The Australian Journal of INDIGENOUS EDUCATION

A Critical Pedagogy of Place?: *Te Ātiawa* (Māori) and *Pākehā* (Non-Māori) History Teachers' Perspectives on the Teaching of Local, Māori and New Zealand Histories

Richard F. Manning

School of Māori, Social and Cultural Studies, University of Canterbury, New Zealand

This article describes the objectives and methodology of a doctoral research project (Manning, 2008). It then draws upon the key findings of that project to briefly describe how an envisioned critical pedagogy of place partnership model, involving nominated members of the *Te Ātiawa iwi* (tribe) and local history teachers, might enhance the quality of history teaching in the Port Nicholson Block area. This area is located in the Wellington district (south-western corner) of New Zealand's North Island. The discussion then explains, in more detail, why obstacles are likely to be encountered by any attempt by *Te Ātiawa* and/or the teacher participants to develop such a partnership model. Two related place-based metaphors help draw brief conclusions about how these obstacles relate to the New Zealand government's own (1989) principles for action on the Treaty of Waitangi and recount its obligations to uphold the Articles of the United Nations' (2007) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

■ **Keywords:** *Te Ātiawa*, place, Indigenous, Māori, history, teachers

This article begins with an overview of the research problem, objectives and methodology that underpinned the author's doctoral research (Manning, 2008). This description, in turn, will inform a discussion of the perceived benefits and barriers that research participants suspected might result from a potential critical pedagogy of place partnership model that might involve the *Te Ātiawa iwi* (tribe) and local teachers of history. Two closely-related metaphors (referring to a local waterway and the eels that inhabit it) will illustrate the implications of some of the key research findings and to draw conclusions with regard to the New Zealand government's legal obligations to (a) uphold the Crown's 'principles for action on the Treaty of Waitangi' and (b) to adhere to the Articles of the United Nations' (2007) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Finally, a pertinent whakataukī (proverb) will close this article.

The Research Problem

This research was conducted in the wake of the Waitangi Tribunal's (2003) *Te Whanganui a Tara me ōna Takiwā* report — which investigated the Crown's role in the alienation of lands and other resources in the Wellington district (south-western corner of the North Island of New Zealand). The Waitangi Tribunal is a 'formal, ongoing commission of inquiry to hear grievances against the Crown [New Zealand Government]', run under the auspices of the New Zealand Ministry of Justice (New Zealand State Services Commission, 2006, p. 20). In relation to the objectives of this research, it was significant and timely that the tribunal, in its (2004) *Tūranganui a Kiwa* report, called on all New Zealanders to develop a greater 'consciousness' of 'historical memory of place'. It concluded that:

> We cannot help but think that the unsettled state of relations between Māori and Pākehā in this country is in part due to the fact that these stories are remembered only by

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Richard F. Manning, School of Māori, Social and Cultural Studies, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch, 8140, New Zealand. E-mail: richard.manning@canterbury.ac.nz

tangata whenua [people of the land/local tribe/s] and a few historians who specialise in New Zealand history. While only one side remembers the suffering of the past, dialogue will always be difficult. One side commences the dialogue with anger and the other side has no idea why. Reconciliation cannot be achieved by this means. (p. 740)

The tribunal was not alone in stating such concerns. Professor James Belich (as cited in Catherall, 2002, p. A2) had previously provoked a public debate when he complained that the teaching of New Zealand history was a 'national disgrace'. He added that this inevitably produces people who are 'unduly afraid of difference'. With regard to the concerns of Belich, and the Waitangi Tribunal, this researcher initially hypothesised that Gruenewald's (2003) model for a 'critical pedagogy of place', might assist Te Ātiawa and local secondary schools to collaborate in the development of a culturally responsive history curriculum. When examining the relationship between critical pedagogy and place based education (PBE). Gruenewald (2003) observed that:

Unlike critical pedagogy, which evolves from the well-established discourse of critical theory … place-based education lacks a specific theoretical tradition, though this is partly a matter of naming. Its practices and purposes can be connected to experiential learning, contextual learning, problem-based learning, constructivism, outdoor education, indigenous education, bioregional education, democratic education, multicultural education, community-based education, critical pedagogy itself, as well as other approaches that are concerned with context and the value of learning from and nurturing specific places, communities, or regions. (p. 3)

Gruenewald thus proposed that critical pedagogy and PBE can contribute to the sort of 'critical pedagogy of place' that might be relevant to the forms of historical amnesia described by Belich (2002) and the Waitangi Tribunal (2004). Gruenewald reasoned (2003, pp. 3–9) that whereas critical pedagogy 'offers an agenda of cultural decolonization, PBE leads the way towards ecological reinhabitation'. Thus, Gruenewald proposed (2003) that a critical pedagogy of place must be driven by the twin goals of 'reinhabitation' and 'decolonization', suggesting that:

In many ways decolonization describes the underside of reinhabitation; it may not be possible without decolonization. If reinhabitation involves learning to live well socially and ecologically in places that have been disrupted and injured, decolonization involves learning to recognize disruption and injury and to address their causes. From an educational perspective, it means unlearning much of what dominant culture and schooling teaches, and learning more socially just and ecologically sustainable ways of being in the world. (p. 9)

During the initial design stages of this research it became increasingly evident that Te Ātiawa people (and some former teaching colleagues) also saw great potential in the possibility of adopting a critical pedagogy of place to 'unlearn' much of what the dominant Pākehā (non-Māori/white) culture and schooling had taught (or not taught) local students of history about the area in which they now lived. This inevitably influenced the research objectives.

Objectives

The research was designed in collaboration with former teaching colleagues and with the guidance of Te Ātiawa friends and their relatives, most of whom were leading figures involved in the tribe's presentation of Treaty claims against the Crown (during the Waitangi Tribunal's Port Nicholson Block land claims hearings).

This research was not designed to critique the Tribunal's *Te Whanganui a Tara me ōna Takiwā* report, or to comment on the role of the Wellington Tenths Trust, which had been created in 1985 to represent descendents of those original local landowners. Rather, this research was designed to address the concerns of Professor James Belich and the Waitangi Tribunal (2004) which troubled the Te Ātiawa people and teachers involved in the initial research design process.

The research was organised into two overlapping phases of data collection and each phase had its own methodology (discussed later) and objectives. The first phase of the data collection process was underpinned by three objectives. The first objective was to analyse written data to consider whether or not the teaching of New Zealand history in Wellington district secondary schools could be considered 'culturally responsive' in relation to the needs identified by the Te Ātiawa research participants emerging from oral data collected during phase two of the data collection (described later).

The second objective was to critique the wider philosophical debate surrounding the inclusion of Māori history as an academic topic in the New Zealand Curriculum. The last objective of phase one sought to consider the implications of all the above findings. By critiquing a wide body of local, national and international literature and visual resources during the first phase of the data collection process, conclusions were able to be drawn from a more informed position and this complimented the objectives of the second phase of the data collection.

The second phase provided for a much deeper investigation of data collected in the first phase by allowing other sources of data to be identified and considered. The main objective of phase two was to identify what the Te Ātiawa participants considered to be significant events of local and wider New Zealand history that had impacted significantly upon Te Ātiawa, that they felt local secondary school history teachers and students should know about. The next objective was to identify and critically evaluate what history teachers in 24 Port Nicholson Block secondary schools were teaching their students about local

and national historical events and issues, particularly in relation to the historical experiences of Te Ātiawa people.

This would help to identify whether a gap in (pedagogical) priorities existed between the responses of the nominated Te Ātiawa representatives and the teacher participants. It would also enable exploration of why such a gap might exist. The last objective was to invite the Te Ātiawa and voluntary teacher participants to identify potential benefits and barriers related to the possible development of a critical pedagogy of place (CPoP) partnership between the participating schools and the Wellington Tenths Trust.

Methodology

Phase one of the data collection consisted of the collection and analysis of historical primary and secondary data. This involved a logical progression through a six-step process described by Anderson (1990, p. 114) as being typical of most historical data collection procedures. To sum up, the first phase of the research largely involved the collection, identification and analysis of documents, maps and photos in a variety of locations (see Manning, 2008, pp. 73–76). In terms of data analysis procedures, the first (and second) phase of data analysis involved a collaborative evaluation of all the written data collected, including consideration of source and content. A matrix framework was developed to facilitate this interpretative process (Manning, 2008, p. 296). Both date and concept determined the composition of this matrix.

Although a chronological sequence was established, more emphasis was placed upon the identification of the key issues and themes to emerge. Relevant primary and secondary data was also recorded via entries into a reading journal at various site.

Phase two of the data collection, alternatively, allowed two distinct groups of people (Te Ātiawa community members and non-Māori teachers of history) to share their expertise, and some life experiences, without the research becoming an accumulation of life-stories. Subsequently, it consisted of two sets of 'elite interviews'.

Elite interviews, according to Anderson (1990, p. 25), are directed at respondents who have 'a particular experience or knowledge about the subject being discussed'. Nine heads of department/teachers in charge (history) were interviewed, as were nine Te Ātiawa people from a pool of potential interviewees nominated by the Wellington Tenths Trust. Prior to each interview, participants were invited to complete pre-interview questionnaires to assist the development of a comprehensive profile of the research participants and their relevant life experiences.

General and specific prompt questions provided clear objectives for each interview and served specific data collection and analysis requirements. The incorporation of open questions generated a broad range of general information relevant to the study and these questions were sequenced in sections according to relevant themes and coded to allow for a smooth data analysis process. All interviews were recorded and transcribed by a person, unknown to the interviewees, who had signed a pre-prepared statement agreeing to respect the confidentiality of interviewees.

The second phase yielded significant data related to addressing the research problem. It also required the management of potential risks and consideration of ethical issues. As a Pākehā (white/non-Māori) researcher this researcher sought to work in ways that were informed by the principles and methods of kaupapa Māori research, as described by Smith (1999, pp. 183–195). Smith (1999, p. 177) advised non-Māori researchers to consider the 'tiaki' (mentoring) model when negotiating research partnerships with Indigenous communities, one involving a process whereby 'authoritative Māori people guide and sponsor the research'. Cram (1997, p. 49), likewise, suggested that 'research partnerships' with Māori communities are essential if research conducted by non-Māori researchers is to be 'beneficial' to those Māori participating in research activities. This, she proposed, required the building of 'trust'.

To 'build trust', this researcher was guided by a senior Māori academic (Professor Wally Penetito) and a prominent Treaty claims historian (Professor Richard Hill). Local Te Ātiawa custodians of historical knowledge, related to the researcher's Te Ātiawa friends (mentioned previously) also acted as kaiarahi (guides) and identified the problems they wanted to see researched (see Manning, 2008, pp. 76–81). The principal historian of the Wellington Tenths Trust acted as the primary kaiarahi and 'guided' the design of this research by introducing this researcher to key people, such as the Chief Executive Officer of the Wellington Tenths Trust, who approved the design of this project.

This process recalled Cram's (1997, p. 57) suggestion that non-Māori researchers working with 'guides' from Māori-communities involves a 'two-stage process', whereby the 'guide' (i.e., kaiarahi) firstly introduces the researcher to the community and, secondly, the researcher attempts to gain the trust of the community 'through their own conduct'. After considering the methodological preferences of various kaiarahi (and ex-teaching colleagues), Huberman and Miles's (1995) model for participant involvement in data analysis was adopted. This ensured that all research participants (people interviewed) were provided with every opportunity to verify the accuracy of their own interview transcripts and the quotes taken from these transcripts for inclusion in a draft report. Full transcriptions were provided to all participants to assist them to participate in the data analysis and verification processes. The research participants were also provided with written acknowledgement that quotes from their interviews might be slightly edited or condensed for reasons of coherence or length, but only with their permission.

Additionally, each interviewee was provided with written acknowledgement that words which are 'normal'

in spoken language but did not translate into written language, would need to be edited. To enable participants to have input into this translation process, they were invited to edit my translations during the final stage of verification process. All participants were informed that some quotes might need to be condensed but only for reasons of length and that this would only be done with their written permission. The interview dialogue was categorised into the theme group categories of place, power and pedagogy, reflecting the inter-connecting, thematic questions described above. As themes emerged, full quotes, as appropriate, were highlighted.

Participants were invited to participate in, and to receive feedback on, the data analysis process. They were also advised that all quotes and translations used would be cleared with the interviewees concerned. As in the first phase of the data collection and analysis process, the ethical considerations for this phase of the research were informed by the ethical guidelines established by the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, the School of Education Research Committee (Victoria University of Wellington) and the Victoria University of Wellington Human Ethics Committee.

Access to Te Ātiawa participants was negotiated via formal correspondence with the Wellington Tenths Trust. This negotiation following the conclusion of the collaborative design process (described earlier) that involved Te Ātiawa friends and their knowledgeable relatives. Māori cultural protocols were observed where and when applicable, under the guidance of Professor Penetito and the principal historian of the Wellington Tenths Trust (Neville Gilmore), following the Trust's acceptance of a formal invitation. Similarly, access to heads of departments and entry into Port Nicholson Block secondary school sites was initially negotiated with each school's respective Board of Trustees and Principal. Like the interviewees, the names of the participating schools were withheld to protect them from identification. All interested parties were formally advised that the research would be conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the Human Ethics Committee of the Victoria University of Wellington, in consideration of the code of ethical and technical practice developed by the National Oral History Association of New Zealand (NOHANZ).

The participants were invited to participate in the verification process and requested to sign a statement of verification to declare that they had been provided with adequate opportunity to participate in the verification process and that they had been quoted accurately. Confidentiality was respected and care was taken to ensure that the interview process did not hinder the various interviewees' cultural and/or professional obligations. Each school was offered funds towards payment for a relief teacher during the time of each interview.

Similarly, Te Ātiawa interviewees were provided with koha (gifts), in the form of gift vouchers, identical in monetary value to the cost incurred for payment of a relief teacher for the period of three hours. Koha (a gift) was given to Te Ātiawa interviewees as an act of utu (reciprocity) to acknowledge their generosity when choosing to share their personal time and knowledge. All interviewees and participating organisations were informed that an executive report would be produced for interviewees and their respective organisations to review critically, on completion of the research. Assurances were given that all recordings and transcripts would be destroyed, in accordance with the Victoria University of Wellington Human Ethics Committee guidelines, 12 months after the completion of the research.

To sum-up, nine Te Ātiawa people were selected from a pool of potential 'expert' interviewees nominated by the Wellington Tenths Trust. Correspondingly, nine senior history teachers were invited to reflect upon any cultural continuities and discontinuities they experienced in relation to how history was taught to them in their familial and secondary school settings, during their formative years. They were also asked to describe what they felt should occur, today, in Port Nicholson Block secondary schools to enhance the teaching of New Zealand, local, Māori and environmental histories. Likewise, they were invited to identify perceived barriers to any potential CPoP partnership model that might happen to evolve between the tribe (Te Ātiawa) and the participating schools.

Benefits Identified in Relation to a Potential Critical Pedagogy of Place (CPoP) Partnership Model

Both groups of participants (Te Ātiawa and teachers) agreed that a potential critical pedagogy of place (CPoP) partnership model, involving teachers of history and Te Ātiawa nominated 'experts', would greatly assist students to engage in authentic research tasks, especially if that partnership is underpinned by a CPoP approach, not too dissimilar to that proposed by Gruenewald (2003). The Te Ātiawa research participants, especially, believed that the development of ecological literacy skills would enable students to critically reflect upon their personal understandings of key national curriculum concepts like 'identity' and 'citizenship'. The benefits most likely to accrue from a CPoP model were evident when a Te Ātiawa interviewee described how the Wellington Tenths Trust had recently taken Wellington City Councillors for a walking tour along the different reaches of the Waitangi Stream. The objective of that tour was to explain how the naming of Waitangi Park (located next to New Zealand's national museum: Te Papa Tongarewa) was related to the history of that now largely subterranean stream — piped below many of the busiest streets of New Zealand's capital city.

A lower reach of the Waitangi stream had recently been 'resurfaced' to its original surface level at Waitangi Park and this process of 'day-lighting' the stream will serve as a metaphor to illuminate the implications of my research findings later in this article. Meanwhile, when describing the outcome of that tour (Manning, 2008, pp. 198–199), the Te Ātiawa interviewee said:

> Consider why it's called 'Waitangi Park'. In doing that redevelopment [e.g., the 'day-lighting' of the lower reaches of the Waitangi stream] and naming it 'Waitangi Park' the history of human occupation of that area suddenly comes alive! That was a mahinga kai, a place to gather crops. People [Wellington City Councillors] were also quite surprised to find that though there's no stream, because it's all in an underground pipe now, there's still a large quantity of eels living in the Waitangi stream. They hadn't learned the history of that stream [at school] or that that stream's now in a pipe.
>
> But, despite that pipe and other pipes, the eels still migrate up and down the pipes below the city! They travel up into the Newtown area of the city and heaven knows how they survive, but they do survive in that subterranean stream … I think that when those people [City Councillors] understood those elements of that place's history you could just see it was one of those 'ohhhhhhh' moments for them. They said things like: "I'd never even thought about the potential of looking at historical things that way before." It's kind of like 'out of sight, out of mind' and, as a result, it's also a bit like how Māori culture is now. It's just like the stream that's piped underground so that we never have to think of it again!

A further Te Ātiawa interviewee (Manning, 2008, p. 125), referring to another significant waterway in the nearby Hutt Valley, added:

> You can't divorce history from other subjects or from the natural environment … For instance if I'm talking about the history of this place, I will talk about the Waiwhetū Stream and how we've lived here for a long time and how important that stream is to us because it represents the mauri [life force] of water and how essential that [mauri] is to being alive. I'll talk about the history of things that happened around that stream over the time that we have been here and explain why that's important to us and why it's important for the future: because the stream's being contaminated. So, you shouldn't exclude from history those other aspects of living, like science, maths or spiritual things.

These quotes resonate with Gruenewald's (2003) 'twin goals' of a critical pedagogy of place (described previously) and compliment the works of many Indigenous academics who have critiqued the imposition of 'western' schooling systems, globally. Cajete (1999, p. 190), for example, described a 'biophobic' worldview encountered by Indigenous peoples in 'Western' schooling systems 'associated with a kind of 'urbanity of the mind' that seems to be learned and internalised as a result of living a life largely disconnected from nature and propagated by the advent and development of cities'.

Cajete proposed (1999, p. 190) that Indigenous education, alternatively, involves 'an education about community

and spirit whose components include: the recognition of interdependence; the use of linguistic metaphors, art and myth; a focus on local knowledge and direct experience with nature; orientation to place'. Although commonalities may have existed between the preferred pedagogical approaches of the Te Ātiawa interviewees' and Indigenous peoples located elsewhere in the world, there were major differences between the preferences of the Te Ātiawa interviewees and the non-Maori (history) teachers I interviewed.

The Te Ātiawa interviewees, for their part, wished to see local teachers enhance their knowledge of te reo Māori (the Māori language) because they believed this would deepen local teachers' knowledge of place. One of the Te Ātiawa interviewees (Manning, 2008, pp. 191–192), accordingly, used the application of global information (GIS) and global positioning system (GPS) technologies in the development of digital cultural mapping projects, to explain why she felt history and social studies teachers should learn te reo Māori. She said:

> Having that knowledge of te reo Māori would be like adding another dimension to appreciating a series of historical layers on a [GIS] map … By developing knowledge of te reo Māori, you're adding another level of analysis to the history of a place … A sound knowledge of te reo Māori does give you another insight into something much deeper, something that happened, here, in this place, or that this other particular place was named after someone or something that had happened and that you may be in peril by being in that place.

Whereas all the Te Ātiawa interviewees could envisage how GIS/GPS technologies could be applied in developing 'holistic' learning activities for high school students (under the supervision of Te Ātiawa experts), most of the teachers could not. They struggled to see any relevance between the teaching of history and the application of GIS/GPS technologies. One teacher (Manning, 2008, p. 238) typified their responses when he said:

> I've never really thought of that [GIS] as being a really significant thing. GIS is not something that naturally occurred to me as something that I would find useful for studying history. I would associate GIS technologies much more with geography.

Similarly, most teachers did not express any concern about their limited comprehension of te reo Māori (the Māori language). These were not the only barriers that would obstruct a potential CPoP partnership model forming between the Te Ātiawa participants and local teachers of history.

Barriers

Curriculum control issues were highly problematic. Though all participants shared similar concerns that aligned with Berlak and Berlak's (1981) descriptions of 'control of operations' and 'control of standards' dilemmas; the teachers were mostly concerned about 'control of time' dilemmas. The Te Ātiawa interviewees, alternatively,

were most concerned that teachers should not teach exclusively from textbooks about Te Ātiawa history (even if such resources were available).

They wanted knowledgeable people, authorised by the tribe, to be collaboratively involved in the design, delivery, assessment and evaluation of courses addressing their tribe's past. Every Te Ātiawa interviewee wished to remove students, occasionally, from the allegedly 'sterile' confines of classrooms and to place them in natural environs and authentic Te Ātiawa cultural settings, such as mārae (traditional meeting places). This, they reasoned, would enable students to develop their ecological literacy skills.

They also proposed that this relocation of learning would assist students to reflect more critically upon their own cultural assumptions about the interconnections between contentious issues arising out of different peoples' perspectives of place, power, identity and citizenship. The Te Ātiawa participants' wariness of textbook-driven accounts of national history and preference for familial oral sources was much more pronounced then their teacher counterparts.

This finding, however, does not appear to be unique to New Zealand. Rosenzweig and Thelen's research (1998, pp. 167–168, p. 170) suggests that their Oglala Sioux respondents, at the Pine Ridge reservation (South Dakota), also reacted more passionately to questions about cultural discontinuities between home and school than their 'white' counterparts:

> In contrast to the indifference with which white respondents viewed textbook narratives of American history, the Sioux spoke with the passionate interest of the outside critic. In fact, the Oglala Sioux sometimes seemed to enjoy giving our interviewers their take on the cherished symbols of Americana … the Sioux sharply differentiated between oral and non-oral sources. White Americans, on average, rated oral sources 16 percent more trustworthy than films, books, museums, college professors, and High school teachers; the Sioux gave them a 42 percent higher ranking. Put another way, Pine Ridge residents thought the gap between the value of the two sets of sources was more than twice as large as white Americans did.

The Te Ātiawa interviewees, like the Oglala respondents (earlier), were deeply concerned that their oral tribal histories would be misrepresented and that many (non-Māori) teachers/students might possess a, 'one-size-fits-all', deficit view of Māori people. Similar concerns have been expressed elsewhere by Indigenous authors. Lincoln (1998, pp. 91–92), for example, reflected similar concerns about the portrayal of her tribal structures in Alaska when she wrote:

> When I was a little girl, my mother taught me that our Athabascan tribe contains many subtribes, dialects and customs, each having its own chief and elders. Imagine my surprise to read the following words in a history text-book called America and written for tenth graders in American schools: A tribe is a group that is united by common history, follows the same customs, and is ruled by the same chief or group of elders. The people of each tribe speak the same language, and have the same religion.

Battiste (2004, p. 1), meanwhile, observed that 'cultural education has become the panacea of all inclusivities involving [Canadian] Aboriginal children'. Battiste found that the use of 'special units' on 'generic Aboriginal culture' delivered in Canadian schools had become 'more and more obscure to Aboriginal children, who receive authentic cultural content in their daily lives at home'. The most pressing potential barrier identified by the teachers this researcher interviewed was not how they represented the Indigenous 'other', but how the Pākehā (non-Māori) majority of their students (and their caregivers) might respond to any Māori representation of the past. Their comments aligned closely with the findings of Clark's (2008) research in Australian schools.

Before discussing these similarities, it should be noted that history is not a compulsory topic in New Zealand schools. As an optional subject, history is vulnerable to the whims of a student-driven marketplace in which teachers of optional subjects must compete for students to preserve their departmental budgets. Three of the nine teachers interviewed expressed deep concern about the prejudices of the (Pākehā) student majorities they taught. They did so in ways that underlined the impact that student-driven market forces were having upon the status of Māori history in their schools. One teacher, for example, said:

> Since Don Brash's first Ōrewa speech [A landmark speech delivered by the leader of the opposition National Party (January 27, 2004), which alleged the government of New Zealand was providing Māori with preferential treatment], I've definitely noticed that more Pākehā students are ready to say, 'I find that boring' or 'It means nothing to me' and I'm talking about anything to do with Māori now! …We haven't been able to deliver a Year 13 history programme for the last two years and that's simply because we only offer the [nineteenth century] New Zealand topic [which she earlier claimed her students viewed as 'Māori history']. Well, that's what the kids told me! I asked them: 'if we were doing the Tudor Stuart England option, would you do that' They said: 'Oh yeah, we'd definitely do it then!' (Manning, 2008, p. 151)

Clark, too, observed that many of the non-indigenous (Australian) students she interviewed were 'disinterested' in Indigenous peoples' historical experiences. She concluded (pp. 69–70) that:

> This general sense of disinterest was compounded by a number of students who rejected Indigenous history all together … I was shocked by how fiercely some kids reacted to this topic. Samantha's response was probably the most extreme. She goes to an independent girls' school in Melbourne and complained that 'invasion' was a guilt trip teachers pull on their students. 'Like we're meant to feel that our ancestors came and like killed a billion Aborigines,' she said 'and took over a country and gave them diseases' …

Samantha continued, 'but then when its drilled into us that we killed everything good in the country its [history] like not fun.'"

The (New Zealand) teachers this researcher interviewed also complained frequently that they could not 'control time' and that they lacked time to organise field trips and/or to teach (about the Indigenous people of New Zealand) 'well'. They also believed that time constraints prevented them from liaising with teachers from other 'rival' subject areas within their own schools, let-alone to converse with teachers from 'rival' schools, with a view to co-plan the sorts of interdisciplinary (holistic) learning activities favoured by the Te Ātiawa interviewees. The 'personal time' cost associated with the administrative tasks of planning fieldtrips was identified as problematic and largely the result of the emergence of a quasi-market schooling system since the early 1990s.

The three most experienced teachers alleged that a neoliberal 'market system' had created a culture of competition which was not conducive to them developing partnerships with local tribes, let alone teachers from rival (optional) subject areas. This culture of competition for students, they concurred, had undermined collaboration between teachers of rival optional subjects (within schools) and exacerbated competition for students amongst schools. All the teachers interviewed agreed that the newly introduced *National Certificate of Educational Achievement* (NCEA) had also increased their workloads dramatically.

Though all of the teachers said they wanted to 'spend' more time working alongside local *Te Ātiawa* people, they felt they had little time to do so and they believed they should receive remuneration for any loss of 'personal time'. This illuminated their belief that time was/is a commodity in the New Zealand schools marketplace. Additionally, none of the teachers felt they could resolve the challenge of reconciling what they considered to be the personal or particularistic and 'holistic' knowledge of local Te Ātiawa people with the public or universalistic and 'molecular' knowledge, favoured by the (Pākehā) majority of students and, they alleged, the national education (market) system.

The teachers also feared that if they failed to adhere to school protocols, which required them to rely exclusively on taurahere (Non-local Māori) teaching colleagues, to serve as intermediaries between their schools and local tribes, they might risk doing something 'wrong' or risk having 'their' curriculum 'captured' by an 'outside' Māori-group. This stance was typified by the following comment (Manning, 2008, p. 233):

> I think I'm a bit affected by my reliance on the school's Māori teacher [teacher of te reo Māori/Māori language] … As you know, these teachers, well, they're often from outside the local community so they'll have their own personal con-

tacts and tribal networks and that may by-pass the local [Te Ātiawa] people right outside our [school's] doorstep.

The teachers, moreover, feared a Māori individual/group gaining control of setting 'their' curriculum operations and standards and consequently falling foul of the Education Review Office (which audits New Zealand's state-funded schools). As one teacher (Manning, 2008, p. 232) put it:

> I don't know a lot of people in this [Māori] community and it might be that there are some really good people out there, but I do think we have to be careful that, when we do get people into school to speak, that we do get a good balance of community perspectives … I mean, we're talking about that local [Port Nicholson Block] Treaty claim … well another tribe might turn around and say to me: 'Well hang … why weren't we asked to come and speak too?' And so, sometimes, it's much easier to say 'fine, no one [from any local iwi] comes into school at all'.

Though the Te Ātiawa interviewees recognised that systemic constraints would require some form of negotiated curriculum to be developed, they opposed taurahere teachers serving as 'brokers' or 'intermediaries' during any potential negotiations between their tribe and local teachers of history. They preferred a 'face-to-face' relationship with local teachers of history to ensure that they would (a) not be misrepresented and (b) gain the right to oversee the teaching of history about their own tribe. This stance was most clearly articulated when one Te Ātiawa interviewee (Manning, 2008, p. 220) stated:

> I think that amongst Te Ātiawa, here in Wellington, there is deep resentment of anyone from another tribe standing up and talking about us … However, I do think there might be an expectation, amongst us [Local Te Ātiawa people] that Pākehā teachers might do something like that … But in their defence, they just don't really know what they're doing in terms of tikanga [customary protocols/obligations] … I think that the traditional expectation [tikanga] is that Māori teachers, or teachers from Ngāti Porou [a tribe from the North Island's East Coast] for example, will recognize that they don't know our local Te Ātiawa history and that we know our own history better than them.

Consequently, intra and inter tribal political rivalries, which often pre-date 'contact' with Pākehā people in New Zealand, should always be considered by those responsible for the design and implementation of education policies that are meant to 'serve' the interests of Indigenous communities in New Zealand (and many other societies). Though the Te Ātiawa interviewees preferred a more direct 'face-to-face' relationship with local history teachers, the teachers were uncertain about whom to contact amongst local Te Ātiawa people to establish such a relationship. Both groups of participants criticised the New Zealand Ministry of Education for this impasse and for not doing more to support the strengthening of ties between the participating schools and Te Ātiawa. The Te Ātiawa

interviewees doubted that the Ministry would resource a CPoP partnership model between Te Ātiawa and local teachers of history. They also suspected that most local schools would be unable, or unwilling, to prioritise the allocation of additional resources to support such a partnership.

Despite these constraints, the teachers, like their Te Ātiawa counterparts, were receptive to the vision of sharing curriculum control in a CPoP partnership. However, the teachers would only be willing to 'share control' if a formal agreement was developed (with the support of relevant government agencies) between their respective schools' Boards of Trustees and the Wellington Tenths Trust. Both groups, accordingly, needed assurances and felt trapped by a cross-cultural impasse that still prevents them from having the sorts of cross-cultural conversations they desired.

The pedagogical approach they sought, generally speaking, was not too dissimilar in scope to the learning experience, mentioned earlier, that had prompted Wellington City councillors to uplift a lower reach of the Waitangi Stream at Waitangi Park in central Wellington City (mentioned earlier). The following place-based metaphors have been provided to illuminate the national and international implications of my research findings and to conclude this article.

Two Place-Based Metaphors

The first metaphor (below) relates the concerns of the Te Ātiawa interviewees to the tuna (Māori word for eels) still swimming freely in the Waitangi Stream. The second metaphor, in turn, likens the teacher participants to tuna caught inside a hīnaki tukutuku (baited eel trap) lowered into the same stream at Waitangi Park. Wood (2007), via a poster, described Waitangi Park as 'Wellington's newest, most exciting, urban park, covering some three hectares of waterfront'. Wood added that 'the park has won international and national landscape design and architecture awards that recognise it's sustainable, ecological and social attributes and its sophisticated design'.

As Wood (2007) recognised, the Waitangi lagoon and swamp, fed by the Waitangi stream system, was once an important food source for Taranaki whānui (tribes, like Te Ātiawa, originating from Taranaki, on the North Island of New Zealand's West coast) who inhabited the Te Āro Pā (fortress/village) and area, in central Wellington; when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed by local rangatira (chiefs) at Port Nicholson on 29 April 1840. The lagoon largely disappeared from sight following a large earthquake (1855). The Waitangi swamp and stream system then began to disappear following the gradual development of an urban wastewater system from 1859 onwards that piped the stream system underground. Today, the Waitangi Stream remains a heavily-polluted and largely subterranean waterway.

Metaphor One: The Eels Swimming Freely in the Waitangi Stream

Little is known by the general public about the tuna (eels) that migrate up the storm water outfall and through the subterranean pipes/culvert system of the Waitangi stream from the harbour. They remain out of sight and out of mind, providing a good metaphor for the status of Te Ātiawa histories of place in local schools. Like these indomitable tuna, Te Ātiawa, like Indigenous peoples elsewhere around the world, have endured major disruptions to their traditional ways of life as a result of the spread of 'western' imperialism in the 19th century and the more recent onset of globalisation.

Just as the tuna of the Waitangi Stream have journeyed thousands of nautical miles across the increasingly polluted Pacific Ocean, before swimming upstream, through a maze of pipes below the busy streets of Wellington Central, Te Ātiawa and other local tribes have conducted their own remarkable heke (migration/s), over the centuries — overcoming many obstacles and threats to their continued existence.

These tribes' narratives of place and place names, in turn, often refer people back to these epic journeys and events. Some of the schools studied during this research now sit atop sites that were, and still are, of great cultural/historical significance to local and other iwi (tribe/s). The teachers interviewed, however, were largely unaware of this and often expressed frustration about the market-driven cultures of their schools that, they alleged, inhibited their ability to form PBE partnerships with local iwi. Thus the teachers, for their part also resembled tuna, but tuna trapped in a hīnaki tukutuku (Baited eel trap, resembling a tubular basket).

Metaphor Two: The Eels (Teachers) Trapped Inside a Hīnaki Tukutuku

McCarthy (1994, p. 97) drew upon the analogy of a hīnaki tukutuku to illustrate the similarities between the funding dilemmas confronting whare wānanga (in this instance, tribal colleges/universities) and the decisions facing tuna (eels) when they are confronted by a baited trap, while swimming in a stream devoid of food. McCarthy noted:

> The analogy of an hīnaki is an interesting one that captures the essence of the relationship Māori share with the [neoliberal] state. An hīnaki tukutuku is a baited eel trap that is highly effective at attracting eels. Laid on the bottom of a river or creek the eels swim into the hīnaki to feed on the delicacies provided. More importantly however, is the fact that once the eels enter the hīnaki it is difficult for them to escape. The question that the eels fail to ask is who will really be doing the eating? Beyond their own bellies being satisfied, whose bellies will they eventually satisfy? Is it possible to escape?

McCarthy's hīnaki analogy above was adapted to serve the objectives of this author's research because tuna trapped in a hīnaki tukutuku provide a metaphor to describe how

the teacher participants viewed their plight as professionals, all of them describing themselves, for example, as feeling 'trapped' by the ideological constraints of the market-driven cultures of their schools. The teacher participants resembled hungry tuna, trapped in an hīnaki, who could not swim alongside the Te Ātiawa tuna — swimming freely outside the hīnaki-like cultures of their schools. Moreover, the entrapped tuna (teachers) recognised that they had to compete with other hungry tuna/teachers to gain access to an increasingly limited supply of bait (funding and time).

Outside the hīnaki-like culture of these schools, the Te Ātiawa interviewees' stance resembled wary tuna that, based on prior life-experiences, were now loath to enter the hīnaki-like cultures of local schools. Rather, they were prepared to wait for these cultures to be dismantled in ways that would allow them to swim freely beside those tuna (teachers), who might otherwise choose to be free. The hīnaki metaphor can be adapted to many aspects of the research findings. Firstly, most of the teachers felt entrapped by an intricate net of teaching dilemmas similar to Berlak and Berlak's (1981) descriptions of 'control', 'curriculum' and 'societal' dilemmas. This net of dilemmas, like the aka (vine) netting of a tubular hīnaki, could be described as being woven tightly around the rigid ribs and spines of the institutional culture of each school.

These ribs and spines, in this case, would symbolise the rigidly mechanical nature of school timetables and the unyielding ideological assumptions of the dominant culture regarding its ability to control and commodify knowledge, time and space. However, the metaphor needs adjusting insofar as the teacher participants can always choose to exercise agency and at least attempt to resist the reproductive process of an hīnaki-like school culture (or remove themselves from it). Tuna, once trapped, cannot remove themselves so easily from such a formidable trap.

Conclusion

The research indicated that Te Ātiawa people were not effectively enabled to 'participate' in conversations about the curriculum design, delivery, assessment and evaluation procedures of local schools, as per the Crown's (1989) 'principles for action on the Treaty of Waitangi'. These principles include, amongst other things, the principles of 'partnership', 'active protection' and 'participation' (Hayward, 2009; New Zealand State Services Commission, 2006, p. 22). It might be argued, furthermore, that the (non-Māori) teachers' fear of the Māori 'other', coupled with the inadequate pre-service and in-service professional development opportunities available to them, had resulted in the delivery of a not-so-well 'hidden curriculum'. This does little to enhance New Zealand's overall state of Race-relations or to assist Māori tribes/communities to achieve their own aspirations. These findings hold international implications, including (at least prima facie),

undermining the intent of the United Nation's (2007) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; particularly Articles 8, 13 & 15.

Given the concerns of New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal (2004), the inferences offered in the Waitangi Stream and hīnaki tukutuku metaphors (above), this article will be concluded with an appropriate whaktaukī (Māori proverb) that recalls the tuna (eels) inhabiting the Waiwhet Stream. This whaktaukī will, hopefully, stimulate conversations and collaborations (locally, nationally and internationally) in response to the challenges confronting those who strive to support Indigenous peoples' attempts to have their perspectives meaningfully embedded in history and other curriculum subject areas, worldwide. As Mead and Grove (2001, p. 39) proposed, this whaktaukī suggests that 'those who are content with mediocre returns need not be attentive to their work, but those who strive for more desirable goals must ever be alert for possibilities'. It states:

E moe te mata hī aua, e ara te mata hī tuna.

The mullet-fisher sleeps but the eel catcher is alert.

References

Anderson, G. (1990). *Fundamentals of education research.* London: The Falmer Press.

Battiste, M. (2004, May). *Animating sites of post colonial education: Indigenous knowledge and the humanities.* CSSE Plenary Address, Manitoba.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). *Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change.* London: Methuen.

Cajete, G. (1999). Reclaiming Biophilia: Lessons from Indigenous peoples. In G.A. Smith & D. R. Williams (Eds.), *Ecological education in action: On weaving education, culture and the environment* (pp. 189–206). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Catherall, S. (2002, February 3). Teaching of New Zealand history a disgrace. *Sunday Star Times*, p. A5.

Clark, A. (2008). *Teaching the nation: Politics and pedagogy in Australian history.* Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Cram, F. (1997). Developing partnerships in research: Pākehā researchers and Māori research. *Sites*, *35*, 44–63.

Gruenewald, D.A. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(4), 3–12.

Hayward, J. (2009). *The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Appendix).* Retrieved from http://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/doclibrary/public/Appendix(99).pdf

Huberman, A.B., & Miles, M.B. (1995). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428–444). London: Sage.

Lincoln, G. (1998). Lack of true American Indian history in textbooks. In S.B. Andrews & J. Creed (Eds.), *Authentic Alaska: Voices of its Native writers* (pp. 91–95). London: University of Nebraska Press.

Manning, R.F. (2008). *Place, power & pedagogy: A critical analysis of the status of Te Ātiawa histories of place in Port Nicholson Block secondary schools and the possible application of place-based education models.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Mead, H.M., & Grove, N. (2001). *Ngā Pēpeha a Ngā Tīpuna: The sayings of the ancestors.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

New Zealand State Services Commission. (2006). Timeline of the Treaty. In *The Treaty of Waitangi*, Treaty of Waitangi Information Programme. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Rosenzweig, R., & Thelen, D. (1998). *The presence of the past: Popular uses of history in American life.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press Books.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

United Nations. (2007). *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.un.org.esa/socdev/unpfii/en/declaration.html

Waitangi Tribunal. (2003). *Te Whanganui a Tara me ōna Takiwā: Report on the Wellington District.* Wellington, New Zealand: Legislation Direct.

Waitangi Tribunal. (2004). *Tūranganui Tangata, Tūranganui Whenua: The Report on the Tūranganui a Kiwa Claims.* Wellington, New Zealand: Legislation Direct.

Wood, N.J. (2007, November). *Practical as well as pretty: How Waitangi Park Wetlands treat stormwater and protect the harbour.* A poster presentation prepared for the New Zealand Water and Waste Association Annual Conference, Rotorua, New Zealand.

About the Author

Richard Manning is a former secondary school history teacher (1991–2004), who has also worked as a researcher for the Department of Māori Affairs and the Iwi Transition Agency (1989–1990). He also served as an education advisor at the New Zealand State Services Commission (2005–2006) and as a researcher and (Treaty) claims inquiry facilitator at the Waitangi Tribunal (2006–2007). Richard currently coordinates the Treaty of Waitangi Education programme at the University of Canterbury, College of Education, New Zealand. He also lectures in cultural studies and social studies.