

## ***Indigenising the Divide –Amelioration from the Margins***

The New Zealand Landscape

*“For the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. They may allow us to temporarily beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. Audre Lorde*

The history of educational provision for Māori students within the dominant Eurocentric paradigm demonstrates paucity of provision and a culpability which denies our children their birth right as citizens within a bicultural society. It is my belief, as a teacher, that the educational discipline is an emancipatory, compassionate field of human endeavour; yet, until recent indigenous approaches, educational research which informs current New Zealand practice has remained obdurately monocultural, resulting in significant disengagement of Maori students as evidenced by the statistics of disenfranchisement: early leaving exceptions, suspensions by ethnicity, percentage of school leavers with little or no formal attainment.

A review of the educational research pathway to the continuance of the deleterious hegemony described may elucidate the causes of the divisive anomaly within a society which prides itself on innovative, insightful educational endeavour. A perusal of recent research developments within the educational discipline may offer hope of alternative approaches which relegate “The master’s tools” to ignominious obsolescence.

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century the dominant paradigm in educational research was premised upon Eurocentric Enlightenment thinking which viewed all phenomena as objective. It may be characterised as reductionist: linear, exhibiting quantifiable exclusivity, operating within narrowly defined parameters of cognitive ability, focussed on analysis of classifiable data. The “Scientific approach” was lauded in a century which was dominated by Western power structures, packaged and promoted as desirable modernity, despite the war torn savagery and economic chaos which characterised its opening years.

Two non-government organisations influenced the New Zealand educational research field in the opening decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The New Educational Fellowship (Abiss, 1998) rose from the traumatic post Great War scene as an international movement which promoted a child centred approach, espoused “progressive” educational ideals and valued social reform as an ideological stance. The movement spread to New Zealand in the 1930s and flourished throughout that decade and the subsequent decade. Its most prominent expression was in the New Educational Fellowship Conference of 1937, supported by the Labour government and lauded as a populist new educational approach which would heal societal ills. The movement influenced governmental policy makers, teaching organisations and engaged the populist imagination. It was, for a time, considered a socially sanctioned panacea. NEF provided the moral justification and political mandate for the launch of a raft of educational research which investigated social conditions and how they might be ameliorated through the educational process.

Despite its progressive image, the NEF was ultimately a victim of cultural cringe, deferring to its parent organisation, based in “Mother England” in positivist research methodology and in its narrow cultural lens. Its impact upon educational provision for indigenous children was indirect, via the channel of a broader concern for children of the socially disadvantaged. With the societal upheaval created by the Second World War, the movement lost its momentum and faded early in the 1950s, yet its influential echo may be heard in educational research and government policy published in subsequent decades.

The second non-government educational organisation which originated at same time as NEF, was the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZNCER)

NZCER was established in 1934 through grants from the Carnegie Corporation. It became a statutory body in 1945 and now operates under the NZCER Act 1972 (and amendments). We are not formally attached to any government department, university or other educational organisation. (NZCER, 2013)

Initially NZNCER followed the traditional path of the linear, quantifiable research paradigm, couched within the cultural milieu of its time. A perusal of the NZNCER archive exemplifies the dominant cultural preoccupation with collection and objective analysis of data which underpinned educational research, despite early organisational conversations about research into the education of Maori students and the establishment in 1974 of Te Wāhanga.

Te Wāhanga is the Māori research unit within the New Zealand Council for Educational Research. We are committed to making a positive difference to education outcomes for Māori and to supporting transformative Māori educational thinking. (NZCER, 2013)

A gradual process of change occurred within the organisation, mirroring societal changes. The educational restructuring of the 1980s, heralded a significant opportunity for the organisation; it focussed increasingly on the bicultural identity of the New Zealand population.

A recent evidence of further change is in the establishment of its “Shifting Thinking” website which explores the transition in educational thinking and research from the last to the current century. (NZNCER, 2013) and which provides tools of the social networking age such as Tweets and Blogs. Embracing change and the early recognition of Maori educational needs, has allowed NZNCER to maintain agency as a useful research portal for Kaupapa Maori researchers.

Post war New Zealand society was in a state of flux. Returning servicemen were lauded, especially the Māori Battalion soldiers whose bravery caught the public imagination. Rapid urbanisation of the Māori population meant that the respective cultures now confronted each other. A growing awareness of cultural identity and will to action characterised post war Māori Society. This revitalisation flourished with the advent of the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal which recognised the taonga of the indigenous people, including reclamation of the educational process which had been captured by the dominant paradigm, resulting in

educational exclusivity from research to praxis. The time was now right for a challenge to the hegemony which maintained the power structure of the status quo. Kaupapa Māori research arose from the needs of a disenfranchised people to reclaim their identity and heritage. A challenge to traditional research approaches which maintained dominant ascendancy was opportune.

Those first wave researchers rode the waves of uncertainty yet their endeavours proved fruitful (Royal, 1996). An ideological space was created for Māori academics who could challenge the dominance of the educational research base which sustained itself by claims of objectivity, neutrality and scientific efficacy. Different beneficial ways of knowing now entered the consciousness stream of Academia, disrupting the established dominant paradigm. The authenticity of their voices gave heart to alternative indigenous research approaches. Kaupapa Māori research which encompassed a rich cultural heritage was, in New Zealand, the foremost of those alternative practices, a vital tool destined to challenge the master's house.

Kaupapa Māori research first developed as a theoretical framework, premised upon cultural perspectives, critical theorising and a constructivist approach. Praxis enriched the framework, providing it with methodological validity as a research vehicle which could be employed in diverse fields but which was especially relevant in the educational domain. Kaupapa Māori research took back ownership of the educational research process, rejecting the dominant paradigm agenda which resulted in hegemonic belittling of the Treaty partner. Yet (Smith, 1992) warned of the tenacity of the dominant research paradigm.

They may interpret it within a theoretical framework but also in terms of a covert ideological framework.

Continuation of the colonisation process via inculcation of our children's minds is morally unacceptable. Intergenerational societal alienation will continue to deepen the cultural chasm, unless there is growing awareness of the pervasive coloniality tentacles which threaten the vision of a vibrant, bicultural New Zealand, promised by the Treaty.

Research informs practice within our schools. The necessity of a viable alternative educational research paradigm became evident. Fortunately such an alternative arose from within the marginalised Maori community. Kaupapa Māori research methodology had moved beyond its earlier theoretical framework to emerge as a pragmatic, dynamic Māori voice which challenged the edifices of Academia.

Kaupapa Maori has emerged as a discourse and a reality, as a Theory and Praxis Directly from Maori lived realities and experiences. One of those realities is that for over a century and a half the New Zealand education system has failed the majority of Māori children who have passed through it. (Smith, L 2000)

Adoption of a Kaupapa Māori perspective led to a flourish of research on the amelioration of Maori educational status. While Kaupapa Māori is not new, its application within the field of mainstream educational discourse was significant. From the mid 1980s the term began to appear in Ministry of Education documents. This tentative expression blossomed into topical

usage and informed critical pedagogical thinking, giving rise to a number of Māori led initiatives; it found its pragmatic expression in the transformative emancipatory development of Te Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa M Māori, Wharekura, Whare Wāhanga and Ataarangi. The limitations of this paper do not allow for full expression of the significance of these indigenous educational initiatives. Suffice it to say that the effect on consciousness and perception was profound, within and beyond the Māori community. Acknowledgement of Māori ways of knowing and being gained critical acceptance, despite the separatist accusations of the sectors of the uniformed populace and of those politicians who operated from a covert agenda of colonial entrenchment. The ascendancy of iwi control prevailed against the state organisations of constraint such as the Educational Review Office and Ministry of Education, as evidence based exemplars of best practice.

Within mainstream education, provision of Resource Teachers of Māori and Advisory Services further embedded classroom practices, based on Kaupapa Maori educational research. Johnston, (1991) warned that there was a significant divide between stated School Board policy and practice at classroom level which ensured a continuation of Maori student underachievement. Rhetoric was yet to transform into effective strategies which produced evident benefit for Māori students within the main stream educational system. It is my perception, as an educator, that this situation prevails within many state schools which continue the colonising of minds, (Maori and Pakeha) and a marginalisation of Maori aspirations, a situation attested by Maori parents who feel alienated from the state controlled educational process.

A critical juncture in the road to indigenising the divide was the creation of The Māori Education Commission, set up by the Minister of Māori affairs in 1997, was a significant juncture. Its role was to listen to the concern of the Māori community with regard to educational provision and to advise the Minister of Education on effective interventionist strategies which would raise educational achievement of Māori students. The recommendations made by the commission demonstrated a strong Kaupapa Māori research influence. It recognised the need for training recruitment and retention of effective teachers, the development of Māori educational resources, in particular information technology resources, and provision of adequate funding to embed a Kaupapa Māori perspective into the curriculum. The Commission validated Kaupapa Māori research findings and used them to appeal for effective intervention strategies to improve out comes for Maori students. The work of the commission was lauded as a major step forward (Smith, 2000)

Kaupapa Māori research ranges across the field of education endeavour from focus on specific praxis problems to the wider critique of barriers to successful implementation of the Māori world view within the educational system. In addition to the strengthening of cultural agency, Smith (1997) argues that Kaupapa Māori research should analyse the power structures which underpin the dominant pedagogical provision within New Zealand society, thereby effecting a profound structural change within the educational system. Pihama (2002) argues for the adoption of Kaupapa Māori as a form of critical analysis which explores the power relationships which support the dominate hegemony.

Kaupapa Māori research also provides a critical analysis of the pernicious and tenacious deficit theorising which characterises educational provision for Māori students. Cooper (2008) highlights the continued location of deficit teaching models for Māori student provision within the dominant hegemony, suggesting that the distorted cultural lens may, in part, be responsible for the long tail of educational underachievement which so preoccupies Ministry consideration of Māori student achievement. (Controller & Auditor General, 2013) As an educational practitioner, I concur with the assertion.

While there are broad educational challenges which need to be addressed, the continued relegation of a significant number of students who learn differently is a cause for concern. Might I suggest that a goodly portion of the deficit lies, not with the students, but with the current Eurocentric education system? The refreshing alternate provision characterised in a Kaupapa Māori approach to educational strategies may shorten the tail but to do so it must move beyond the boundaries of Kura Kaupapa Māori implementation and influence mainstream provision where 85% of Māori students reside. Self-reflective practice is needed to ensure that capacity building is a key focus within the approach. Even so, a predominantly culturist approach may not succeed, since unresolved socio economic factors also impact upon Māori student achievement.

Kaupapa Māori research also honours the Treaty partnership and elucidates the nature of bicultural engagement, thereby weakening the power structures which support cultural supremacy and relegate Māori to the low social economic status, depriving Māori children of their birth right as citizens who have equitable access to educational and economic resources. By analysis of the structures which support continuing inequality, Kaupapa Māori research provides an indirect effect on socio economic status.

Cooper (2012) also warns that there is a danger of educationalists simply addressing issues of cultural responsiveness while ignoring the deeper issues of transmission of Maori knowledge. Such tokenism is a real and present danger; despite these vulnerabilities, Kaupapa Māori research has much to offer mainstream provision for Māori and Pakeha students. It brings the human dimension into the educational research process. The frame of reference is Māori, premised upon the legitimacy and authenticity of the Māori world view. Its epistemological basis originates within the Māori community, informing educational research from initiation to praxis. The intention is emancipatory and fully participatory; a reclamation of the locus of control and a continuing challenge to the dominant hegemony whose overtly scientific approach has reduced educational research and praxis to a tool of enduring domination of the indigenous people of New Zealand.

Kaupapa Māori research provides a sense of Māori identity, one of the key requirements of growth which were identified by Maslow in his hierarchy of human needs (Maslow, 1943) Loss of identity, personal or cultural, results in paralysis of hope and an inability to envisage an alternative to the current deleterious situation. It leads to a sense of learned helplessness which Maier and Seligman (Maier and Seligman, 1976) identified as the key precursor of adult depression, expressed in the statistics relating to educational disengagement, alcohol and substance abuse, violence and imprisonment. Conversely Cooper (Cooper, 2005) talks of the ability to “weave worlds” which is the inheritance of children raised with a sense of their own culture. The strong sense of identity engendered by such knowledge provides a secure foundation for intellectual, spiritual, social and emotional growth and for success in diverse cultural settings.

Whanau engagement has been identified as a key factor in the achievement of students (ERO.2008). The alienating effect of a loss of trust in the educational process is evident in the grim educational statistics quoted earlier. Kaupapa Māori research creates space for the primacy of the whanau in decision making, thereby re-establishing balance, acknowledging the importance of whanau involvement in the education of children and reducing the alienating effect of mainstream education. It supports Maori cultural aspirations for their children as a legitimate expression of New Zealand citizenship. It recognises the right of Māori to be involved fully in key decisions which affect the direction of New Zealand society; it values its operation as a bicultural and ultimately multi-cultural society, ensuring cross cultural reliability. It defines New Zealand's place on the world stage and gives voice to a Māori perspective within the global digital community. It encourages the state apparatus to address the needs of its entire populace via the educational process.

Kaupapa Maori is a discourse that has emerged and is legitimised from within the Maori community. (Bishop, 1999)

Research informs praxis. The central principles of Kaupapa Māori research could lead to significant changes in operation within our school system, as a result of acknowledgement of the values inherent in the approach.

Embracing the concept of whanaungatanga is central to any Kaupapa Māori research process. The establishment and continuance of positive relationships which exhibit aroha is vital. Such reciprocity creates and sustains respectful interaction from initiation to dissemination of research findings. Process validity which accepts lived experience as evidence, respect for ancestral wisdom and cultural regulation which guides whanau oriented research is characteristic of the approach. Manaakitanga ensures a collaborative process which respects cultural traditions. A culturally appropriate education which is predicated upon relationship, mutual respect and a collaborative approach to problem solving is a taonga of great value.

Kaupapa Māori research is also premised upon the concept of Wairua, addressing the totality of what it means to be human, not just the education of the intellect, divorced from emotion, spirit and cultural context. Ako Māori is central to spiritual development, valuing and embedding knowledge within the education system as a validated alternative to mainstream provision. This knowledge is particularly evident in the field of ecology, acknowledging responsibility of stewardship in a world which has been plundered by economic expediency. The concept of environmental guardianship is not yet central to mainstream science education but it is central to humanity's continuation on Planet Earth.

By the late 1990s Kaupapa Māori research had reached critical mass, a voice of sufficient strength to penetrate the bastions of the educational overlords. Initially the dominant cultural response was tokenistic, involving a capture of Māori terminology which liberally peppered ministerial documents. Officers of the Ministry who visited our Te Moana location struggled painfully through opening meetings with recitation of artificially constructed mihi in a

cultural parody which was painful to watch - words without honest intent, veiling the true agenda: business as usual. The shades of 1840 artifice clung to their persona.

Characterised as a “decade of qualification and assessment reform in New Zealand “(Baker, 2001), it was a time of decentralisation of centralised power which transferred to Boards of Trustees; this was a doubled edged sword, leaving room for individual Boards to narrow their focus, concentrating Pakeha power or to promote a “ listening to culture’ (Macfarlane, 2000) approach. In the field, resources to implement a “culture of care” were scarce.

I can only speak for my experience in our rural cluster schools but I suspect that it was typical of a wider experience. Our community sought assistance from advisers from the Canterbury College of Education to critique pedagogical practice within our school and to point out useful resources which would assist implementation of a culturally safe curriculum but we struggled to find support in our wider locality. In mainstream school system, where the majority of Māori students were educated, there was a cold climate of resistance to changes which would increase culturally sensitivity. Policy was set at ministerial level and expressed in a number of documents which were delivered to schools but implementation was guided by individual school Boards of Trustees. The degree of engagement varied considerably in our area.

A second critical juncture in the journey to indigenise the divide was in the publication by the Ministry of Education of two seminal documents which bore witness to the influence of Kaupapa Māori research, thereby changing the cultural aridity of the educational landscape. They were: *Te Whariki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) *and* *The New Zealand Education System: An Overview* (Ministry of Education, 2008). Each publication heralded significant change in classroom climate; a multiplicity of professional development programmes embedded practice. Slowly the educational world turned. A brief perusal of the respective documents elucidates such transformation.

The publication of the excellent early childhood document *Te Whariki* was a breakthrough of significant proportions. Its rapid widespread adoption bears testimony to the efficacy of the Kaupapa Māori perspective which informed the document.

This is the first bicultural curriculum statement developed in New Zealand. It contains curriculum specifically for Māori immersion services in early childhood education and establishes, throughout the document as a whole, the bicultural nature of curriculum for all early childhood services.

The document was premised upon “almost two decades of shared knowledge and agreed understandings.” It also acknowledged the primacy of the Treaty of Waitangi. The influence of Kaupapa Māori research upon the document’s values and goals is evident. While some educators suspected the Ministry intention as a control mechanism in response to the success of Kohanga Reo, the impact of the document in the wider early childhood community, well beyond Māori Immersion services, was significant. I spent time visiting early childhood premises in the early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It was clear that the principles and praxis in early childhood centres in the Canterbury region were strongly influenced by Kaupapa Māori research as expressed in the widely disseminated *Te Whariki* document, which revolutionised practice within the New Zealand early childhood sector.

Reformation was in the air. Attention then moved to the schooling of primary and secondary students to assist the review of those sectors. The curriculum review document ((Ministry of Education, 2008) included a framework, premised upon key competencies:

1. The ability to think
2. Making meaning
3. Relating to others
4. Managing self
5. Participating and contributing

The similarities between these key competencies, though a Western construct and Te Ao Māori values were critiqued in the draft document. The Commentary Group was commissioned by the Ministry of Education to report on these suggested amendments to the national curriculum. While group members found similarities between the key competencies and Māori perspective, they also highlighted crucial differences which were likely to impact upon the effective implementation of the document recommendations.

The Commentary Group were cognizant of the important parallels between this type of pedagogical approach and the values, beliefs and preferred practices that represent and embody an indigenous Maori cultural worldview (*Te Ao Maori*). (MacFarlane & al 2008)

The group felt that the key competencies could be enriched by reference to a Māori world view which valued the collective rather than individualistic development. It also noted a number of key differences between the proposed amendments and Māori perspectives. It made reference to the document He Mā puna te Tamaiti (Grace, 2005) as an exemplar of a different approach. The response document produced by the group enunciated the enrichment process in detail, while making reference to a number of relevant Kaupapa Maori research documents. It presented a validated pedagogical alternative as a significant witness to the presence of Māori voice in educational circles.

The opening years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century saw a transition from Kaupapa Māori research which examined the causes and consequences of cultural marginalisation within the educational discipline to pragmatic expressions of strategies designed to radicalise educational provision for i Māori students. While the research flourished and was expressed in many portals (Too many for inclusion is this brief review), particular note should be made of the Educultural Wheel (Macfarlane, 2004) which clearly enunciated a pragmatic approach to the engagement of Māori Students within the mainstream educational system. It formed part of his address to educationalists to “Listen to the culture” As a succinct expression of Māori values which



could be incorporated into pedagogical practice it was seminal; its influence spread well beyond the conference hall, informing purpose and practices in diverse settings, including our Alpha programme.

The influence of Kaupapa Māori research on educational vision and praxis was heralded by initial discussion between the Ministry of Education and Te Puni Kokiri in the closing years of the 20th century and found expression in the ground breaking publication, in the new century, of the gazetted strategies listed below:

1. Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008 – 2012
2. Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013–2017

Ka Hikitia Managing for Success -2008-2012 met with limited success. The consultation with iwi which followed the initial 1998 discussions of appropriate provision for Māori students, focussed on the achievement of Māori students rather than the previous decades of deficit models but direction and agency remained with the Ministry. The declared intention was to realise Māori potential.

This government is committed to lifting the performance of the education system. Achieving this for and with Māori is a priority. We need to move away from characterising the problem as the failure of Māori learners within the system to how the system can maximise Maori potential. Maori enjoying education success as Maori is what we are about. (Tolly, Kahikatea, 2009)

Yet the Ministry's own assessment of the strategy reveals only marginal success, described as "pockets of success" and "some improvement" and acknowledges that control remained within the Ministry.

Overall, implementation slower than expected. Despite some improvements, disparities remain. (Ministry of Education 2013)

The Ministry described the strategy as "Direction setting and building momentum" yet significant progress remained elusive. Despite the hyperbole which accompanied the document launch, there was very limited change in praxis. Schools continued to meet their statutory obligation to report Māori student achievement so the paper trail prevailed yet within classrooms there was scant evidence of change. Within teacher forums which I attended, there was considerable cynicism about the publication of another "Glossy" (Teacher talk for a document with hype but no school wide funding to effect change). Without targetted funding to lift teacher performance within the classroom, significant change was unlikely. While Kaupapa Māori research, Te Puni Kokiri input and iwi consultation informed the initiation of the approach, continuance of Ministry of Education dominance and control resulted, I believe, in the limited outcomes described above.

The Ministry of Education's phase two document, Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013–2017 is now gazetted. It details goals and future strategies for achieving them. Perusal of the intent and stated strategy suggests a wider, more co-operative engagement with stakeholders:

It will include activities to raise awareness and provide support and seek contributions from students, parents, whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori organisations, communities and businesses.

There is a sense of urgency within the document which states that “Immediate and sustained change is needed” via “Strong engagement and contribution from parents, whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori organisations, communities and businesses.” This document, unlike its phase one predecessor, lists a bibliography which indicates reference to key Maori researchers. (Bishop, Durie). Adherence to principles long espoused by Kaupapa Maori researchers is evident in the document which lists as guiding principles:

- a. The Treaty of Waitangi
- b. Māori potential approach
- c. Ako—a two way teaching and learning process
- d. Identity, language and culture count
- e. Productive partnership

There is a more definite move away from the deficit model of instruction to realising Māori potential and a promise of resource allocation and funding for change agents:

It will be supported by tools and resources targeted to those who are critical in effecting the change.

Significantly and for the first time, there is, in this document, a focus on improving the organisational efficiency of the Educational Review Office and the Ministry of Education in the delivery of services. Such reflective practice is also an indicator of the influence of Kaupapa Māori research on the document and on Ministry intentions and practice. Indeed, throughout the entire document, there is a greater alignment with Kaupapa Māori research principles than was evident in the phase one document. The strategy is in its first year of operation so its ultimate success in delivering the stated outcomes for Maori students is a matter of speculation. The Ministry is certainly optimistic; it has already advertised on its site the subsequent document: Ka Hikitia 2018-2022: Realising Maori Potential which it is claimed will support:

Innovative community, iwi and Māori-led models of education provision.

It would seem that the intention is to hand over direction and power to Māori educationalists who will, presumably, premise their provision upon further Kaupapa Māori research. In this way the divide, economic, cultural, social and educational which presently characterises our

society will be indigenised and subsequently eradicated. Those of us, who, as practioners, have a lengthy association with the Ministry, take a cautious approach to Ministry declarations of intent and hope that they are not tools of the “Politics of Distraction” (Smith G, 2003). There may indeed be a changed perspective, as suggested by the Ministry funding and initiation in February 2012 of the Huakina Mai Research Project (2012) which seeks to eradicate address severe behavioural challenges exhibited by some disengaged students.

The research team has been tasked with designing a comprehensive kaupapa Māori severe behaviour intervention framework, to be known as *Huakina Mai*. This framework will draw from key aspects of two other Kaupapa Māori evidence-based programmes that are known to be effective for use with Māori students who are referred for special education support. (Huakina Mai, 2012)

Although this project lies within the field of special education, the reference to Kaupapa Māori perspectives and its acceptance and financing by the Ministry is evidence of the validity of the research based approach within Ministerial circles and in the wider research community. The proliferation of such projects may create critical mass which will recognise and embed the validity of Kaupapa Māori research and evidence based practice within Ministry circles and in the wider research community.

When considering the future reach of Kaupapa Māori research which informs praxis, there are also agencies, other than the Ministry of Education, involved in the education of Māori students in the South Island of New Zealand. Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu and the Ministry of Education signed a Memorandum of Understanding in 2001. The main purpose of the memorandum is to improve educational outcomes for Māori students within the Ngai Tahu rohe. This initiative led to the publication and dissemination of the Te Kete o Aoraki document (2002) which provides school communities with strategies to improve educational provision for Māori students. The Ministry of Education provided financial support for a number of initiatives designed to implement the stated strategies. The relationship between the Runanga and the Ministry has now been formalised; it offers hope that such strategic alliances can effect significant improvement of educational outcomes for Māori students.

The Ngāi Tahu 21st century vision for the education of students within its iwi is expressed in a document of intent which guides strategies designed to lift the achievement of students (Ngāi Tahu 2025). The plan supports the implementation of quality educational programmes, the inculcation of Ngai Tahu culture and values and the creation of leaders who will be devoted to the service of their local communities.

Ngāi Tahu education aims to influence the education sector to ensure that Ngāi Tahu viewpoints are reflected at all levels of the system. While Ngāi Tahu education is not directly involved in delivering education services, it does support those that do.

Strategic relationships offer hope of amelioration of educational outcomes for Māori students. It is, I believe, the development of such alliances which will inform future educational praxis. Māori initiatives sustained by Māori visions of excellence in educational practice and implemented by organisations and companies which share the vision can effect speedy,

efficient delivery of services and outcomes in a streamlined manner which is not hindered by bureaucratic protocols. This aligns with the Ministry of Education's stated intention, described earlier of "Maori led models of educational provision" (Ministry of Education, 2012) which will, presumably, attract funding by the Ministry.

Comprehensive educational provision which heals trauma, personal and generational, which equips students with the skills to operate within their cultural context and in the globally connected wider world and which encourages excellence, will result in transformational benefits for 21<sup>st</sup> century students and for their communities. The impetus for change comes from within the Maori community, the locus of control remains with community. This change in consciousness is perhaps the greatest benefit of Kaupapa Māori research, allowing Maori communities to see themselves as change agents, in control of their destiny.

As in the 1980s when concerned Māori voices led to the creation and rapid spread of Kaupapa Māori educational establishments, so the future educational landscape is envisaged as a paradigm of excellence which honours the bicultural partnership promised by the Treaty of Waitangi and which protects the toanga of the tangata whenua, the education of our nation's children.

*Mā te mātauranga, ka taea te pae tawhiti;*

*Mā te māramatanga, ka taea te Ao*

