



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

**Te Noho Kotahitanga:
Putting the 'Critical' Back in Biculturalism**

Kelly Panapa

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree of
Masters of Professional Studies - Education at
The University of Auckland, New Zealand

2015

Abstract

This dissertation discusses biculturalism in the public imagination and how it is represented in public policy, particularly in a tertiary educational context. Critical, decolonising, and Kaupapa Māori theories are drawn from to articulate a critical approach to biculturalism. Critical biculturalism, as it is developed in this dissertation, teases out four key strands: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’; Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations. These strands frame a positive critique of biculturalism as it is articulated in policy at Unitec. Unitec, an Auckland based tertiary institution, has formulated a Māori Success Strategy that articulates aspirations of becoming “[a] bicultural institution of technology operating in a multicultural environment” (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011, p. 2). This critique aims to offer insights to further advance Unitec’s vision. Three key aspects to a Critical Biculturalism are:

1. That it must open up the space within the mainstream for Kaupapa Māori to advance Māori aspirations and other important ideas about a New Zealand nationhood.
2. That it stresses the need for partnership between Māori and Pākehā, rather than the separation of one group from the other.
3. That participatings engage with the notion of difference and are prepared to question, be questioned, and to become uncomfortable, within an environment where concepts of utu, manaaki and even aroha are practiced.

Preface

My lived experiences have informed my bias towards the notion that meaningful biculturalism is both a worthwhile and achievable goal. Understanding and appreciating the tensions within biculturalism that limit its influence, while at the same time feeling frustrated and impatient with both its pervasive absence or meaningless dilution in public policy and practice has provided the impetus to enquire further into the area for post graduate study.

Raised by my mum *and* grandparents meant I was different to my peers and my cousins. I had the best of both worlds. I was raised by Māori tikanga and values and was also provided with Pākehā tools (cultural capital) to prepare me for a Pākehā world (European). Māori concepts such as tapu (sacred), noa (neutral phenomenon), utu (reciprocity/balance), koha (gift, present), manaaki (respect, kindness), mana (status) and tikanga (correct practice, procedure, protocols) to name a few, were all, well engrained. My Māori grandfather and Pākehā grandmother role modeled a relationship of sharing responsibility for all matters important to them and having equal say about how to ‘get on with it’. Tikanga and kaupapa Māori were normal, cementing in me a strong Māori identity even when my fair skin meant I often had to defend it.

I feel well placed to provide constructive critique, as I do in this dissertation, to the bicultural aspirations of the Institute of Technology (Unitec) where I currently work. My world was nothing short of te noho kotahitanga¹, a permanence of relationship built on trust, affection, love, disagreement but most of all equal power-relations. Te noho kotahitanga is well articulated at Unitec as underpinning the direction the Institute hopes to orientate towards. This prefaces my optimism for a positive uptake of a theorised, treaty based biculturalism at Unitec and more widely in Aotearoa (New Zealand). I am motivated and actively engaged in advancing Māori ways of being, doing and knowing in a colonised context and particularly in education. I am invested in this project in my work as an academic and educator in a mainstream tertiary institution but also as a parent and trustee at governance level for Māori medium schools. My own educational

¹ Literally translates as to settle in unity. This is also the title of the Unitec partnership document.

experiences, my observations and experiences as an educator and as a parent all contribute to the theoretical position I develop in this study.

In my work and in the schools I am involved in, I am committed to a relationship with my non-Māori colleagues that values their worldviews, together with mine. I feel compelled to share counter-narratives from Māori perspectives with my non-Māori colleagues as a means to interrupting euro-centrism. I feel connected to other Māori staff at Unitec who feel the same and believe in the importance of Māori staff political assertions for rangatiratanga (chiefly authority and responsibility). So, naturally my interest was high during the developmental phase of the 2010 Māori Success Strategy. At the same time I embarked on my postgraduate journey around issues such as race, ethnicity and education, research and Māori education. These coincidentally concurrent experiences fuelled my interest in better understanding Unitec's discursive response through policy to government rhetoric about improved outcomes for Māori in tertiary education.

I utilise two of New Zealand's three official languages throughout this dissertation and have offered explanations in footnotes the first time I use Māori terms. I have provided this for readability despite the contradiction this demonstrates with the discussion herein.

It is important to acknowledge the privilege of voice I hold in entering the field of research and scholarly writing. I must concede therefore that my voice is not one of authority on all things Māori but merely one voice from a diverse range of possible Māori experiences. I therefore regularly situate myself inside the text as a means of acknowledging the privilege of voice that attempts to affect positive change for Māori but as Hoskins eloquently states "speaks potentially in both dischord and harmony with other voices engaged at the edges of similar terrains" (2001, p. x). Positioning myself as a "Māori" researcher/ educator is both a privilege and a responsibility, one with which I do not take lightly.

Acknowledgements

*Tēnei au, tēnei au ko te hōkai nei o taku tapuwae
Ko te hōkai nuku, ko te hōkai rangi ko te hōkai a tō tupuna a tāne-nui-ā-rangi
I pikitia rā ki ngā rangi tūhāhā ki te tibi o manono
I rokohina atu rā
Ko io matua kore anake
I riro iho ai ngā kete o te wānanga
Ko te kete tuauri, ko te kete tuatea, ko te kete aronui
Ka tiritiria ka poupoua kia papatūānuku
Ka puta te ira tāngata ki te whai ao, ki te ao mārama*

*E rere atu ana aku mihi ki a Papatūānuku rāua ko Ranginui tēnā kōrua. Ki ngā tūpuna me ngā kaitiaki i
atawhaitia ēnei mahi, mutunga kore ngā mihi.*

E hara taku toa i te toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini!

For her amazing patience, reassurance, encouragement and high standards, these qualities together with her incredible expertise, sharp mind and ngākau nui maintained my excitement and engagement throughout this dissertation and honed my thinking and writing no end. Tēnā koe e te rangatira Te Kawehau Hoskins.

To my numerous friends and colleagues who offered support and encouragement in your own special ways and who have reminded me how blessed I am to have such amazing people in my life. To my study buddies, Paula Bold-Wilson, Deane-Rose Ngatai and Victor Grbic whose progress with their exciting and important work and their valued company motivated me to 'keep on'. To my respected friend and colleague Catherine Mitchell, my humble and inspirational brother-in-law Daniel Hikuroa thank you for your invaluable feedback and generosity of time. Particular thanks must go to taku hoa piripono Tabitha McKenzie for her useful feedback, help with the glossary and proofing and my clever and very kind dear friend Jeanette Hobbs for providing a much needed writing retreat and her countless hours of editing. Your excitement and engagement in my topic towards the end was a timely energiser Tēnā kōrua, Tēnā hoki koutou katoa.

To my mum Sue Panapa and taku hoa rangatira Jeremy Hikuroa, my constants who kept me grounded, without your invaluable support together with my parents in law Evelyn and Selwyn Hikuroa, through countless hours of childcare, house-keeping and cooking, particularly in the last three months of writing I could not have completed. Your emotional and practical support motivated me to do this project well for you all. Tēnei te mihi aroha, mutunga kore ki a koutou.

Ki aku taonga, aku tamariki Jason, Ariana and Miguel. Kei taku taha koutou i ngā wā katoa ahakoa ā tinana, ā wairua rānei. Mo koutou ēnei kōrero kei roto nei, mo koutou hoki tōku manawa. Mauri ora aku pōpō.

To my koro who is the fittest and sharpest great great grandfather I know and to my nan who I think of every day and miss dearly, who instilled in me he ngākau nui ki te Ao Māori me ngā pūkenga mō te Ao Pākehā. Without whom my path would surely have been different. Tēnā kōrua.

Finally, he mihi nui ki a Unitec for enabling this project to take place. I am truly humbled and eternally grateful for the privilege to work in this way for this amazing network of people.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Glossary.....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction – A ‘critical’ bicultural theory in education.....	1
Chapter 2: Perspectives of the Treaty and Biculturalism.....	9
Biculturalism and the Treaty	9
Biculturalism	9
The Treaty of Waitangi	11
Pākehā perceptions of the Treaty relationship.....	14
Māori perceptions of the Treaty relationship	18
Chapter 3: Critical Influences.....	23
Critical Theories.....	23
Critical Multiculturalism	24
Decolonising Methodologies	26
Kaupapa Māori theory.....	28
Chapter 4: Critical Biculturalism	30
The indigenous-settler relationship.....	32
Decolonising practice	36
(including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’)	36
Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy	40
The interrogation and transformation of structures and power-relations.....	44
Chapter conclusion	48
Conclusion	49
Appendix	52
References.....	53

Glossary

NB. These translations are for the context of this dissertation. They are not definitive and can have different meanings in other contexts.

Māori Word	English Word
<i>Aotearoa</i>	New Zealand
<i>Ārikitanga</i>	High rank, high birth
<i>Aroha</i>	Love
<i>Haka</i>	Posture dance performance
<i>Hangi</i>	Earth oven
<i>Hapū</i>	Sub-tribe
<i>Hongi</i>	To press noses in greeting
<i>Kaitiakitanga</i>	Guardianship
<i>Kaupapa Māori</i>	An approach underpinned by Māori knowledge/ Concerning Māori matters
<i>Kawa</i>	Formal customs of the marae
<i>Kāwanatanga</i>	Government
<i>Kīngitanga</i>	Kingdom, reign of a king, sovereignty
<i>Koha</i>	Gift, present
<i>Kura Kaupapa Māori</i>	Kaupapa Māori primary schools
<i>Mana</i>	Status
<i>Manaaki</i>	Respect, kindness, hospitality, to raise ones status
<i>Māori</i>	Normal, defines relationship between Māori and Pākehā the non-indigenous population
<i>Mātauranga Māori</i>	Ever evolving body of knowledge
<i>Ngākau māhaki</i>	Respect
<i>Noa</i>	Neutral phenomenon
<i>Nohotahi</i>	Co-operation
<i>Pae Arahi</i>	Cultural Advisor
<i>Pākehā</i>	European
<i>Rangatiratanga</i>	Chiefly authority and responsibility
<i>Rūnanga</i>	Māori Advisory Board
<i>Tāmoko</i>	Māori tattooing designs
<i>Tapu</i>	Sacred
<i>Tauīwi</i>	Latter immigrants
<i>Te Kōhanga Reo</i>	Kaupapa Māori early childhood centres
<i>Te noho kotahitanga</i>	To settle in unity
<i>Te reo Māori</i>	The Māori language
<i>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	The Treaty of Waitangi
<i>Tikanga</i>	Correct practice, procedure, protocols
<i>Tino rangatiratanga</i>	Total sovereignty

<i>Tuku whenua</i>	Transfer of land
<i>Utu</i>	Reciprocity, balance
<i>Wakaritenga</i>	Legitimacy
<i>Whakataukī</i>	Proverb
<i>Whānau</i>	Family
<i>Wharekai</i>	Dining room
<i>Whare Kura</i>	Kaupapa Māori secondary schools
<i>Wharenui</i>	Large meeting house
<i>Whare wānanga</i>	Kaupapa Māori universities
<i>Whare whakairo</i>	Carved house
<i>Whenu</i>	Strand
<i>Whenua</i>	Land
I roto	In (in reference list)
Whārangi	Page/pages (in reference list)
Ngā kaiwhakatika	Editors (in reference list)
Tānga pukapuka nama	Edition (in reference list)
Kāhore he rā	No date (in reference list)

Chapter 1: Introduction – A ‘critical’ bicultural theory in education

Culture is one of the most complicated words in the English language. Biculturalism, a discourse that attempts to weave two complex and at times incompatible cultures together, as has been the case in New Zealand, exacerbates the complications. Despite a powerful mono-cultural backdrop biculturalism has established a space in a highly contested political arena influenced by ideas of identity, nationhood, power, colonisation, decolonisation, indigenous rights, minority rights, governance and Māori self-determination (to name a few) and is now commonplace in public policy. Having been the state sponsored social policy discourse since the early 1980s, biculturalism has foregrounded the descendants of the first settler groups, Māori² and Pākehā (European), as the two partners to the Treaty of Waitangi (the Treaty). The education sector has seen multiple interpretations of ‘biculturalism’ articulated in national policy from the Native Schools Act, to Taha Māori, to our most recent “Māori success as Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2013).

In the 1980s, Professor Ranginui Walker (1986) asserted the importance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in determining bicultural aspirations and claimed it “can be interpreted as a charter for biculturalism, and that is precisely how [Māori] have interpreted it in the last 145 years” (p. 5). Despite tinkering by successive governments around the periphery of the issues, thirty years on since Walker’s assertions discourses and social policy that privilege euro-centric system of government and its institutions have prevailed and resulted in the undermining of Māori bicultural assertions and a further embedding of a mono-cultural New Zealand society. Mono-culturalism (or euro-centrism as I sometimes refer to it in this dissertation) pervades every aspect of modern life and is exemplified in state services such as local government, health care, welfare, and education (Piripi, 2011).

² ‘Māori’ (normal) is an indigenous term that “defines a colonial relationship between ‘Māori’ and ‘Pākehā’ the non-indigenous settler population” (L. Smith, 1999, p. 6). The term Māori “provides both for a pan-Māori indigenous identity while retaining the idea of the specific and the local, since what is regarded ‘Māori’ differed according to community, social status and geographic location” (Hoskins, 2001, p. 33).

Metge (2010) identifies three competing liberal models of nationhood that I suggest have all played a role in limiting engagement in a critical form of biculturalism. The first model of nationhood identified by Metge (2010) is the: “We are all New Zealanders” model. This model *emphasises* the goal of ‘national unity’ but by implication devalues diversity and the Māori contribution. The second model: ‘Biculturalism’ has focused on the relationship between the heirs of the two parties to the Treaty and has been perceived as *sidelining* ‘national unity’ and the place of other minorities. Finally, ‘Multiculturalism’ focuses on the large number of different cultures established in New Zealand and their right to recognition. The consequence is marginalisation of Māori as being one among many and again, this model sidesteps ‘national unity’ (Metge, 2010). All three of these liberal discourses identified by Metge fall short of interrogating structural limitations to success on Māori or providing alternate ideologies by which to frame alternate structures. Weak or liberal discourses are described by May and Sleeter (2010) as discourses that reify culture and cultural difference, and getting to know the ‘other’ better so we can all get along, while neglecting to interrogate power-relations and address material inequalities between Māori and Pākehā.

This dissertation unpacks how biculturalism is reflected in the public imagination and responds to the prompt from Kelly Barclay (2005) that: “[m]ore critical responses to culture and indigenous rights need to be developed to open future possibilities [in New Zealand]” (p. 121)³. I invoke Critical Biculturalism³ in the education context, but it is also usefulness across a range of settings, to speak back to weak/liberal versions of biculturalism that have done little to advance Māori aspirations or the Treaty relationship. Critical Biculturalism is advanced as the necessary ‘next step’ to re-invigorate biculturalism in Aotearoa (New Zealand). Critical Biculturalism speaks to the indigenous-settler relationship forged through the Treaty and is capable of transformative change for Māori and the nation as a whole.

Critical Biculturalism is posited as providing a frame for privileging Māori cultural ways of being, doing and knowing in education. As alternatives to dominant ideologies, Māori

³ When referring specifically to the theory of Critical Biculturalism that is developed in this dissertation I capitalise the C and B to differentiate between Critical Biculturalism as is articulated here and critical biculturalism in general terms

epistemologies and ontologies provide a powerful tool capable of interrogating power-relations and regimes of truth that have created a dynamic of dominance and subordination between Pākehā and Māori. These are conditions that the education sector have long had difficulty engaging with, opting for weak versions of biculturalism instead. Liberal versions of biculturalism that promote ‘getting along better’ by recognising, respecting and celebrating ethnic and cultural differences (May & Sleeter, 2010) have done little to meet the aspirations of Māori communities.

Opening up opportunities for Māori to articulate and address Māori concerns on their own terms is a key success factor to a critical biculturalism. I posit four whenu (strands) that constitute Critical Biculturalism and guide transformative action. The four whenu are then used to frame a positive critique of biculturalism as it is articulated in a New Zealand tertiary educational context, Unitec Institute of Technology. Unitec is located in West Auckland and is New Zealand’s largest mainstream institute of technology. Unitec’s Māori Success Strategy (MSS) (2011) articulates an aspiration to be “a bicultural Institute of Technology operating in a multicultural environment” (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011). At the time the strategy was implemented, Māori success, retention and completion rates across all tertiary institutions (except whare wānanga), had not achieved parity with non-Māori (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013). The MSS was Unitec’s response to government expectation for tertiary providers to take deliberate action to address disparities that persist between Māori and Pākehā in education.

It is now four years on from the release of the MSS and it is timely to approach it with a positive critique. A central aim of this study is to outline a Critical Biculturalism useful in general terms, and for analysis and enhancement of the MSS more specifically. I advance Critical Biculturalism firstly by drawing from a range of literature to analyse biculturalism and the context from which it is predicated. A chapter follows that outlines the key critical and indigenous theories that have influenced my conception of Critical Biculturalism. I focus in particular on a network of ideas linking threads in a number of expressions of critical theory, such as Kaupapa Māori theory (an approach underpinned by Māori knowledge/concerning Māori matters) (Hoskins, 2001; Pihama, 2010; Smith, 2003; 2012) and Critical Multiculturalism (May, 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010). Once the

theoretical backdrop is provided I move on in the next chapter to articulate Critical Biculturalism and its four whenu. For the purpose of clarity, the following four, tightly twisted and intertwined whenu are teased out: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonising practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’; Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations. At the conclusion of the theoretical development of each whenu, I critique the MSS *against* the key tenets of each whenu. This study seeks to acknowledge the positive aspects of the MSS while also offering a critical and productive discussion on MSS. It is my hope that this discussion will contribute to ongoing positive developments of the Unitec’s Maori Success Strategy.

The context

The government is unequivocal in its expectation that tertiary providers must adapt their service and academic provision to better cater for the increasingly diverse student population. This is especially targeted towards adapting our provision to better engage with Māori; it is our responsibility to ensure that Māori can enjoy educational success as Māori so that Māori potential is realized and the economy flourishes. (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011)

The link between education and wealth, as suggested in the above quote by Unitec, is indisputable, so too is the link between a lack of education and deprivation. Education has been a key tool in the colonisation process of indigenous peoples (Rains & Archibald, 2010; L. Smith, 1999), and in New Zealand has typified a mono-cultural agenda to the detriment of widespread Māori well being. Western binary logic that locates Māori worldviews in opposition to Western worldviews has led to a separation of the two, establishing a hierarchy of dominance and subordination (Hoskins, 2001). As a result, mainstream education for Māori, as for most indigenous peoples in colonised contexts, has been dogged by colonial and racist attitudes that view Māori/ indigenous epistemologies and ontologies as inferior to colonial ways of knowing and being (Battiste, 2005; Rains & Archibald, 2010; L. Smith, 1999). The Waitangi Tribunal has ruled that models for education in New Zealand were not only of detriment to Maori, but also in breach of the Treaty (Waitangi Tribunal, 2015). Schools remain modeled on a Western education system, are steeped in Western tradition and have engrained Western cultures. These cultures are assumed to be ‘universal’, thus excluding to the margins indigenous epistemologies and ontologies (G. Smith, 2003; L. Smith, 1999). This reality has resulted

in a schooling system in Aotearoa that has failed to provide fair and equitable outcomes for Māori (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2009). Despite concerted efforts otherwise, unfortunately Unitec is no exception.

Good intentions in recent decades however, both private and state have resulted in attempts to achieve greater agency for Māori. Thus, the last twenty years have seen a distinct shift in government rhetoric around the success of 'Māori as Māori' (Durie, 1999) in education, with a further elevation of the expectations in the last decade. Most significant of government initiatives in the education sector has been the release, of the Ministry of Education's Māori education strategy: *Ka hikitia – managing for success* (2008-2012). Its successor *Ka hikitia – accelerating success* (2013-2017) was launched in 2013 and will guide actions that “make a significant difference for Māori students in education for the next five years and beyond” (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 6). These documents appear to advocate bicultural discourses as the redemptive solution to social inequalities perpetuated by the mainstream education system. Unless there is some kind of critical reinvestment in biculturalism however, well intentioned actions aimed at addressing educational disparities between Māori and Pākehā, will have little impact if they neglect to address unequal power relations that result in systemic and institutionalised racism (Bishop et al., 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010). This is the aspect of biculturalism that mainstream institutions in colonised contexts exhibit difficulty appreciating as being and are reality and are therefore unable to realise meaningful change.

Unitec is an institution that has a long history of bicultural aspirations and embracing Māori culture. In 2001 Te Noho Kotahitanga (TNK) (to settle in unity) - the partnership document was developed to express Unitec's commitment to the Treaty. TNK puts five principles into practice to underpin Unitec's goals: Rangatiratanga – Authority and Responsibility, Wakaritenga – Legitimacy, Kaitiakitanga – Guardianship, Nohotahi - Co-operation and Ngākau Māhaki – Respect. The intention is that through this document, Unitec is able to acknowledge the valuable role the Treaty plays in respecting and promoting the equal standing which it confers on Māori and Pākehā (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2015).

There have been many other significant commitments on Unitec's behalf to honour the commitment promised by TNK. These include establishing the following: the rūnanga (Māori advisory board) in 2001; the Maia Māori centre, to provide "academic support, scholarship information and study workshops to students" (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2015); and the opening of the institution's marae in 2009, also named Te Noho Kotahitanga with a brand new whare whakairo (carved house) at the centre bearing the title Ngākau Māhaki. The wharenuī (large meeting house)/ whare whakairo, has recently been accompanied by the whare kai (dining room) - Manaaki, completing the building structures for the marae complex (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2015). These are some of the significant physical manifestations of Unitec's commitment to partnership as articulated by Te Noho Kotahitanga. Unitec also host a Pae Arahi (cultural advisor, at executive leadership level) and Whai Ake, a successful Māori scholarship programme. These are all positive examples of Unitec's commitment to partnership with Māori. There have also been other significant actions in the space of policy and resourcing at Unitec.

In 2011, the institute took another step towards realising its aspirations and created its own Māori Success Strategy that committed Unitec to becoming a "bicultural Institute of Technology operating in a multicultural environment" (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011, p. 3). Stemming from this aspiration are two aims, being: "Unitec will be the ITP leader of Māori student educational outcomes [and] Unitec will lead the bicultural competency of staff and students (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011, p. 3)". Objectives are subsequently laid out in accordance with these aims and are guided by the five principles of TNK (see appendix 1) to improve the outcomes for Māori students (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011, p. 1). Unitec's MSS and its contents are indicative of an institution motivated to reflect and realise a bicultural approach to education.

In 2013 a report was collated (The Māori Success Strategy, 2011-June 2013: Report) (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013) to document the actions carried out and the achievements to date as a consequence of the MSS. Some of the significant outcomes and

resource provisions noted in this report include the appointment of four new senior academic Māori positions, including the Dean of teaching and learning, mātauranga Māori (an ever evolving body of knowledge) and the development of the Poutama (a three staged progression guide for departments to self assess their levels of mātauranga Māori content in the living curriculum) to provide leadership and support around the implementation of the MSS. As a result of these actions some positive outcomes have emerged. Three particular gains are noted in the report: “There is much collaboration occurring across the institute to achieve the aims and objectives of the Strategy; The Poutama is having the desired effect in increasing mātauranga Māori content...; Māori student success, retention and completion is on an upward trend” (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013, p. 2). But trends are very rarely sustained and in their own investment plan 2015-2016, Unitec predict that a disrupted industry (as they suggest is the current state of the tertiary education sector) drives competition and in these situations the “[p]erformance differences widen – as the level of competition increases and competition shifts to true sources of advantage, the gap between top and bottom performers can persist for many years” (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2015b, p. 4). While this prediction is a business one, intended to inform investment decisions, this uncannily reflects the experience of Māori in Education for nearly 200 years.

The MSS report (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013), reflects an unwillingness to rest on the laurels of the positive outcomes noted, and a desire to continue to improve. The MSS also acknowledges some concerns where no progress has been made, and the following four challenges are listed: “The visibility of the Unitec brand in Māori communities; Aligning lifting Māori success at Unitec with initiatives in schools, [Private Training Establishments] and wānanga, yet maintaining a Unitec identity; Ensuring the strategy is relevant to the wider community; Convincing staff that Māori success is Unitec’s success” (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013, p. 2). On the basis of these concerns and in the interest of continual self-improvement the assertion was made that the strategy is in need of an update (Unitec Institute of Technology, 2013, p. 2). This dissertation aims to provide some useful insights to inform the next iteration of Unitec’s MSS in or to actualise Unitec’s bicultural aspirations so that Māori and Pākehā may enjoy equitable educational success.

To conclude, a critically bicultural approach to education in New Zealand, and at Unitec in particular, is important to lift Māori participation and success in education. Various models have influenced this discourse, including the 'We are all New Zealanders' model, multiculturalism, and even a weak or liberal form of biculturalism. I argue in this dissertation that those models fail to adequately meet the need to critically examine entrenched colonial systems and to interrupt the powerfully mono-cultural (Pākehā) backdrop that underpins education in Aotearoa. To its credit, Unitec is not only engaging in policies but is also actively resourcing a future path to re-energise biculturalism and Māori ways of being and of doing. This dissertation examines a critical theory of biculturalism to guide the discourse and even to measure the progress being made in educational institutions and at Unitec in particular.

Chapter 2: Perspectives of the Treaty and Biculturalism

Biculturalism and the Treaty

Biculturalism is the key conceptual thread that binds this dissertation together. This thread leads the reader through to the development of a critical bicultural approach to transforming mainstream education and then on to apply the approach to support bicultural aspirations to the setting of Unitec, Institute of Technology. A range of literature is reviewed in this chapter to discuss various ways that biculturalism is perceived in New Zealand, how it has come about, the key challenges it faces and how critical theories are used to develop a discourse that can further advance the bicultural outcomes achieved to date. The trail towards a critical biculturalism begins with understanding the origins of biculturalism and the current dominant bicultural discourses.

Biculturalism

Biculturalism first gained traction during the 1970s, as a local response to an “internationally emerging ‘politics of recognition’ (Taylor, 2001) and offered a traditionally ‘difference-blind’ democracy the space to begin to give more political recognition to cultural and ethnic difference in the face of a resurgent ethno-cultural ‘identity politics’” (Barclay, 2005, p. 119). Bicultural discourses succeeded in capturing the public imagination in New Zealand enough to supersede the multicultural discourses held internationally. This was largely due to Māori political activities (such as the 1977 Bastion Point land protest by Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei hapū (sub-tribe) members) that asserted indigenous rights and demanded redress for the detrimental consequences of serious breaches of the Treaty. Māori activists of that time envisioned a country where “Māori ought to be able to behave as Māori in wider New Zealand life rather than submerge their identity in favour of Pākehā mores and values” (King, 2003, p. 484). Biculturalism therefore, in the 1970s “marked a shift in the public discourse previously dominated by euro-centric policies of assimilation and integration” (Yukich, 2010, p. 16). The principal purpose for biculturalism in New Zealand since this pivotal time has

been to recognise the rights afforded to Māori under the Treaty, and to honour the promise of partnership⁴. Today, the Treaty and the bicultural discourses it privileges, have come to signify both what joins and divides New Zealanders.

The space that biculturalism enters has always been contested and has come under closer scrutiny in the last two decades. Critics assert on one side that it affords Māori unearned privileges based on race, and on the other side Māori critics assert it fails to challenge a reality composed by Pākehā colonisers and therefore perpetuates colonisation. A focus on biculturalism has also led to a convenient lack of interest by the New Zealand state in substantively addressing the social and political aspirations of other minority groups leading to a dominant public opinion of binary logic that multiculturalism and biculturalism work in opposition to each other. Central to a bicultural inquiry are questions about; how or why biculturalism might perpetuate Pākehā assimilation and colonisation of Māori? Whether biculturalism should advance a discourse of Māori authority? And also what does biculturalism mean for members of minority cultures who do not identify with Māori or Pākehā heritage? These are the layers of complexity that a critical biculturalism discourse seeks to address.

One additional element that cannot be omitted when interrogating bicultural discourse is the permanence of relationship that Graham Smith suggests is like a marriage (G. Smith, 2012). Despite the reality of a colonised context, a reality we cannot undo, when questions of Māori authority are raised, Pākehā discomfort has limiting effects on advancing meaningful and transformative articulations of biculturalism. Discomfort with engaging in issues of power has caused Pākehā and Māori to tend to disengage and lose sight of relationship. Well referenced in this dissertation is Alison Jones' critical and sustained work in the subject of Māori-Pākehā relationships in the field of education, regarded as highly valuable work in an analysis of biculturalism. Jones orientates towards a biculturalism that embraces difficulty in relationship and rejects urges to assimilate asserting, "when Pākehā 'comfort' is victorious, we all lose an opportunity to remain

⁴ A growing diversification of the New Zealand population however, (since recent loosening of immigration policy) has seen liberal multicultural discourses creep into public policy and challenge an existing biculturalism. Māori political assertions to honour the Treaty partnership have been a key force behind biculturalism maintaining currency in a contested cultural space in Aotearoa.

within a relationship of struggle" (Jones, 2007). Engagement within the relationship and a willingness to stay engaged through moments of deep incompatibility is hypothesised as being necessary to enable biculturalism to flourish so all may reap the benefits.

Biculturalism is currently interpreted and practiced in a multitude of ways. This dissertation advances an argument for a re-investment in biculturalism that reflects the critical potential of the Treaty. Descendants of the Māori⁵ and Pākehā who signed the Treaty are inherently implicated while many New Zealanders are still coming to grips with what that means for them, including other Tauwiwi⁶ (later immigrants). The Māori-settler relationship with the Treaty and each other is central to the critical conception of biculturalism as it is developed throughout this dissertation. At times I specifically privilege the Māori-Pākehā or Māori-crown/state relationship and at other times deliberately extend the ties to include Tauwiwi. Biculturalism in New Zealand is advanced in this dissertation as being inclusive and relevant to all that are embraced by this whenua (land). The following section provides a brief overview of the Treaty and its link to biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The Treaty of Waitangi

By 1840 when the Treaty was signed, Māori and Pākehā had already co-existed for several decades (Orange, 2011). A Māori economy was thriving and Māori were establishing profitable relationships with traders, settlers and whalers all reliant on the resources that Māori had access to (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). Leading up to the signing of the Treaty, Māori were starting to desire British intervention in relation to the behaviour of their subjects in Aotearoa, with regard to lawlessness and demands for land (Orange, 2011; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). There was also a growing sense of responsibility by Britain that they needed to act. The Treaty had three objectives: "the protection of Māori interests, the promotion of settler interests and the securing of strategic advantage for

⁵ The Treaty was signed by hapū leaders thus signifying independent hapū agreement to the Treaty – not an all encompassing Māori agreement as was the colonial discourse.

⁶ Tauwiwi or later immigrants refers to Pākehā and is inclusive of settlers who arrived after the Treaty was signed. I use the term Pākehā when specifically speaking about 'white' settlers with British ancestry and Tauwiwi when speaking about settlers more generally.

the Crown” (M. Durie, 1999, p. 176). The irony noted by Durie however, that the “only way the Colonial office felt it could guarantee the protection of Māori interests was to usurp sovereignty from Māori” (M. Durie, 2002, p. 176) yet within a decade, the agenda to protect Māori had slipped and the Treaty was used to “separate them from their land and culture and to boost emigration from an overcrowded Britain” (Durie, 1999, p. 176). This is a euro-centric legacy that has been successfully maintained and protected by the state to the present day.

Māori political aspirations⁷ at the time formed the backdrop to Māori expectations about the Treaty. As a result, the Māori translation of the Treaty and the discussions at the event on the day (and subsequently), did well to satisfy Māori resolve for self-determination (Orange, 2011). It is not known for certain whether deliberate deception was the intention of the day but the translated document and the subsequent discussions failed to interpret accurately the stark differences between the Nation state Māori had envisioned and the one where the Crown possessed all the authority and power that traditionally sat with chiefs, rangatiratanga.

With two subtly different but contradictory versions, the Treaty was complicated by duplicity. The English version ceded the *sovereignty* of New Zealand to Britain. The use of the word sovereignty in the English version and articulated in the Māori version as *kāwanatanga* (governance/ Government) is central to the ensuing debate. Mason Durie noted, “[a]s a translation for sovereignty, there are serious shortcomings since *kāwanatanga* [governance] has a lesser meaning than its weighty English equivalent (Durie, 2002, p. 2). *Kīngitanga*⁸ (kingdom, sovereignty), *ārikitanga* (high rank, high birth) or *rangatiratanga*⁹ accompanied by the word *mana* (status) would all have been more suitable choices to convey the message (Durie, 2002). Never the less, despite the ambiguity around sovereignty, the English version still assured Māori more privileges than they received. The English version guaranteed to Māori their “full rights of

⁷ That equally shaped and were shaped by the Declaration of Independence signed five years before the Treaty

⁸ Used in the declaration of independence (Durie, 1998)

⁹ Used in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Māori translation of the Treaty) not as being ceded to the crown, but assured to Māori.

ownership of their lands, forests, fisheries and other prized possessions” (Orange, 2011, p. 11), as well as the rights and privileges of British subjects and Crown protection (Orange, 2011). Despite the assurances of the promises, it was evident that Māori were dubious about the English version indicated by the small number (only 39 chiefs of the 500 plus who signed the Treaty) that signed this version (Orange, 2011). Most signed a Treaty in te reo Māori (the Māori language) that assured Tino Rangatiratanga (total sovereignty) in addition to the assurances of the English version. This is an important point and it highlights contrary to common Pākehā opinion that by signing the Treaty, Māori were not agreeing to relinquish their right to be a sovereign people (Mulholland, 2006).

The discussions and negotiations of the terms prior to its signing¹⁰, led Māori to believe the Treaty to be an agreement of mutual respect of each party’s integrity and authority, as was, and still is, the essential element of Māori customary alliances (Durie, 1991). British colonial and imperial discourses however, provided little space for conceptualising relationships of equality and reciprocity (Hoskins, 2001). The result has been nearly 200 years of indigenous-settler, Treaty-based tensions. Tensions caused by variant interpretations of the Treaty coupled with a Māori sense of injustice served as a result of the euro-centric application of the Treaty in place of its bicultural promise. Māori have always asserted the Treaty provided for two forms of authority in New Zealand, ‘rangatiratanga’ and ‘kāwanatanga’ and we are still working out how these might co-exist. Kymlicka (1996) offers useful insights as to how this might occur and also how the rights of other ethnic minorities might also be simultaneously protected.

While there is wide and careful debate about the material differences in meaning between the Māori and English versions of the Treaty there is little argument to refute the fact that either the Treaty of Waitangi or Te Tiriti o Waitangi was a commitment to an on-going relationship. The reality in the New Zealand context is that the Treaty and its essence of on-going relationship have had little influence over the nations ‘constitutional construction’. Despite its multiple versions however, I typify the Treaty in this study as both a political and an “ethical compass” (Yukich, 2010, p. 26). I draw from a plethora

¹⁰ based on the Māori translation of the Treaty and associated discussions about its contents

of scholarly writings that mirror Barclay's (2005) view that "the Treaty provides one important focus for a relational justice between indigenous and non-indigenous people in New Zealand" (p. 133). A relational justice I suggest is epitomised by Eddie Durie in his discussion about the Waitangi Tribunal process where he suggests that ultimate justice for indigenous peoples depends on political power-sharing through constitutional reform (Durie, 2005).

I draw from the ideas above to propose a reinvestment in the Treaty relationship. The Treaty provides the foundation for a critical biculturalism. A critical biculturalism is argued as being key to addressing the issues that have emerged as a result of a long history of the denial of Māori rights. Concerns of cultural recognition, power and structure, colonisation and relationships that are laid out above are all addressed in forthcoming sections. The Treaty as an 'ethical compass' can support cultural reform leading to a more just power-relationship between Treaty¹¹ partners. This outcome better situates all New Zealanders in approaching and honouring a multitude of cross-cultural relationships. The following two sections look into the ways Māori and Pākehā perceptions of the Treaty relationship both support and limit the theoretical underpinnings of Critical Biculturalism as it is developed in this dissertation.

Pākehā perceptions of the Treaty relationship

The dominance of Pākehā culture in New Zealand society affords Pākehā with advantages that they are frequently oblivious to. The advantage is perceived as being earned, and thus Māori failure to access it is perceived to be a result of lack of effort or determination. Advantage correlates to power and is fiercely protected, sometimes consciously and often subconsciously. Additionally, Pākehā misconception that Māori ceded their sovereignty under the Treaty contributes to the complex network of ideas that Pākehā use to justify their position of power and privilege. Discourses that seek to interrogate power are consequently rejected. In order to advance a critical biculturalism, it is crucial to unpack and challenge dominant Pākehā perceptions that will limit the success of Critical Biculturalism. This section therefore begins such a discussion.

¹¹ I use the term Treaty to refer to both versions (unless I specify one version or the other in my discussion)

Since the onset of the first bicultural discourses of the 1970s and 1980s Pākehā trepidation¹² around the idea of a Treaty-based relationship has seen a liberal discourse of cultural inclusion take precedence (Barclay, 2005; May & Sleeter, 2010). Liberal cultural discourses have appealed to the ethnocentric Pākehā majority that has keenly adopted them over notions of indigenous culture and assertions for self-determination. While there is some general agreement that ethnic minorities should enjoy a greater degree of inclusion in mainstream society, liberal cultural discourses are perceived as “a ready, and readily implementable, answer to “the problem” of ethnic and cultural diversity” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 4). Pākehā in New Zealand, like the colonising majority in other societies, perceive a ‘misunderstanding of difference’, as opposed to inequitable power relations, as the root of conflict associated with culture (May & Sleeter, 2010).

The implication of a general acceptance of liberal cultural discourses and the rejection of discourses that seek to deliver a more equitable distribution of power, is that the Treaty, and its articulation of Māori maintaining rangatiratanga is thus relegated in perceived relevance. Reluctance to engage in the principles of the Treaty that could engender more just and equitable structures leads to Pākehā opinion that the Treaty is an historical remnant with little relevance in a modern/ multicultural/ globalised context (Terruhn, forthcoming). The relationship the Treaty speaks of inevitably follows suit, and the Treaty is perceived as a mere reminder of a nation’s duty to celebrate symbolic expressions of Māori culture that do little more than remind us of an exotic and distant pre-colonial history. As the Treaty is perceived as a relic of the past, Māori culture by association is seen as a fixed and historic artefact. The consequence for biculturalism is that it is perceived as a finite project of redressing historical wrongs rather than as a continual partnership (Terruhn, forthcoming).

Pākehā identity politics (Barclay, 2005; Bell, 1996; 2005) have also played a significant role in shaping liberal approaches to the Treaty relationship. By acknowledging the Treaty as a valid mechanism for exploring the Indigenous-Settler relationship in

¹² I am conscious that in referring to Pākehā that I am in effect representing the view of all Pākehā as one homogenous group. The intention is not to minimise the multiplicity of Pākehā realities but to comment on some of the general conditions that influence this discourse.

Aotearoa, Pākehā are then required to interrogate their own assumptions about a locally contextualised identity that departs from their ‘colonial’ history. To explain this further, Bell (1996) introduces the notion of the specific construction of ‘fictive ethnicities’ by institutions of nation states. Fictive ethnicities (constituting the new ethnicity of a new nation state) are constructed by two main conditions; “nations [being] created out of some form of violence and that their successful creation depends on forgetting of that violence” (Bell, 1996, p. 151). This idea can be translated into the New Zealand context, where after having enforced a colonial agenda of dominance and subordination, in order to constitute their new ‘fictive’ New Zealander nationality/ethnicity, Pākehā are accordingly required to forget that history and it is in their interest to encourage Māori to forget too. I can personally attest to this occurrence as I am regularly confronted with Pākehā sentiment that injustice served upon Māori, by colonial actions are “in the past” and that “we need to *move on* from that” if we are going to have a chance of becoming a unified nation. This forgetting poses a problem to a bicultural discourse that in fact requires ‘remembering’ history and its ongoing effects in the present.

In the present, a key consequence of the fictive ethnicity/nationality of ‘New Zealander’ together with its associated egalitarian agenda is that it denies a relationship between two parties by instead attempting to make everyone the ‘same’, as ‘New Zealanders’ through forgetting colonisation (Bell, 1996). By rejecting any rights based differentiation based on the Treaty and arguing instead that we are all equal before the law or when a discourse of ‘one nation’ prevails, we effectively are reduced to a single narrative of being, where everyone is the same and relationship with the ‘other’ is rendered immaterial (Terruhn, forthcoming). Such is the risk of an inclusive equality void of critical debate. These two ideas (of forgetting instead of remembering, and of sameness instead of difference) need to be challenged if we are to shift Pākehā thinking toward a relationship with Māori difference within a Critical Biculturalism.

Increasing Pākehā comfort in a relationship with Māori difference would see a softening of the egalitarian stronghold. Promotion of differential rights generally results in objections to the ‘privileged’ status afforded to Māori (and to Māori culture)(Terruhn, forthcoming). In support of this position are arguments based on the notion that

institutionalisation of 'Māori privilege' as a consequence of biculturalism "compromises a basic equality; that biculturalism is divisive rather than unifying; and that differential rights for Māori constitute a form of racism that must be rejected" (Barclay, 2005, p.120). This position suggests a dominant perception that a Treaty based partnership and the bicultural discourses it influences represent an unequal distribution of power and resources in favour of Māori (Terruhn, forthcoming). This idea is mirrored by May and Sleeter (2010) too, in reference to criticisms of multiculturalism. They note:

Critics of multiculturalism... increasingly construct middle-class whites, white men, and/or monolingual English speakers as the "new minority", the newly disadvantaged (see, e.g., Barry, 2000; cf. Vavrus, this volume). It is almost as if, in Kozol's (1992) wry observation, having monopolized power and privilege, such groups now wish to monopolize misery! (p. 2)

The egalitarian "obsession with 'treating everyone the same' comes without acknowledgement of the need to treat people differently to achieve equal outcomes" (Robson, 2006, p. 22). The fundamental assumption upon which this position rests is that New Zealand is somehow different to other colonised countries in so far as it is a 'just' society free of stratification based on race, class, cultural and economic status, likewise, that colonised and coloniser are afforded equal privileges as 'equal citizens'. This egalitarian discourse favoured by Pākehā does the work of directing attention away from material inequalities (May & Sleeter, 2010; G. Smith, 2003; L. Smith, 1999). One does not need to look far to find such inequalities, they are evident in "statistics, that demonstrate how due to the denial of Māori rights, Māori are still more likely to be uneducated, in poor health, without a home and unable to speak in their own language" (Mulholland, 2006, pp. 13-14). The statistics tell of a reality that is in stark contrast to the 'Māori privilege' suggested by Pākehā proponents of liberal cultural discourses.

Pākehā discomfort with 'privileging Māori interests' has restricted the potential of biculturalism in New Zealand (Barclay, 2005) and lead to the evolution of a "multiplicity of biculturalisms" (Terruhn, forthcoming, p. 1). These multiple biculturalisms unfold between the dichotomous 'soft' end, interested in the mainstreaming of Māori culture, to the 'hard' end committed to structural change and forms of indigenous sovereignty (G. Smith, 2012). The 'hard', structuralist approach, that interrogates unequal power relations, has been fiercely rejected by the Euro-centric majority while the 'soft' culturalist approach (if any at all) continues to enjoy Pākehā favour.

The culturalist approach enables Pākehā to feel good about the way the exotic Māori culture shapes the national identity and distinguishes them from other Europeans (Terruhn, forthcoming). Pākehā feel justified in appropriating aspects of Māori culture as part of their own and are quick to exhibit symbolic representations of Māori culture that have captured the nation's and the world's imagination (e.g. haka (posture dance performance), hongi (to press noses in greeting), hangi (earth oven), tā moko (Māori tattooing designs)). Where an alternative to a mono-cultural discourse has been sought, 'soft', liberal cultural discourses that are pitched at recognising, respecting and including cultural difference are preferred (May & Sleeter 2010). The Treaty relationship from the Pākehā perception (as you might expect) is very much euro-centric typified by liberal and/or culturalist discourses that essentialise Māori culture and identities and reject discourses that seek to address personal and institutional manifestations of racism. Māori (not surprisingly) perceive the Treaty relationship differently and these differences form the basis of many Māori-Pākehā tensions that a critical biculturalism seeks to understand and engage with. The next section unpacks further how Māori perceive the Treaty relationship and how these perceptions advance the theorisation of Critical Biculturalism.

Māori perceptions of the Treaty relationship

“Hei ahau koe e whai piringa ki taku ukaipo? Hei a koe ranei taua e pahuahua ai? Kahore, hei a taua tonu, paringa tai moana, timunga tai tangata, te purapura e ruia ai, te reanga tangata e puta ai, puta ki te whei ao, ki te ao marama.” Whakatauki nō Muriwhenua (Williams, 2005, p. 235)

[Is it through me that you will gain a place at my mother's breast? Is it through you that we will be replete? No, it is only together as a single ebbing tide, a flooding tide of people, that the seed can be properly sown and a new generation emerge into the world of light.]

Māori values of reciprocity and caring for others underpin a dominant Māori perception of the Treaty relationship. Māori perceptions of the Treaty that go predominantly unheard by the dominant culture are highlighted in this section and advanced as providing critical and necessary elements to a transformative theorisation of biculturalism. Giving voice to ideas that have previously been subordinated to the colonial agenda is also a pivotal first action in praxis that seeks to interrupt an unequal distribution of power. The whakataukī (proverb) quoted above illustrates an enduring expectation by Māori that prosperity for both partners could/should/would be reached

together. This is one of numerous historical quotes and proverbs that support the argument that Māori have always perceived the Treaty as an agreement to partnership. The above whakataukī also acknowledges a belief that neither party could be fully sustained by an all-consuming exhaustion of each other's resources. The whakataukī emphasises a focus on future generations too and how they (Māori) saw partnership as being pivotal in sowing 'properly' (together and in the spirit of reciprocity) the 'seeds' of the new generations.

Contemporary scholars articulate similar sentiments with a slant on a greater access to justice and political power sharing. Eddie Durie (2005) suggests by his criticism of the Waitangi Tribunal process that political power and privilege is unevenly or unfairly weighted towards one culture and 'judgment' processes need to advance the values of two cultures equally. In regards to reaching just outcomes through the Waitangi Tribunal process, Durie (2005) advises that resolution of cross-cultural conflicts requires, either fair negotiations with equality of bargaining power, or a biculturally competent adjudicatory body. Sentiments like these maintain the idea that for Māori, in regards to the implementation and outcomes of the Treaty relationship, the principles of reciprocity and balance¹³ were historically and are still currently expected in regards to its implementation and outcomes.

It is necessary at this point in speaking of Māori perspectives or actions to acknowledge the influence of my own narrative. I therefore make no claims to authenticity and attempt not to portray Māori as having one fixed reality but rather provoke a discursive response to a particular position. It is appropriate in a discussion about Māori perspectives of the Treaty relationship to mention the impact of colonisation on Māori thinking. Western thought patterns that perpetuate binaries would have us situate historical/ traditional/ authentic positions in opposition to contemporary/ colonised/ corrupted discourses (Hoskins, 2001). By this measure traditional/ historical (authentic) positions are seen as being fixed and uncorrupted rather than part of a continuum of an "evolving, dynamic society within a colonised context" (C. Smith, 1994, p. 58). Colonisation and hegemony have fostered this perspective in the consciousness of many

¹³ Utu

Māori too. It would thus be remiss of me to pursue this section without first acknowledging the breadth and depth of Māori experience and reality and to position this discussion as but one of many. My position is influenced by Hoskins (2001) who suggests that...

... Māori have had to negotiate and reposition ourselves in response to colonization, this work recognizes culture as dynamic and as motivated by a desire to create change within a colonized context, not through attempts to recreate the past, but by suggesting that our subjugated knowledges can (and already do) provide guidance and a shared ontological framework which is a powerful force for change. (p. 1)

As a result, when making reference to 'Māori' I am suggesting a particular Māori political position (among many) and rejecting the reification of a single Māori reality. Unlike our colonisers who have the privilege of an assumed diversity of cultural realities and identities, the reality of the colonised is that escaping the trappings of binary logic completely (Māori or not Māori) is a challenge. Whilst I am not sure it is completely avoidable, I am motivated to rise to this challenge. I return now to discussing 'Māori' perceptions of the Treaty relationship and the role the principle of reciprocity has played in forming such positions.

Māori perceptions regarding land transactions demonstrate the salience of the utu (reciprocity and balance) principle in the historical context. Williams (2005) explains how Māori perceived land transactions with Pākehā in terms of their own traditional arrangements for the transfer of land - referred to as tuku whenua. These arrangements were "conditional in nature and could be revoked if the reciprocal relationship between settler and Māori did not endure. Thus from the Māori perspective the transfer lasted for as long as the relationship did" (Williams, 2005, p.235). Suffice to say, Māori assumed the right to withdraw from any arrangement if they felt that the principle of reciprocity was not maintained. Reciprocity in Māori culture, as it is in many, is fundamental to a healthy relationship.

Utu, the reciprocal and generative process that ordered relationships (Hoskins, 2001) pervaded all aspects of traditional Māori society and Māori extended this value to the Treaty. The promises expressed in the Treaty provided assurance to Māori that benefits would outweigh the concessions and any sacrifices made would not be in vain as the

Crown would certainly reciprocate. It is clear that Māori understood an alliance with the British Crown would be mutually beneficial and that Māori cultural and economic dignity would be maintained for future generations.

Little has changed in the way Māori perceive the Treaty. Ranginui Walker attested in the 1980s that Māori always viewed the Treaty as providing the way out of a situation of dominance and subordination (Walker, 1986). Today, this image is well preserved. A critical application of the Treaty that privileges Māori values such as *utu* and *manaaki* (respect, kindness, hospitality) underpins a Māori ideology of biculturalism that rejects unequal power relations in favouring Pākehā. Addressing this reality is an on-going struggle however because from the outset equal power relations between Māori and Pākehā were undermined. Colonial endeavors by force and by pen maneuvered to weaken Māori culture and autonomy (Orange, 2011) resulting in sustained dysfunction in the Māori-settler relationship and a resultant deep mistrust between Māori and their coloniser (L. Smith, 1999). Generations of colonial agendas that have led to the degradation of Māori culture, customs, language and ways of being and the subsequent destruction of widespread Māori social and economic subsistence and efficacy - have stymied Māori optimism in the New Zealand government (through its institutions) to deliver equitable outcomes for Māori as Māori (Durie, 1998). Despite this experience, Māori have maintained an enduring reverence for the Treaty itself. The salient Māori perceptions of the Treaty are the maintenance and advancement of Māori dignity by upholding the promise of partnership based on the principle of reciprocity, and the Treaty as providing the maintenance of (or return to) self-determination.

Some other key ideas underpin these perceptions. The first is that the Treaty is transhistorical. To perceive it as a relic of the past is thus to assume that the process of colonisation is limited only to the past when in fact colonisation and indigenous-settler relations are continually shaping and reshaping power relations in the present (L. Smith, 1999). Māori regard as on-going the injustices that have arisen through post-Treaty colonisation processes and its neocolonial forms, and therefore require on-going and renewed engagement and critique (G. Smith, 2012).

The second fundamental idea that underpins Māori thinking about the Treaty is that it is conceived of as a living document, as continually speaking. It is brought to life by the relationship it communicates between Māori and Pākehā, not unlike a marriage (Jones, 2007). The principles of the Treaty are not simply words on parchment; they have relevance and applicability in all aspects of traditional, modern and future societies. As society adapts to advances in technology, so too do the ways the Treaty is lived. For Māori, finding new and meaningful ways to breathe life into the Treaty is a necessary condition to maintaining a lasting and reciprocal relationship and requires two equally interested and engaged parties (Hoskins, 2001; Jones, 2007; Jones & Jenkins, 2008).

In sum, Māori often criticise the Treaty relationship for its limited focus on Māori development, which keeps Māori in the position of minority rather than partner. Terruhn (forthcoming) reflects the sentiments of many Māori by noting that biculturalism currently does little to threaten the normativity of Pākehā values, practices and institutions, allowing Pākehā to remain 'the silent centre' of biculturalism. Crucial to understanding a Māori perception of the Treaty relationship is that Māori perceive the Treaty as a promise of partnership and protection of their rights and privileges whilst maintaining power and control over self-determined political structures, and formations. This dynamic must inevitably be underpinned by the deep-seated value placed in balance and reciprocity and the expectation for an enduring relationship based on the principle of *utu*. From a Māori perspective, biculturalism constitutes an 'as yet unfulfilled' promise (Terruhn, forthcoming). The following five sections tease out the tightly woven critical theories that have influenced the development of Critical Biculturalism that is advanced in this dissertation as the means to fulfill the promise of partnership and *tino rangatiratanga*.

Chapter 3: Critical Influences

Critical Theories

All thinking is difficult, but critical theory makes for additional discomfiture. If you take [critical theory] seriously, it won't make you popular or easy to live with because it radically questions taken-for-granted assumptions and familiar beliefs, and challenges many conventional practices, ideas and ideals. (Gibson, 1986, p. 4)

Critical theory has at its heart the goal that “people should be able to determine their own destinies” (Gibson, 1986, p. 2). This is a central idea to the conception of Critical Biculturalism. Because I attempt to theorise a Critical Biculturalism, I lay out some key concepts in critical theory crucial to my project and highlight the overlay between key critical influences. This, I argue, marks the space where I develop Critical Biculturalism.

With its emancipatory interests, critical theory criticises social malformations, inequalities and injustices and is committed to their transformation (Gibson, 1986, p. 3). This emancipatory endeavor of critical theory provokes a set of ideas that foreground both action and theory, based on the notion that “theory and practice are indivisible, that there is always theory underlying, and embedded in, any practice” (Gibson, 1986, pp. 3-4). Not satisfied with simply observing to explain problems, critical theories engage directly with ‘real’ problems that limit people gaining more control over their lives (Gibson, 1986; G. Smith, 2003; 2012). There are thus two essential elements to critical theory: the (political) action of social transformation and the theory, or idea, of structural analysis (including the forces of capitalism and colonisation) that informs the action (G. Smith, 2012).

The element of action means that critical theory is grounded in the lived experience. This is closely tied to Gibson's (1986) point that there is no such thing as a single, heterogeneous critical theory, rather there are critical *theories*. The significance this has on our understanding of critical theory is that it is always situated within a context and attempts to respond to the milieu of a given specific setting. Thus the central features of critical theory have been applied to a variety of contexts and adapted to serve the

particular emancipatory endeavor of each. Critical feminist studies, Critical Race Theory and critical multiculturalism are some examples.

Despite the derivations of each of these theories from a critical theory approach, there is much intra- and inter- theoretical disagreement as different theorists reveal alternate truths through the milieu of their lived experiences. It is in the space where the key influencing theories overlap that the intersection of lived realities and identities also cross. These intersections are what constitute a Critical Bicultural theory. Interested in interrogating ethnocentrism in mainstream educational institutions within the New Zealand Aotearoa colonised context, that has had devastating effects on contemporary indigenous Māori society, I soon became limited by the theories I was employing (critical multiculturalism, decolonising methodology and kaupapa Māori theory and analysis). As a result, a critical bicultural theory began to emerge in response to the liberal bicultural discourses that have failed to address unequal indigene-settler power relations in mainstream educational contexts.

A brief description of how Critical Biculturalism compares and contrasts with some of its key theoretical influences is found below.

Critical Multiculturalism

Critical multiculturalism draws from critical race theory which at its core seeks to unpack “how a regime of ‘white supremacy’ and its subordination of people of color have been created and maintained” (Dunbar, 2008, p. 87), and examines “the relationship between that social structure and professed ideas such as the rule of law and “equal protection” (Dunbar, 2008, p. 87). While giving priority to structural analysis of unequal power relations and analysing the role of institutionalised inequities, critical multiculturalism includes but is not necessarily limited to racism (May & Sleeter, 2010). Analysing the normative nature of whiteness and the process of racialisation is key, but it extends to frame culture as fluid, complex and encompassing multiple social categories that all speak from a particular place out of a particular history, experience, culture, without being constrained by that position (May & Sleeter, 2010). Critical multiculturalism has provided the language and theoretical apparatus to articulate experiences of racism and

racial inequality without undermining the legitimacy of other, equally valid forms of identity such as culture. Central to critical multiculturalism is naming and actively challenging racism and other forms of injustice not simply recognising and celebrating differences and reducing prejudice (May & Sleeter, 2010).

Rather than presenting culture as the site where difference coexists peacefully, critical multiculturalism develops strategies to explore and understand conflict and to encourage creative resolutions and contingent alliances that range from interpreting cultures to intervening in political processes (May, 2009). This was particularly useful and aided my thinking towards a re-investment in a cultural discourse that is specifically contextualised in New Zealand and privileges the Treaty partnership: biculturalism. Critical multiculturalism supports a conception of a Critical Biculturalism that rejects the prevailing liberal discourses that underpin dominant bicultural assertions in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Reinvesting in a critical cultural discourse is becoming more relevant as ethnic diversity increases and the question of how to accommodate ethnic minorities and indigenous rights becomes more pressing (Terruhn, forthcoming). Biculturalism and multiculturalism are often conceptualised as being politically antagonistic and/or incompatible. Kymlicka (1996) offers timely reprieve to this dilemma in his call for an adequate theory that is compatible with the just demands of disadvantaged social groups. He articulates multiple ways minority cultures become incorporated into political communities resulting in multiple variations in the sorts of relationships they desire with the larger society (Kymlicka, 1996). The important distinction he makes is that while all these groups are entitled to fair and sometimes special treatment and to exercise their legitimate human rights, indigenous peoples in colonised contexts have acquired a special political status affording them a different order of rights. Kymlicka (1996) and May and Sleeter (2010), suggest these multiple layers of rights as being both possible and necessary.

Decolonising Methodologies

Decolonising methodologies speak specifically to the legitimacy of the distinctive historical, political and cultural voice of indigenous peoples in colonised contexts (L. Smith, 1999) and “involves the performance of counterhegemonic theories that disrupt the colonial and the postcolonial” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. xi). Decolonising and indigenous methodologies speak back to the euro-centric regime of truth that subordinates indigenous ways of being, doing and knowing to those of the Western. Through its linking of traditional Western research paradigms with European colonialism, decolonising methodologies heighten the senses to the power of knowledge and the role the philosophical base of Western research has had on perpetuating colonial forces on indigenous peoples (L. Smith, 1999).

Decolonising methodologies privilege storying or counter-narrative methods that are congruent with indigenous values and priorities as a means of advancing and legitimising diverse indigenous realities and rejecting discourses that assimilate, integrate and/ or homogenise indigenous communities. Inherent to the indigenous methodological agenda is the value of subjectivity when conducting research. Unlike research conducted by traditional Western paradigms, indigenous methodologies argue that the researcher and the researched must share a commonality that enables a higher degree of nuanced understanding between them. These nuanced experiences, when observed by an objective researcher are likely to have the significance of meaning missed. Thus the voice of the ‘objective’ researcher becomes the most important despite a lacking in credentials to interpret accurately. Christopher Dunbar (2008) adds:

Indigenous researchers such as Smith (2005) assert that Indigenous research is about changing and improving conditions. They are driven by a purposeful dream and not a prescription. Their subjects are not merely objects to be studied objectively (allegedly) rather, the desired outcome is that which challenges the worldview of Indigenous people based on a Eurocentric perspective. (p. 92)

Like critical multiculturalism, some decolonising/indigenous scholars challenge the use of race as the central unit of analysis (Dunbar, 2008). Whilst recognising its purpose, they feel that the politicisation of race limits the ability to analyse other limiting forces such as colonialism and class/capitalism. Darder and Torres (2004) note “much of critical race theory is informed by ‘ambiguous ideas of institutional racism or structural racism” (p. 99). They add that the use of race as the central focus for analysis without a clearly

theorised conception of what race is, does little to serve the emancipatory pursuits of indigenous people living in colonised contexts. Thus decolonising methodologies attend to a wider network of intersecting factors that deprive indigenous peoples of their rights to self govern and deliver equitable social and economic outcomes for themselves.

Integral to decolonising methodologies, as Graham (2003; 2012) and Linda Smith (1999) both stress, is the process of conscientisation. Graham Smith (2003) suggests that the term/idea of 'conscientisation' serves the indigenous emancipatory agenda more truthfully than the term 'decolonising' as it is a shift away from putting the coloniser at the centre of attention. For my purposes both terms are connected and useful. Part of the decolonising project is conscientisation - unveiling the conditions and ideologies that maintain a dynamic of unequal indigenous-settler power relations. It is about growing a critical consciousness to the 'politics of distraction', or "the process of being kept busy by the colonizer, of always being on the 'back-foot', 'responding', 'engaging', 'accounting', 'following' and 'explaining'" (Smith, 2003, p. 2) as opposed to interrogating power and engaging in transformative praxis. Conscientisation is about recognising hegemony and 'unlearning' the deficit terms indigenous peoples have learned to see themselves in (G. Smith, 2003; L. Smith 1999). Smith (2003) urges indigenous communities to critically 'conscientise' themselves about their needs, aspirations and preferences as an important counter strategy to hegemony.

Decolonising methodologies have been useful in advancing indigenous aspirations for more equitable distribution of political power with their coloniser, by legitimising indigenous world-views through research that serves their own aspirations and legitimates their own experiences. These have been important insights contributing to the development of a Critical Biculturalism in this dissertation that seeks to contribute to interrupting colonial, post-colonial and neo-colonial forces that maintain a situation of unequal indigenous-settler power relations. Kaupapa Māori is an example of an indigenous methodology that has been developed by the indigenous Māori of Aotearoa to address the concerns they faced. The following section introduces Kaupapa Māori and the influence it has had on theorising a Critical Biculturalism.

Kaupapa Māori theory

Mātauranga Māori is the “always evolving underlying body of knowledge that can guide practice and understanding. How you do that is a kaupapa Māori approach” (Durie, 2012). The deliberate addition of the word ‘theory’ to kaupapa Māori by Graham Smith in his PhD thesis was “a strategic move to open up a powerful space in the academy... [as] a form of academic inquiry” (Smith, 2012, pp. 10-11). Kaupapa Māori is thus a set of discourses developed by Māori, that privilege Māori ways of being, doing and knowing to address Māori struggles and concerns for self-determination. Grounded in the socio-political context of the indigenous Māori reality in New Zealand and rooted in critical theory kaupapa Māori has been instrumental in the development of Critical Biculturalism. Kaupapa Māori is a site of self-determination for Māori and a tool for critique and resistance of on-going colonial oppression. Kaupapa Māori Theory as articulated by Graham Smith (2012) has roots in two intellectual influences. First: critical social theory -transformation of the social context for Māori in New Zealand through structural and political change and second: the legitimacy of Māori language, culture and knowledge both in the everyday lives of people and also in the elite academy of knowledge production (G. Smith, 2003). Kaupapa Māori provides space for thinking and researching differently, to centre Māori interests and desires and to speak back to dominant existing theories in education (G. Smith, 2012). It must be applied, practiced and experienced (subjective), it cannot be observed from a distance (objective).

Kaupapa Māori is a decolonising methodology that privileges the experiences of New Zealand Māori in a colonised context. Although methodologies speaks specifically about the formation of theory and ideologies that underpin thinking and ways of knowing, kaupapa Māori is also an approach to the application of Māori knowledge and world views. Kaupapa Māori has been a successful radical tool of resistance for Māori, having its greatest impact when it is at play in the margins, outside the mainstream. The most notable examples of Māori initiatives for transformative change in education can be found in the establishment of Te Kōhanga Reo (Kaupapa Māori early childhood centres), Kura Kaupapa Māori (Kaupapa Māori primary schools), Whare Kura (Kaupapa Māori secondary schools) and Whare Wānanga (Kaupapa Māori universities). These Kaupapa

Māori pathways have significantly contributed to Māori educational attainment statistics. However, there is a deep mistrust by Māori of Pākehā using and colonising this tool. One of Smith's criticisms has been the domestication of kaupapa Māori by its appropriation to the mainstream where the cultural role has been overshadowed by its structural purpose. Smith (2012) declares, that to 'domesticate' it limits its potential and it is at this point where Critical Biculturalism steps in.

Kaupapa Māori is mostly interested in Māori development and so is about Māori self-determination but can also guide practice at the 'interface' of the bicultural relationship. A Critical Biculturalism is essential because, like it or not, we do not exist in isolation. We are always negotiating relationships with others (including our Treaty partner), thus a robust Critical Biculturalism is essential for Māori, and is essential for all. Influenced by the principles of kaupapa Māori, Critical Biculturalism provides a malleable framework for gaining incremental, cultural and structural change from within a mainstream context thus opening spaces where kaupapa Māori can take hold. Critical Biculturalism draws critical insights from the theoretical bases of kaupapa Māori theory, critical multiculturalism and decolonising methodologies to furnish four 'critical' bicultural strands: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonising practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler 'minds'); Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations.

Chapter 4: Critical Biculturalism

It would be rare to find a social space in Aotearoa that does not have to operate at the intersection of Māori and Pākehā, and in light of this hard reality, investment into a theory of Critical Biculturalism is long overdue. Critical Biculturalism is developed in this chapter as constituting the four strands as follows: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler 'minds'); Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations. At the conclusion of the theoretical development of each whenu, I set out a critical reading/analysis of the MSS *against* the key tenets of each whenu. I seek to acknowledge the positive aspects of the MSS while also offering a critical and productive discussion on MSS. It is my hope that this discussion will contribute to ongoing positive developments of the Unitec's Maori Success Strategy.

Kaupapa Māori has led the way in Aotearoa in creating space to rethink from Māori perspectives not only the dominant practice (and ideologies that those practices are based on) but also to suggest alternatives (Smith, 2003). The space created by Kaupapa Māori is also necessarily for Māori (Smith, 2003). Whilst drawing heavily from the cultural and structural fundamentals of Kaupapa Māori, Critical Biculturalism seeks to secure a critical space for theorisation and development about relationship. That is, our relationship with the Treaty and the Māori -Pākehā relationship. Māori have long advocated that a Treaty-based biculturalism provides a mechanism for accessing a greater degree of social justice, resulting in greater social well-being and economic flourishing for Māori. Critical Biculturalism as I develop it here proposes relationship as imperative to the transformative process. To be clear, Critical Biculturalism does not sideline tino rangatiratanga as a vision, rather it provides an apparatus for transforming monocultural contexts, inducing it from within mainstream contexts in the spirit of balance and reciprocity.

Biculturalism has been articulated within a wider discourse of indigenous rights and maintained in New Zealand by an associated skepticism of multiculturalism (Terruhn, forthcoming). Critical Biculturalism draws initially on contemporary notions of ethnic nationalism and subsequently on the right as indigenous people to self-determination (Kymlicka, 1996; United Nations, 2008). Similar to kaupapa Māori, one intention of Critical Biculturalism is to honour the self-development aspirations of Māori. I am careful not to suggest that it is simply about describing what is going on either, or just making education more 'Māori friendly'. It is premised on legitimising Māori language, culture and knowledge to generate action, and praxis, leading to transformative change (G. Smith, 2012). Critical Biculturalism recognises relationship as paramount to the success of a critical bicultural discourse. Additionally, as Critical Biculturalism is about transforming through legitimising Māori aspirations and Māori ways of reaching them, accountability to Māori communities and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances are necessary.

At the centre of Critical Biculturalism, is the Treaty-based (indigenous- settler) relationship. Māori *and*¹⁴ Pākehā are implicated in this relationship and therefore *both* have a responsibility to 'doing' the relationship justice. Critical Biculturalism creates a space for both Māori and non-Māori to address the indigenous-settler relationship. It recognises that the social, political, and economic position of Māori is not just a 'Māori problem'. It draws from the key principles of kaupapa Māori but invites our coloniser to the table and provides kawa¹⁵ and tikanga¹⁶ for two parties to engage in dialogue as equals. Pākehā rejection of more 'critical' bicultural discourses and partiality towards liberal biculturalism do little to interrupt power relations that privilege Pākehā worldviews, and this has debilitating effects on Māori. Pākehā have a responsibility to be conscious of this dynamic and to fulfill their role in a critical Treaty-based, bicultural relationship.

¹⁴ I have italicized the *and* and the *both* of this sentence to imply a one sided Treaty based relational dynamic.

¹⁵ the formal customs of the marae -these are not adapted

¹⁶ the correct or proper procedure for carrying out an activity –these can be adapted to suit the context/circumstances

The following four sections articulate the four tightly woven whenu: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’; Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations. These whenu bind Critical Biculturalism together. Whilst I advance four distinct strands, I acknowledge that there is much overlay between the strands and I identify that overlay below. However, discerning where and how the elements of each strand depart from another is possible as each has a slightly different focus as reflected by the key-words of each whenu: ‘relationship’, ‘decolonisation’, ‘culture’ and ‘structure’.

The indigenous-settler relationship

Māori initiated a dangerous and risky relationship with the cultural other, risking their alteration for such a relationship (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). The Māori cultural orientation to relationality, to taking risks, is I suggest a powerful ethical dimension that Māori bring to sociality. (Hoskins, 2012, p. 92)

The Māori propensity to forge and maintain relationships, as reflected in the quote above, has largely been unrequited in our colonial history. In relation to Māori customary and historical land transfers, Justice Eddie Durie (2005) highlights a regretful reality of two quite different cultural understandings between Māori and Pākehā about what their entitlements and responsibilities were. Durie (2005) refers to Māori complaints that the government was stealing their land and government officials responding with references to Māori treachery, an example of two very different ideas about what were appropriate and fair expectations of each other. This regretful reality is one that has persisted throughout our history and to the present day, sometimes out of convenience and sometimes despite the best of intentions. What is regretful is not that there are two conflicting interpretations, or realities for the one situation, but that the valuable process of negotiating and navigating this complex terrain to the advantage of both parties was typically, and impatiently, sidelined, if not completely circumvented, to the settlers’ benefit.

The obligatory struggles over power and resources that accompany the colonisation process have embedded a pattern of dominance and subordination in New Zealand, that

a relational justice would inevitably interrupt. The vision of a relational justice as envisioned by Barclay (2005) is therefore yet to be fully actualised in Aotearoa. This strand to Critical Biculturalism posits a commitment to an indigenous-settler relationship as imperative to accessing the generative potential that comes from ‘working the hyphen’ (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). Jones and Jenkins advance Michelle Fine’s phrase ‘working the hyphen’ used by to call attention to the complex gap at the Self-Other border when working across cultures and unpack the difficulties of such a relationship (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). Jones and Jenkins apply the hyphen specifically to the indigene-coloniser relationship and explain its discursive production of the ‘other’ as it remembers a shared past. The hyphen marks, “a relationship of power and inequality that continues to shape differential patterns of cultural dominance and social privilege” (Jones & Jenkins, 2008, p. 473), its a place of struggle between “the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and the ways of resisting of the Other” (L. Smith, 1999, p.2). ‘Working the hyphen’ talks about creating a relationship “based on the tension of difference, not on its erasure” (Jones & Jenkins, 2008, p. 473) as has been the dominant colonial discourse.

Barclay (2005) cuts through to the main impetus of a relational strand to Critical Biculturalism by asserting that our colonial history has resulted in Māori declaring themselves outside of the nation as an outcome of being excluded from it (Barclay, 2005). The relationship strand is about inclusion, but not in the warm, fuzzy, cosy, liberal sense that elevates ‘respect’ and ‘understanding each other better so we can all get along’ as the answer to disparate social/educational outcomes for Māori. The kind of inclusion that I refer to is a meaningful and engaging inclusion, one that values relationship and its potential more than it values comfort. Investing in a relationship committed to working the hyphen means being committed to the ‘hard work’ (and vision, co-operation/collaboration and skill) required to build a nation (Metge, 2010). It is ‘hard work’ and it is uncomfortable because the hyphen denotes an “uneasy, unsettled relationship, based on learning (about difference) *from* the Other, rather than learning *about* the Other” (Jones & Jenkins, 2008, p. 471). Learning *from* the other positions the other as an equal, whereas learning *about* them enters a dynamic of unequal power relations. Thus, embracing the hyphen means an outcome of exclusion is a failing in a Critical Bicultural frame.

By *not* attempting to fully understand the Other - the careful, tense interplay of histories provides an interesting account of the complexity of contemporary as well as past indigenous-settler relations (Jones and Jenkins, 2008). What happens as a consequence is the legitimisation of ‘multiple truths’ in a typically, assimilatory, reductionist, dominating space. By resigning to the notion that there are multiple truths that can never “add up” we reject being reduced to one plausible truth (Jones, 2007). It is at this point that the relationship strand is tightly woven with the decolonising strand of Critical Biculturalism because in order for this to occur, there needs to be a heightened awareness, self-consciousness even, about the hyphen. Awareness is imperative, as is a willingness to enter into a complex and conscious decision making process that interrogates the issue of who has voice and who does not. It requires an understanding that speaking with one voice is impossible. This creates the space for power relations to shift and becomes more complex than the pervasive colonised-coloniser binary. It becomes a generative ground for new ideas (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). This enters the space of decolonisation.

Also in the decolonising space is the absolute imperative for Māori counter-stories or privileging of Māori ways of doing, being and knowing. Durie (2000) invokes the Māori principle of mana into the relationship space. Mana, as he describes it, refers to the spiritual authority of persons or peoples. All people have it. One who has great mana, should not need to proclaim it, however if one’s mana were not recognised when the circumstances require it, it would cause considerable offence (Durie, 2000). Historical tension between Māori and Pākehā are a result of failing to respect mana Māori. This failing continues to be an underlying issue in Māori and Pākehā disputes (at least from a Māori view) (Durie, 2000). Good relationships depend on finding ways to recognise and respect the mana of both parties. Durie also highlights the importance of the principles of manaaki, to raise the mana of others by the way you greet and care for them, and aroha. I suggest Durie pushes the hyphen further with aroha. He explains you *can* actually know your other, however, a deep comprehension of another's point of view, you can *only* gain from *loving* them. Mana, manaaki and aroha are all about the hyphen. They remind us of the dangers of generalising and of assumptions. This does not mean agreeing with the other. Aroha may be displayed in the ability to disagree with equanimity (Durie, 2000).

Alternatively, to persuade others to a point of view, it is helpful to respect them first and as Durie (2000) suggests maybe even love them. This is the epitome of relationship. Without a commitment to relationship as suggested by Durie (2000), Barclay (2005), Jones (2007) and Jones and Jenkins (2008), all question whether transformation can occur and justice be realised if the parties are only antagonistic and disengaged.

The Unitec MSS makes several attempts to invoke the relationship strand. Unitec has acknowledged that achieving its lofty aspiration of becoming a “bicultural Institute of Technology operating in a multicultural environment” (see Appendix) will require “all working together for the success of Māori students” (see Appendix). This is an important idea as this shows understanding that Māori enjoying educational success as Māori at their institution is not *just* a ‘Māori problem’. Unitec is recognising the need to work together as Jones (2007) vehemently urges. This is a not a straightforward task however. To satisfy the indigenous-settler relationship strand of Critical Biculturalism some common sense practices need to be discarded. The indigenous-settler relationship strand reminds us to be cautious of ‘ending’ our attempts at the ‘soft’ end of the spectrum which promote conditions of ‘respect and ‘learning *about* difference’ so we can ‘get along better’. Because Critical Biculturalism seeks to interrupt power-relations, a critical indigenous-settler relational discourse needs to be prepared to embrace everything that is hard about relationships too (e.g. contestation and debate, facing power at work, facing racism at work) while also staying in the relationship. In advancing a discourse that embraces Māori and Pākehā responsibility for the success of all students, Unitec needs to be invested in embracing “a struggle with no end” (Jones, 2007, p. 1) and to accept the necessary interminability of struggle where tension, contradictory and irreconcilable realities sit in interminable tension with the other (Jones, 2007). Finding ways to work with and legitimate multiple, irreconcilable truths in a mainstream context where there are external (e.g. capitalist, globalist, reporting, politics) and internal forces (e.g. hegemony, habit, competition, politics) is a necessary task and will need to be reflected more strongly in the language used in the MSS.

Unitec provides other evidence of a call to relationship in the MSS. Objective one: “enable active participation of Māori communities and stakeholders in decision making

at Unitec” (see Appendix) and objective four: “Build staff capability to engage with te ao Māori” show a readiness to engage meaningfully with Māori communities and stakeholders. This is an important focus to a Critical Bicultural frame of the MSS. It will be imperative that these relationships are conscious of the historic coloniser-colonised discourses that have resulted in unequal power relations. The struggle alluded to by Jones (2007) calls for a positive and energised engagement where each is taken seriously and resists the urge to enter into a relationship of dominance and subordination, thus resisting “a battle where someone must win” (Jones, 2007). Addressing unequal power-relations is an uncomfortable place for one whose position of power or privilege is being interrogated or challenged. In Aotearoa today, power and privilege rests with the Pākehā majority. In engaging in Critical Biculturalism to advance bicultural aspirations and effect transforming change, Unitec’s people, must be prepared to confront their own comfort/discomfort. Pākehā comfort therefore must not be empowered to limit the potential of relationship. This could be an area of exploration in a renewal of the MSS. Jones (2007) best reflects the aspect of relationship that addresses ‘comfort’ in her assertion that when “Pākehā comfort is victorious, we all lose an opportunity to remain within a relationship of struggle” (Jones, 2007, p. 13). Finally, in order to reflect the indigenous-settler relationship strand in the MSS, Unitec will need to embrace Māori principles in regard to relationships in addition to the dominant eurocentric discourses regarding relationship. Durie’s expressions of mana, manaaki and aroha are an important starting point in advancing the “hyphen” (Jones and Jenkins, 2008). These Māori principles provide a space to be cautious about the risks of generalising and making assumptions about the ‘Other’ and the nature of the relationship with the ‘Other’ and ought to be reflected in the practices associated with operationalising the MSS.

Decolonising practice

(including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’)

If we take seriously Barthes’s (1994) argument about the power of the reader to make the text and that understanding “lies not in [a text’s] origin but in its destination” (p. 148), it is obvious that the indigene’s *audience* in the site of inquiry becomes the key player in meaning. Therefore, when dominant group members are unable to understand the speaker, the indigene’s ability to speak is reduced dramatically. Even good intentions by the dominant group are not always sufficient to enable their ears to hear and *therefore* for the other to speak. (Jones & Jenkins, 2008, p. 478)

Deafness of the colonisers to indigenous speakers is one of the necessary conditions of a colonised society (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). Integral to decolonisation is conscientisation. Conscientisation enables us to critically question dominant ideologies and hegemonies that we may otherwise uncritically consume and/or perpetuate. The decolonising strand to Critical Biculturalism, I argue, identifies the need to engage in a process of conscientising ourselves to the power of voice and the limitations colonisation has on Māori voice in Aotearoa. Conscientisation¹⁷ is explained by Graham Smith (2003) in reference to kaupapa Māori theory as being the “counter strategy to hegemony” (p. 3). Hegemony is described by Smith (2003) as a way of thinking that occurs “when oppressed groups take on dominant group thinking and ideas uncritically and as ‘common sense’ even though those ideas may in fact be contributing to forming their own oppression” (p. 3). An important element of colonisation, he goes on, has been the “diminishment of the indigenous ability to actually imagine freedom or a utopian vision free of the oppressor” (G. Smith, 2003, p. 3). Key to a decolonising agenda therefore is “freeing of the indigenous mind from the grip of dominant hegemony” (G. Smith, 2003, p.3).

Critical Biculturalism advances decolonisation however, as being not just a Māori concern but rather a necessary concern for both Māori and Pākehā/Tauīwi. But decolonisation for Tauīwi is two-fold. Firstly its about conscientisation to the coloniser-colonised dynamic of dominance and subordination and how this dynamic is created and maintained. Secondly decolonisation for Tauīwi, as it is for Māori, is about raising consciousness to the origins of dominant ideologies that underpin society as we know it, and the resultant social structures and institutions. This is tied to claims of ‘naturalness’, ‘universality’ or ‘common sense’ about Western epistemologies and ontologies. Conscientisation for Tauīwi is about confronting assumptions about the way they see the world. Conscientisation requires Tauīwi and Māori to be aware that their assumptions of

¹⁷ Smith makes distinction between decolonisation and conscientisation arguing that in many ways they achieve similar outcomes but that they “teach and emphasize some distinctly different elements” (2003, p. 3). He notes a preference for using the later term for its proactive stance as opposed to the reactive notion of decolonization that puts the colonizer at the centre (2003). I am inclined to agree but have chosen to keep the two ideas together in this dissertation as they are both useful discourses in advancing a Critical Biculturalism. At times I use the terms interchangeably.

‘naturalness’ or ‘universality’ have origins from other lands, and are premised on culturally constructed and value laden ideologies (L. Smith, 1999; Waitere, 2008).

Māori counter-narratives are a necessary tool to advancing a decolonising agenda within a critically bicultural frame. Māori counter-narratives are important in talking-back to Western ideology and its associated discriminations (Hoskins, 2010; Jones, 2007; May & Sleeter, 2010; G. Smith, 2003; L. Smith, 1999). The decolonisation strand must advance the *use* of counter-narratives but also the “reawakening of the Māori imagination that had been stifled and diminished by colonization processes” (G. Smith, 2003, p. 2). Through privileging stories of multiple and multi-layered and complex Māori realities, the coloniser and the colonised consequently engage in the process of interrogating assumptions of truth, unravel hegemony and therefore partake in decolonisation.

Decolonisation within a Critical Bicultural frame is about enabling a critical consciousness about the impacts of historical and neo-colonial colonisation on indigenous peoples and must interrupt the resultant adverse affects of unequal Māori-Pākehā power-relations. The decolonising strand is bound to the structural strand where it talks to the need to question and critique dominant discourses, structures and practices and to maintain a critical stance. Critical Biculturalism, by privileging decolonising discourses, embraces critical theory and theory in general to understand and make informed choices about which theories are beneficial to the cause. It is about embracing and engaging with all forms of knowledge, Western and Māori, not either/or (Smith, 2012). Critically important to a decolonising stance is an acute awareness that decolonisation is an on-going project and not something that will be arrived at. There is no identified end point. This ties in with the interminable struggle referred to in the relationship strand.

Although deeply influenced by theory and conscientisation, decolonising is necessarily interested in action. Action informed by theory, praxis (G. Smith, 2003; 2012), and focused on effecting transforming change for Māori.

In a decolonizing framework, deconstruction is part of a much larger intent. Taking apart the story, revealing underlying texts, and giving voice to things that are often know intuitively does not help people to improve their current conditions. It provides words perhaps, an insight that explains certain experiences – but it does not prevent someone from dying. (L. Smith, 1999, p. 3)

The scary reality remains that Māori social and economic well-being is suffering and requires urgent addressing. A decolonising agenda must address this and enable action to effect transformation of the situation.

Effecting Critical Biculturalism at Unitec through the decolonising strand necessarily involves engagement with multiple realities. Objectives that invite counter narratives and privilege Māori ways of being, doing and knowing would be expected in a policy document that aspires to Critical Biculturalism. Unitec has made significant attempts to this end. Objective two: “increase leadership positions where Mātauranga Māori expertise is required; support and grow leadership capacity of existing staff and students [and]; Support and grow Mātauranga Māori expertise in all leadership positions” (see Appendix) and objective three: “Improve Mātauranga Māori practices, knowledge and content within all Unitec’s living curricula environs” (see Appendix), both evidence Unitec’s efforts to legitimising Māori epistemologies and ontologies. An important next step for Unitec could be to create space for both Māori and non-Māori to utilise counter-narratives to provoke reflection and conscientisation to the origins and assumptions of universality of dominant discourses and ideologies.

Action is also imperative, the current objectives could be enhanced to support students and staff to engage critically in the process of conscientisation in order to affect transformative change through practice that has been enhanced through close interrogation (praxis) of historical and contemporary colonising forces, including neo colonial forces such as capitalism. Critical Biculturalism positions Māori world-views strategically to speak back to dominant discourses and it is not as yet clear in the MSS whether this is the role of objectives two and three. One way this could be better articulated could be by positioning Māori leadership goals and language and cultural goals in such a way that they serve the function of interrogating regimes of truth and the power of knowledge. This could be articulated through objectives that seek and develop capacity in new and existing staff around decolonising and conscientising discourses.

Advancing Māori ways of being, doing and knowing as a tool of resistance or as Hoskins (2012) describes; strategic essentialism, serves the purpose of achieving certain political

and social goals (Hoskins, 2012). Critical Biculturalism, while advancing this idea at the same time rejects an uncritical misuse of the promotion of “Māori [or other] ethnic/cultural identity as authentic, homogenous and stable” (Hoskins, 2012, p. 86). Critical Biculturalism calls upon Unitec to recognise and reflect in policy the risks, and for the most part resist essentialist, homogenising cultural and political identities that place Māori in fixed binary opposition to Pākehā (Hoskins, 2012, p. 87). Instead, Critical Biculturalism advances a discourse of embracing of multiple realities. This means embracing simultaneously individual and collective identities, as well as culture as evolving in a continuously changing context. This means embracing tino rangatiratanga, thus situating the power to make decisions for Māori, with Māori. The *‘decolonising practice and conscientisation of indigenous and settler minds’* strand could support Unitec’s ongoing decolonising and conscientising aims in this way.

Finally, as for all the strands, leadership is critical. The *‘decolonising practice and conscientisation of indigenous and settler minds’* and the *‘interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations’* strands however, are arguably the most critically reliant on a clear articulation of a leadership agenda. These two strands require the greatest shift from dominant discourses. Thus strong leadership that is clearly defined and orientated towards decolonising praxis and conscientisation is imperative. Leadership must be sought that is critically capable of advancing this agenda and Unitec’s MSS could be further enhanced by reflecting this. But the impetus on leadership is two fold. Firstly, Māori leadership is required (as is already recognised in the MSS). However elements of Māori leadership that push past ‘standard’/dominant and/or ‘cultural’ models of leadership (that do not interrogate dominant discourses that do little to change the status quo) into critical models of leadership also need to be articulated in a strategy that aspires to meaningful change for Māori. Secondly, leadership in the discourse of decolonisation is not a space exclusively for Māori, decolonising is not *just* a Māori concern. Pākehā also need to engage in decolonising discourses. This requires critical Pākehā leadership too.

Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy

... given the ways in which Māori have had to negotiate and reposition ourselves in response to colonization, this work recognizes culture as dynamic and is motivated by a desire to create change within a colonized context, not through attempts to recreate the past, but by suggesting that our

subjugated knowledges can (and already do) provide guidance and a shared ontological framework which is a powerful force for change. (Hoskins, 2001, p. 1)

Critical biculturalism privileges culture (including language and identity) as important to transforming change. Culture within a critical bicultural frame not surprisingly refers to a critical conception of culture and is posited as Hoskins (2001) asserts above as providing the space for a shared ontological framework. Privileging Māori culture is about talking back to dominant ideology as much as, if not more than, celebrating its artefactual and symbolic representations. The cultural strand is very tightly intertwined with the structural and decolonising strands as it legitimates alternate realities to the dominant euro-centric culture and provides valid lenses for critique and renewal while providing lived examples of alternate practices.

Language and culture help Māori and others to ‘conscientise’ and to recentre their own cultural values and priorities in a colonised context. By drawing from kaupapa Māori theory and decolonising methodologies, critical biculturalism seeks to normalise the sharing of Māori epistemologies to inform ways of being/doing/thinking (G. Smith, 2012). Māori knowledge and epistemologies – (approaches to the organisation of that knowledge) and Māori ontologies (views of being and reality) are positioned as being critical in education for Māori achievement (Ministry of Education, 2013) and also for biculturalism. Critical Biculturalism, in drawing from kaupapa Māori theory, is about maintenance and revitalisation of Māori culture as much as it is about a “shift of mindset” (Smith, 2003, p.2). The cultural strand supports the Māori struggle to maintain authenticity as a culture and to protect the resilient archive that has survived colonisation (L. Smith, 1999).

But, culture is not fixed and Māori culture is no exception. Mason Durie (2012) explains, “some people think Māori knowledge is something ancient, and therefore static... when actually mātauranga Māori¹⁸ is about an evolving knowledge” (p. 24). Māori knowledge and culture is highly contextualised and localised which is why there is very real resistance to homogenisation as noted in the previous section. The cultural strand of Critical Biculturalism acts as a constant tether to Māori identities and the

¹⁸ Explained by Mason Durie in the same article as “an always evolving underlying body of knowledge that can guide practice and understanding” (2012, p. 24)

important role everyone must play in maintaining them. This is probably the intention of educational institutions in their approaches to the 'inclusion' of Māori knowledge and worldviews. Critical Biculturalism ensures that these approaches are understood as useful starting points to achieve improved outcomes for Māori but that on their own, they do little towards achieving transformative change.

Unitec have demonstrated a strong commitment to embedding and legitimising Māori cultural ways of doing, being and knowing in their organization. With three of the five objectives all indicating a strong commitment to building expertise and engagement in mātauranga Māori and te ao Māori (see Appendix). In objective two, the need to increase 'Māori' leadership in the institution has been clearly articulated (both in mātauranga Māori specific leadership roles, growing capacity within existing staff and students and supporting mātauranga Māori expertise in all leadership positions). All of these objectives will result in useful and strategic outcomes towards legitimising Māori cultural ways of doing and being. The MSS has thus privileged Māori cultural practices and knowledge.

What is not clear however from the document is how Māori-Pākehā cultural relations of power that have historically subordinated Māori worldviews to those of the West will be more evenly distributed. This example is also enmeshed with the '*interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations*' strand. One institutional example of this is to ascertain how/ where the MSS sits in relation to other strategic documents in the institution. Questioning whether the MSS (as a key document that privileges Māori culture) is subordinate to administrative, statutory or financial/ investment policies could be fruitful. If the answer is yes, an inquiry into other documents and how they are situated should provide clarity about how aspirations of Māori success and biculturalism fare institutionally. If kaupapa, tikanga and mātauranga Māori are subordinated to capital or neo colonial agendas increased activity around Māori culture is likely to have limited influence towards a Critical Bicultural vision or sustained and accelerated Māori success as Māori as these discourses are still entering into a space of unequal power dynamics.

What the MSS suggests is that there is an over investment in surface features of Māori language and culture at Unitec rather than a deeper recognition of Māori knowledge and worldviews that would in themselves transform the institution if taken seriously. The strategy appears to speak to an assumption that investment in Māori culture will achieve biculturalism. This is definitely a good place to start and a close look by Unitec at the underlying assumptions by which the MSS is premised will reveal useful information about how to advance the cultural element of the strategy further. This level of interrogation would hopefully produce objectives around increasing *bicultural* capacity as well as *Māori cultural* capacity. This could mean engaging with kaupapa, tikanga and mātauranga Māori as well as the four Critical Bicultural strands of: the indigenous-settler relationship; decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler 'minds'); Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy; and the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations.

Because Critical Biculturalism advances a relational discourse Māori cultural ways of being, knowing and doing are promoted as enabling opportunity for non-Māori to reflect on and reclaim and embrace their own cultural identities that often go unnoticed due to their dominant prevalence. Activities of this nature support the ongoing development of critical consciousness in relation to the assumptions of universality in regard to Western ideology and logic that form the basis of the dominant culture in New Zealand. Objectives that reflect building staff and student capability to critically interrogate dominant culture and their underpinning ideologies might also be found to have useful outputs toward a Critical Biculturalism.

The cultural strand of critical biculturalism extends the embrace of a critical cultural consciousness between Māori and Pākehā. Critical consciousness prompts Pākehā to reflect on the dominance of Western ways of being, doing and knowing, that are so prevalent, they are assumed universal (May & Sleeter, 2010). In its cultural objectives, Unitec's MSS is making positive gains towards critical engagement in culture which can create the space for alternate truths, alternate ways of being, doing, and knowing (May & Sleeter, 2010). The cultural strand urges Pākehā (and Māori) to learn *from* and appreciate Māori cultural aspirations and politics in a meaningful way, and not just superficially

(Durie, 2012). Unitecs MSS could take measures to advance Māori political and structural aspirations further, as this is an area that has been underdeveloped to date. For Māori cultural capital to have currency in Aotearoa it must be applied and valued (Smith, 2012). This whenu pursues equal status of Pākehā and Māori cultures and maintains, normalising the use of Māori language, tikanga and hierarchy of values as vital to getting there. These are all worthwhile qualities for tertiary educational institutions to consider more deeply.

The interrogation and transformation of structures and power-relations

Critical biculturalism must courageously address issues of power and injustice. The structural whenu invites the discourse of structuralism; the idea or theory of structural analysis that informs transforming actions (Smith, 2012). This strand therefore focuses on the politics of social change through action informed by analysis of the social order. Capitalism and colonisation are acknowledged as central forces requiring analysis for their negative influences on Māori people (Smith, 2012). Structures, such as the economy, ideology and the state, for their role in determining social relations of power and injustice, are interrogated through a structural discourse (Gibson, 1986). Critical biculturalism's 'critical' influence emphasises structural change as necessary to gain a fairer and more equitable distribution of power between Māori and Pākehā. The structural strand recognises the necessity of speaking back to bicultural discourses that privilege expressions of culture alone to promote as Barclay (2005) suggests a "bicultural redistribution of power and resources" (p. 121).

The structural whenu resists what Graham Smith (2012) refers to as a "browning of the mainstream institutions" (p. 12). The language of structuralism insists that critical biculturalism must not therefore fall into the trappings of merely 'incorporating' Māori culture and language; it must provide the space from which to challenge mainstream institutions from a bicultural perspective. Transformative change cannot happen if deconstruction of the issues is where the project ends, and this highlights the centrality of praxis (G. Smith, 2003; 2012; L. Smith, 1999). Action, underpinned by theory (praxis),

along with constant review, is advanced as fundamental to making gains toward a critical bicultural vision.

Justice Sir Eddie Durie further advances the idea of political power sharing in the pursuit of justice for indigenous peoples. A structural lens makes possible the examination of New Zealand's constitutional make-up as having undermined the civil, political and human rights of Māori (Durie, 2005). New Zealand's constitutional foundations are thus premised on the subordination of Māori ways of being, doing and knowing to Pākehā mores and values through the process of colonisation and more recently capitalism. Durie (2005) suggests an examination of the structural limitations of a given project and motioning towards change of those limitations. Durie (2005) is advancing a structural discourse in order to achieve social justice for Māori.

Additionally, the structural strand resists the dominant urge to 'victim blame' or perpetuate discourses that frame disparities between Māori and Pākehā in deficit (Māori) terms (G. Smith, 2003; L. Smith, 1999). An example of this in the education sector is in the pervasive use of the phrase "Māori underachievement". An unpacking of this phrase reveals a representation of disparate outcomes in education between Māori and Pākehā as being resultant of Māori achieving at sub par standards. Removing another layer to this idea uncovers an assumption of universality of the 'par' or 'acceptable standard' and that Māori inability to meet this standard is their 'underachievement'. The subtle and yet devastating outcome is the pairing of Māori with deficit thinking. These thoughts seep into the subconscious minds of teachers, of whānau, of students, of principles and so on who then subconsciously fulfill this prophecy. Unfortunately (unfortunately because it is so widely used and invested in), framing disparate outcomes in education between Māori and Pākehā in deficit terms has proven, despite considerable effort, not to achieve transformative change for Māori. The structural strand also highlights the need to develop consciousness to the prevalence of this pattern (of deficit thinking and negative consequences) (Smith, 2003). A structural lens recognises structural limitations such as an absence of Māori power and autonomy (and resource) as a pivotal limitation to Māori reaching Māori aspirations (Durie, 2005; Smith, 2003). The subtle shift from Māori

underachievement to Māori aspiration and Māori voice (which assumes Māori autonomy to resource praxis as they see fit) is implicitly necessary in addressing Māori concerns.

Finally, the '*interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations*' strand reflects a critical stance and advances the notion of the pursuit of a 'utopian vision' (Smith, 2012). Unitec's vision of becoming a "bicultural Institute of Technology operating in a multicultural environment" certainly has the potential to meet the 'utopian vision- standard' as long as the 'bicultural' that is aspired to is one that provokes transformative praxis. As liberal or weak versions of biculturalism are already the dominant discourses, a vision that aims to perpetuate these circumstances will have little (if any at all) effect and thus fail to be aspirational. Unitec's willingness to engage with this whenu and to aspire to becoming a *Critically Bicultural* Institute of Technology would certainly elevate their vision to one of utopia. Jones (2007) also engages in the idea of a utopian vision and uses the analogy of chasing a carrot to suggest that a utopian vision does not necessarily have an end point, or perhaps should not. Having the vision is the most important aspect (Jones, 2007; Smith, 2012). The significance that this has for Unitec is that the vision of the MSS may not necessarily ever be reached. Jones and Smith both argue that by commitment to the pursuit of the 'unreachable' carrot, we are able to keep moving forward.

For Unitec, whether achieving Critical Biculturalism is ever possible or not, is irrelevant. The power in this strand is that articulating a theorised and aspirational vision provides the direction that all can navigate towards, and thus when working together small actions can add up to have transformative impact. Graham Smith (2012) cautions however, that the vision should not be considered as something "against which to measure change" (p. 12) as this would be daunting if not depressing. Articulating how Unitec hopes to invest in biculturalism will mean being prepared to engage in a challenging and confronting process that could upset ones position of privilege. This means, interrogating power relations and interrupting patterns of dominance and subordination that perpetuate white privilege. The structural whenu therefore interrogates the uneven distribution of power and clears a space within mainstream structures for Māori aspirations to be defined and

pursued. The other three whenu ensure that the defining and resourcing of, and actions taken towards Māori aspirations are safely in the control of Māori.

In theorizing a Critical Biculturalism, this dissertation first seeks to prompt productive discussion about how Biculturalism is conceived at Unitec and what conditions are necessary to navigate towards that purpose. The underpinning of practice with a theoretical basis will enable as Smith notes the ability to identify and celebrate “the incremental victories along the way rather than be disillusioned about an apparent lack of a quick Big Victory” (Smith, 2012, p. 12). Articulating a theorised vision is a necessary task however, that is not where the structural strand ends. Little can change by theory and discussion alone. Engaging in this strand calls urgent action to bring about structural change in order to address issues that have significant impact on peoples lives (L. Smith, 1999, G. Smith, 2003). At Unitec, relations of power can be addressed at all levels. Power relations can be balanced out in the classroom between teacher and student through pedagogical practice as Bishop et. al. (2009) have examined and through collegial relationships between staff (Jones & Jenkins, 2008), but a strand that invokes structuralism necessitates a particular focus on developing fairer and more equitable structures (Smith, 2012). Nationally this could mean a rethink of Government structure to provide a more equitable role in Māori decision making. Locally, and at Unitec this could mean a rethink about governance and leadership structures that provide for greater Māori decision-making powers and accountability to Māori communities. These are possibilities that have not yet been clearly articulated in the MSS and could therefore lead to significant transformative outcomes.

The structural is perhaps the most challenging of all four strands to implement as it inevitably questions where power is positioned and is motivated towards bringing about change to that position. This very position has been fiercely protected throughout our nearly 200 years of colonisation. Unitec will inevitably experience great discomfort in a structural analysis of its efforts towards becoming a “[Critically] [B]icultural institute of technology operating in a multicultural environment” (Unitec, 2010, p. 3). Education is a state structure that has privileged a Western euro-centric model and has historically

served to maintain a power-relation of dominance and subordination between Māori and Pākehā epistemologies and ontologies. Unitec is no exception to this rule. Where Unitec is exceptional, however, is in being prepared to feel uncomfortable and engage in discussion never the less.

Chapter conclusion

In sum, with its four woven strands, critical biculturalism seeks to have two particularly transforming influences on the New Zealand context. First it emphasises on-going Māori sovereignty, or tino rangatiratanga (never ceded as a result of signing the Treaty). Secondly, while emphasising some degree of separate development and/or autonomy, critical biculturalism stresses the need for partnership between Māori and Pākehā, rather than the separation of one group from the other. The partnership model emphasises the Crown's active commitment to the inclusion of Treaty 'principles' within the constitutional and administrative framework of the modern New Zealand nation state and in line with recent interpretations in international law in relation to indigenous rights (May, 2010). The four critical bicultural strands of: '*the indigenous-settler relationship*', '*decolonising practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler minds)*', '*Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy*' and '*the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations*' used to frame the analysis of Unitec's MMS reveal that the objects of relationship are clear, but that conscientisation is not always evident. While legitimacy of Maori is an explicit goal, the transformation and structural change is not always apparent.

Conclusion

Underpinning Critical Biculturalism is an understanding of the differing perspectives of the Treaty that are largely (and in a generalised sense) held by Pākehā and Māori. Rather than reconciling the differences between the parties to the Treaty, Critical Biculturalism encourages engagement with that difference. This engagement, I suggest, needs to take place in the context of a relationship between the parties grounded in Māori concepts of *utu*, of *manaaki*, and of *aroha*. Differences lead to discomfort, and engaging with those differences might be ‘hard work’ but is necessary to achieve a reciprocal relationship of partnership, in place of a hierarchical relationship of dominance and subordination, where one party’s perception of being and of doing remains un-interrogated and thus accepted as if a ‘universal’ truth.

The concept of a Critical Biculturalism developed in this dissertation specifically draws out four inter-woven strands (whenu) of: ‘*the indigenous-settler relationship*’; ‘*decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler ‘minds’)*’; ‘*Māori cultural (epistemological and ontological) legitimacy*’; and ‘*the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relations*’. These strands are discussed in detail to show how they weave together to constitute Critical Biculturalism. The four strands that constitute Critical Biculturalism are advanced as providing a useful lens to analyse bicultural discourses.

This paper discusses various critical, decolonising, Multiculturalism, and Kaupapa Māori theories, including a ‘weak’ or ‘liberal’ theory of biculturalism. These theories, it has been argued, limit progress toward a genuine partnership between Māori and Pākehā as they respond to the closely aligned but subtly different discourses. Critical Biculturalism as it is developed in this dissertation is advanced as providing a nuanced theorised conception of biculturalism for the New Zealand, Treaty based context.

Critical biculturalism is a useful framework for an evolving discourse about nationhood, about Māori and Pākehā relations, about the Treaty, and about education in New Zealand, all in a general sense. It is also useful as a framework to consider in a more specific sense Unitec's MSS policy and resourcing, and to measure these against the 4 strands. The strands have been used to frame a positive critique of biculturalism as it is articulated in policy at Unitec. Unitec has established policy to develop and enhance relationship with Māori in the nature of Te Noho Kotahitanga. Using Critical Biculturalism to critique Unitec's policy reveals that Unitec has engaged with Maori in terms of the whenu of Maori cultural legitimacy but that there has likely been an over investment in artefactual expressions of Māori language and culture, with limited resourcing towards a deeper recognition of Māori knowledge and worldviews that, given adequate resource and attention have transformative potential in themselves. The MSS is not yet direct enough on the whenu of '*the indigenous-settler relationship*'; '*decolonizing practice (including conscientisation of indigenous and settler 'minds')*'; and '*the interrogation and transformation of structures and power relation*' these are therefore, all useful points to focus on in future iterations of the MSS.

Ultimately, three key aspects to a Critical Biculturalism are:

1. That it must open up the space within the mainstream for Kaupapa Māori to advance Māori aspirations and other important ideas about a New Zealand nationhood.
2. That it stresses the need for partnership between Māori and Pākehā, rather than the separation of one group from the other.
3. That participating and engaging with the notion of difference and being prepared to question, be questioned, and to become uncomfortable, within an environment where concepts of utu, manaaki and even aroha are practiced.

Unitec's MMS policy makes progress with all three key aspects to a Critical Biculturalism as identified above. This is worthy in Graham Smith's words of "celebrat[ion of] the incremental victories along the way" (2012, p. 12). But a Critical Biculturalism, with its 'critical' elements would not accept a rest at this point. Continued engagement and self-assessment is imperative to ongoing development of praxis. Critical Biculturalism

suggests that the ongoing self-interrogation of Unitec's objectives and activities particularly in the areas of honouring the Māori-Pākehā relationship, decolonising and conscientising discourses and the privileging of Kaupapa Māori to stimulate structural transformation to a balancing of power-relationships end.

Appendix

References

- Barclay, K. (2005). Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism: towards a more relational practice of democratic justice. I roto J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, & T. McIntosh (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *New Zealand identities: departures and destinations* (Whārangī 118-139). Wellington: Victoria university press.
- Battiste, M. (2005). *Indigenous Knowledge: Foundations for First Nations*. University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Bell, A. (1996). We're just New Zealanders. I roto P. Spoonley, D. Pearson, & C. Macpherson (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *Nga Fatal: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/ New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore press.
- Bell, A. (2009). Dilemma of settler belonging: roots, routes and redemption in New Zealand national identity claims. *The sociological review* , 57 (1), 145-162.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand. *Teacher and teaching education* .
- Darder, A., & Torres, R. (2004). *After race: Racism after multiculturalism*. New York: New York University press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Preface. I roto N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publications.
- Dunbar, C. (2008). Critical race theory and indigenous methodology. I roto N. Denzin, & Y. &. Lincoln (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *Handbook of critical indigenous methodologies* (Whārangī 85-99). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Durie, E. (1991). The treaty in Māori history. I roto W. Penwick (Kaiwhakatika), *Sovereign and indigenous rights: The treaty of Waitangi in international contexts*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Durie, E. (2000). Plenary addresses: Peace in customary terms. I roto W. Tie (Kaiwhakatika), *Just peace? Peacemaking and peacebuilding for the new millenium conference proceedings* (Whārangī 94-98). Auckland: Centre for justice and peace development, Massey University.
- Durie, E. (2005). The rule of law, biculturalism and multiculturalism. *ALTA conference*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga - the politics of Māori self-determination* (taanga pukapuka te nama 4). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2012). Interview- Kaupapa Māori: Shifting the social. (T. Hoskins, & A. Jones, Ngā Kaiwhakatika) *New Zealand journal of educational studies* , 47 (2), 21-29.
- Gibson, R. (1986). What is critical theory? I roto R. Gibson, *Critical theory and education* (Whārangī 1-19). London: Hoddr and Stoughton.

- Hoskins, C. (2001). *Kia whai kiko te kōrero - Constituting discourses: Exchanges at the edges*, MA thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Hoskins, T. (2010). *Māori and Levinas : kanohi ki te kanohi for an ethical politics*, PhD. Thesis. Auckland, Auckland University
- Hoskins, T. (2012). A fine risk: Ethics in kaupapa Māori politics [online]. *New Zealand journal of educational studies* , 47 (2), 85-99. (Durie, year)
- Jones, A. (2007). Ka whawhai tonu matou: The interminable problem of knowing others. *Inaugural Professorial Lecture, University of Auckland*. Auckland.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the indigene-colonizer hyphen. I roto N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (Whārangi 471-485). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publications.
- King, M. (2003). *The penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). The politics of multiculturalism. I roto W. Kymlicka, *Multicultural citizenship, a liberal theory of minority rights* (Whārangi 10-33). Oxford scholarship online.
- May, S. (2009). Critical multiculturalism and education. *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* , 33-48.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). Introduction. I roto S. May, & C. Sleeter (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (Whārangi 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Metge, J. (2010). *Tuamaka; The challenge of difference in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington: Printlink Ltd.
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Ka hikitia - accelerating success 2013-2017*. Ministry of Education. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Mulholland, M. (2006). Introduction. I roto M. Mulholland (Kaiwhakatika), *State of the Māori nation: twenty-first-century issues in Aotearoa* (Whārangi 11-15). Auckland: Reed Books.
- Orange, C. (2011). *The treaty of Waitangi* (taanga pukapuka te nama 3rd edition). Wellington: Bridget Williams books.
- Pihama, L. (2010). Kaupapa Māori theory: Transforming theory in Aotearoa. *He pukenga korero: a journal of Māori studies* , 9 (2), 5-14.
- Piripi, H. (2011). Te tiriti o Waitangi and the New Zealand public sector. I roto V. Tawhai, & K. Gray-Sharp (Ngā Kaiwhakatika), *'Always speaking': The treaty of Waitangi and public policy* (Whārangi 229-244). Wellington: Huia.
- Rains, F., & Archibald, J. A. (2010). Introduction: Through our eyes and in our own words. *International journal of qualitative studies in education* , 13 (4), 337-342.
- Robson, P. R. (2006). The state of Māori health. I roto M. Mulholland (Kaiwhakatika), *State of the Māori nation: Twenty-first-century issues in Aotearoa* (Whārangi 17-32). Auckland: Reed publishing.
- Smith, C. (1994). *Kimihia te māramatanga: Colonisation and iwi development*, MA thesis. Auckland: Auckland University.

- Smith, G. H. (2003). Kaupapa Māori theory: theorizing indigenous transformation of education and schooling. *Kaupapa Māori symposium: NZARE / AARE joint conference*. Auckland: University of Auckland and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi.
- Smith, G. (2012). Interview- Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. (T. Hoskins, & A. Jones, Ngā Kaiwhakatika) *New Zealand journal of educational studies*, 47 (2), 10-20.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed books Ltd.
- Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. I roto M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates, *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. Sage publications.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2001). *He tirohanga o kawa ki te tiriti o Waitangi: a guide to the principles of the treaty of Waitangi as expressed by the courts and the Waitangi Tribunal*. Wellington: Te puni kokiri.
- Terruhn, J. (Forthcoming). The culturalisation of politics: Biculturalism versus multiculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. I roto R. Vemuri (Kaiwhakatika), *Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging*. Freeland, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
- Unitec Institute of Technology. (2011). *Unitec's Māori success strategy*. Unitec Institute of Technology. Auckland: Unitec Institute of Technology.
- Unitec Institute of Technology. (2013). *The Māori success strategy, 2011 - June 2013: Report*. Unitec Institute of Technology. Auckland: Unitec Institute of Technology.
- Unitec institute of technology. (2015). *Te noho kotahitanga marae*. Whakahokia January 06, 2015 mai www.unitec.ac.nz: <http://www.unitec.ac.nz/maori/who-we-are/te-noho-kotahitanga-marae>
- Unitec institute of technology. (2015b). *Unitec Investment plan 2015-2016*. Unitec institute of technology, Auckland.
- United Nations. (2008). *United Nations declaration for the rights of indigenous peoples*.
- Waitere, H. (2008). Cultural leadership: creating futures our ancestors can walk in with our children. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 23 (2), 34-47.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (Kāhore he rā). *Waitangi Tribunal*. Whakahokia January 10, 2015 mai www.justice.govt.nz: <http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/wai0718/Chapt02>
- Walker, R. (1986). The meaning of biculturalism. Auckland: R.J. Walker.
- Williams, J. (2005). Truth reconciliation and the clash of cultures in the Waitangi Tribunal. *ANZLAH E-Journal*, 294-298.
- Yukich, R. (2010). *Grasping the nettle: a narrative inquiry into three Pākehā secondary school principals' cross-cultural engagement with Māori* (Masters thesis). Retrieved from <http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>.

