the pedagogic process.

Kaupapa Māori educational theory, principles and practices suggest new approaches to interpersonal and group interactions that have the potential to move Aotearoa/New Zealand

educational experiences for many children of diverse cultural backgrounds from the negative to the positive. *Kaupapa Māori* practices suggest that where the images and the metaphors we use to express these images are holistic, interactional and focus on power-sharing relationships, the resultant classroom practices and educational experiences for children of other than the dominant group will be entirely different.

New metaphors need to be holistic and flexible and able to be determined by or understood within the cultural contexts that have meaning for the lives of the many young people of diverse backgrounds who attend modern schools. Teaching and learning strategies which flow from these metaphors need to be flexible and allow the diverse voices of young people primacy. In such a pedagogy, the participants in the learning interaction become involved in the process of collaboration, in the process of mutual story-telling and re-storying, so that a relationship can emerge in which *both* stories are heard, or indeed a process where a new story is created by all the participants. Such a pedagogy addresses Māori people's concerns about current pedagogic practices being fundamentally monocultural and epistemologically racist. This new pedagogy recognises that all people who are involved in the learning and teaching process are participants who have meaningful experiences, valid concerns and legitimate questions.

This model constitutes the classroom as a place where young people's sense-making processes (cultures) are incorporated and enhanced, where the existing knowledges of young people are seen as 'acceptable' and 'official', in such a way that their stories provide the learning base from whence they can branch out into new fields of knowledge. In this process, the teacher interacts with students in such a way (storying and re-storying) that new knowledge is co-created. Such a classroom will generate totally different interaction patterns and educational outcomes from a classroom where knowledge is seen as simply something that the teacher makes sense of and then passes onto students.

NOTES

- [1] 'Mainstream' is not used here in the sense in which it is employed in the inclusive education literature. Rather, it refers to the situation in which most Māori students currently find themselves—in educational institutions that have been developed by past policies of assimilation and integration and which take little, or no account of their cultural differences. In other words, mainstream educational contexts are those that have been developed and determined by and for the dominant culture.
 - [2] This pattern and its necrotic outcomes also affect other community language groups, especially those able to be identified in Ogbu's terms as 'involuntary minority groups', whose experiences of language loss and cultural marginalisation are broadly the same as Māori (see Holmes, 1990).
 - [3] A recent study by Johnstone and Read (2000) identified this belief as being the most common among experienced Pākehā male psychiatrists.
 - [4] Full details of this research can be found in Bishop (1996, 1998a, 1998b).
 - [5] What is outlined here is a series of suggestions that speak to the theoretical parameters identified earlier. Such identification necessarily raises questions such as what empirical evidence is there that such an approach will improve achievement? It is not possible to address this question in this paper. However, this question is at the heart of an ongoing major funded research project, directed by the author, into professional development strategies that can be used to aid teachers to work with Māori students to improve their educational achievement (see also Cahill & Collard, McCarty, this issue).
- This research began in 2001 by examining the experiences of young Māori people in mainstream secondary schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and from their ideas of what constitutes effective teaching, developed and trialled a professional development package for teachers. During 2002, the research team worked with a selected group of teachers, monitoring and giving feedback on their classroom interactions and also monitoring changes in student achievement that occurred as a result of the process. Early results from this research project indicate that approaches to revisiting classroom relationships and interactions that locate Māori children within the learning/teaching dynamic are, in fact, very practical and easily achieved. For example, in-depth detailed student narratives of experience are very powerful in challenging the preponderance of deficit discourses among teachers and thus changing the subsequent basis of teacher-student interactions.

REFERENCES

- APPLEBEE, A. (1996) *Curriculum, as Conversation* (Chicago, IL, and London, University of Chicago Press).
- BEANE, J. (1997) *Curriculum Integration. Designing the core of democratic education* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- BELL, B. & COWIE, B. (2001) *Formative Assessment and Science Education* (Dordrecht, Kluwer Press).
- BISHOP, R. (1996) *Collaborative Research Stories: whakawhānaungatanga* (Palmerston North, Dunmore Press).
- BISHOP, R. (1997) Interviewing as collaborative storytelling, *Education Research and Perspectives*, 24 (1), pp. 28–47.
- BISHOP, R. (1998a) Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: a Māori approach to creating knowledge, *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11 (2), pp. 199–219.
- BISHOP, R. (1998b) Examples of culturally specific research practices: a response to Tillman and López, *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11 (3), pp. 419–434.
- BISHOP, R. & GLYNN, T. (1998) Achieving cultural integrity within education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in: K. CUSHNER (Ed.) *Intercultural Perspectives on Intercultural Education* (New York, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).
- BISHOP, R. & GLYNN, T. (1999) *Culture Counts: changing power relations in education* (Palmerston North, Dunmore Press).
- BRUNER, J. (1996) *The Culture of Education* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- CHAPPLE, S., JEFFERIES, R. & WALKER, R. (1997) *Māori Participation and Performance in Education. A literature review and research programme*. Report for the Ministry of Education (Wellington, Ministry of Education).
- CLAY, M. M. (1985) Engaging with the school system: a study of interactions in new entrant classroom, *Aotearoa/New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 20 (1), pp. 20–38.
- ELBAZ, F. (1981) The teachers' 'practical knowledge': report of a case study, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11, pp. 43–71.
- ELBAZ, F. (1983) *Teacher Thinking: a study of practical knowledge* (New York, Nichols Publishing).
- HARKER, R. & NASH, R. (1990) Cultural reproduction and school achievement: a case for Kura Kaupapa Māori, *Access*, 9 (2), pp. 26–39.
- HESHUSIUS, L. (1996) Modes of consciousness and the self in learning disabilities research. Considering past and present, in: K. KIM REID, WAYNE P. HRESKO, & H. LEE SWANSON (Eds) *Cognitive Approaches to Learning Disabilities* (Austin, TX, PRO-ED).
- HOLMES, J. (1990) Community languages: researchers as catalysts, *New Settlers and Multicultural Education Issues*, 7 (3), pp. 19–26.
- HOWELL, F. (1997) A report on problem-based learning. Unpublished paper, Griffith University.
- JOHNSTONE, K. & READ, J. (2000) Psychiatrists' recommendations for improving bicultural training and Māori mental health services: a New Zealand survey, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 34 (1), pp. 135–146.
- KALANTZIS, M. & COPE, B. (1999) Multicultural education: transforming the mainstream. In MAY, S. (Ed.) *Critical Multiculturalism: rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).
- KUHN, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1995) Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy, *American Educational Research Journal*, 32 (3), pp. 465–491.
- LAURITZEN, C. & JAEGER, M. (1997) *Integrating Learning Through Story: the narrative curriculum* (New York, Delmar Publishers).
- LOVEGROVE, M. (1966) The scholastic achievements of European and Māori children, *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 1 (1), pp. 16–39.
- MAY, S. (1999a) Language and education rights for indigenous peoples, in: S. MAY (Ed.) *Indigenous Community-based Education* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters).
- MAY, S. (1999b) Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: avoiding essentialism, in: S. MAY (Ed.) *Critical Multiculturalism: rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).
- MAY, S. (2001) *Language and Minority Rights: ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (London, Longman).
- MCCUDDEN, M. (1992) *He Tohu Amanga Matauranga* (Wellington, Specialist Education Services).
- MCNAUGHTON, S. & GLYNN, T. (1998) Effective collaboration: what teachers need to know about communities. Invited keynote address, New Zealand Council for Teacher Education Annual Conference, Hamilton, 15–17 October.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1993) *The Aotearoa/New Zealand Curriculum Framework: Te Anga Matauranga o Aotearoa* (Wellington, Learning Media).
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1997) Curriculum development update 23. *The Aotearoa/New Zealand Education Gazette*, 75 (16), pp. 1–8.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1998) *Nga Haetaa Matauranga. Annual Report on Māori Education 1997/98 and Direction for 1999* (Wellington, Ministry of Education).
- NASH, R. (1993) *Succeeding Generations* (Auckland, Oxford University Press).
- NICHOLSON, T. (2000) A close reading of the gaps, *New Zealand Education Review*, 5 (11), p. 9.
- SCHEURICH, J. & YOUNG, M. (1997) Coloring epistemologies: are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26 (4), pp. 4–16.

- SIMON, J. (1990) The role of schooling in Māori-Pākehā relations. Unpublished thesis, Auckland University.
- SMITH, G. H. (1992) Tane-nui-a-rangi's legacy...propping up the sky: Kaupapa Māori as resistance and intervention. Paper presented at the Aotearoa/New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australia Association for Research in Education joint conference, Deakin University, Australia, 20–25 November.
- SMITH, G. H. (1997) Kaupapa Māori as Transformative Praxis. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Auckland.
- SMITH, L.T. (1999) *Decolonising Methodologies: research and indigenous people* (London/Dunedin, Zed Books/University of Otago Press).
- TE PUNI KOKIRI/MINISTRY OF MĀORI DEVELOPMENT (1998) *Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps between Māori and Non-Māori*. A report to the Minister of Māori Affairs (Wellington, Te Puni Kokiri/Ministry of Māori Development).
- TE TAURA WHIRI I TE REO MĀORI (1995) *He Taonga te Reo* [The Treasure of the Language] (Wellington, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori [Māori Language Commission]).
- VYGOTSKY, L. S. (1978) Interaction between learning and development, in: C. COLE, V. JOHN-STEINER, S. SCRIBNER & E. SOUBERMAN (Eds) *Mind in Society: the development of higher psychological processes* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press).
- WALKER, R. (1990) *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: struggle without end* (Auckland, Penguin).
- YOUNG, R. (1991) *Critical Theory and Classroom Talk* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters).