Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice

Volume 38 (2024)

Indigenous Peoples' and modern Western ethics and educative leadership

Reynold Macpherson

© 2024 Reynold Macpherson

This is an Open Access article licensed under Creative Commons Licence CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0
https/creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

DOI: 10.2478/jelpp-2024-0012

Published by sciendo
www.https://sciendo.com/

Produced by NZEALS
www.nzeals.org.nz

Indigenous Peoples' and modern Western ethics and educative leadership

Reynold Macpherson

Abstract

This paper relates Indigenous Peoples' moral philosophies to modern Western ethical thinking that is evident in leading contemporary theories of educative leadership. It introduces Indigenous ethics in general and explains the philosophical research methodology used. It then reports Celtic, Māori, North American Indian and Canadian First Nations, Australian Aboriginal and Emirati ethical frameworks in greater detail and relates them to modern Western ethics prominent in contemporary theories of transformational, instructional, distributed, and ethical leadership. It finds that Indigenous philosophies emphasise the interconnectedness of humans and nature, spirituality in ethical decision-making, and collectivism, while Western frameworks often prioritise individualism and separate the spiritual from the secular. It suggests that leaders consider incorporating Indigenous perspectives on sustainability, social responsibility, and spirituality into curricula and educational practices, promoting global citizenship and ethical awareness. This will entail recognising customary laws and traditions, supporting decolonisation efforts, and ensuring accurate representation of Indigenous knowledge. By fostering mutual respect and understanding of diverse ethical traditions, educative leaders can create more inclusive, equitable educational environments that value the contributions of both Indigenous and Western moral philosophies.

Keywords: *Indigenous ethics; Celtic ethics; Māori ethics; First Nations' ethics; Aboriginal ethics;Emirati ethics; educative leadership*

Introduction

A preliminary literature review indicates that Indigenous Peoples' ethics encompass a diverse array of moral frameworks, cultural values, and spiritual beliefs that have sustained Indigenous communities for generations (Smith, 2010). Rooted in deep connections to land, community, and ancestral traditions, Indigenous ethics prioritise harmony with nature, collective well-being, and intergenerational stewardship (Alfred, 2009).

Central to Indigenous ethics is a profound reverence for the natural world (Cajete, 2000). Many Indigenous cultures view the land, water, plants, and animals as sacred entities deserving of respect and reciprocity (Deloria Jr, 1972). This worldview often entails sustainable practices that honour the interconnectedness of all living beings and recognise humans as custodians rather than owners of the Earth (Kimmerer, 2013).

Community and kinship play pivotal roles in Indigenous ethics, emphasising the importance of social cohesion, cooperation, and mutual support (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Concepts of relationality and reciprocity govern interpersonal relationships, fostering a sense of interconnectedness and shared responsibility for the welfare of the community (Battiste, 2013). Decision-making processes often prioritise consensus-building and inclusivity, reflecting values of equality, fairness, and respect for diverse perspectives (Wilson, 2008).

Spirituality and traditional knowledge systems are integral to Indigenous ethics, providing moral guidance and cultural continuity (Smith, 1999). Ceremonies, rituals, and oral traditions transmit moral teachings, wisdom, and ancestral knowledge from elders to younger generations, reinforcing ethical principles and cultural identity (LaDuke, 1999). Spirituality fosters a deep sense of belonging, purpose, and interconnectedness with the natural and spiritual realms, guiding ethical conduct and decision-making (Barker, 2003).

Indigenous ethics also encompass principles of justice, accountability, and stewardship (Alfred, 2009). Traditional governance systems uphold principles of equity, restorative justice, and collective responsibility, seeking to maintain balance and harmony within communities and with the broader environment (Anaya, 2004). Concepts of reciprocity and intergenerational equity underscore the obligation to preserve cultural heritage, protect natural resources, and ensure the well-being of future generations (Borrows, 2002).

However, Indigenous ethics have faced significant challenges and injustices, including colonisation, dispossession of land, cultural suppression, and systemic discrimination (Smith, 2012). The Doctrine of Discovery was a set of international legal principles largely developed between the 15th and 16th centuries (Hele, 2023). The Doctrine maintains that upon discovery of new lands, European nations could acquire the territory and sovereignty over it if the territory had been unknown to Europeans, unoccupied by a Christian prince or inhabited by people Europeans considered "uncivilised." It served as the basis of sovereignty for settler nations, defined as countries with an Indigenous population, but whose government and dominant cultural norms were established by people who moved there from other countries. Hence, the Doctrine created conditions for the legal, political and economic dispossession and subjugation of Indigenous Peoples globally. Efforts to reclaim Indigenous knowledge, revitalise cultural practices, and advocate for Indigenous rights are central to contemporary Indigenous movements for social justice and cultural revitalisation (Simpson, 2014).

In summary, Indigenous Peoples' ethics reflect holistic worldviews, grounded in reverence for the Earth, community-centred values, spiritual interconnectedness, and a commitment to cultural continuity and environmental stewardship (Wilson, 2008). These ethical frameworks offer valuable insights into sustainable living, social cohesion, and collective well-being, emphasising the interconnectedness of humanity with the natural world (Deloria Jr., 1972).

Methodology

A research question underpinned this paper: *How are Indigenous Peoples' and modern Western ethics related to contemporary theories of educative leadership: transformational leadership, instructional leadership, distributed leadership, and ethical leadership?* Three primary methodologies were applied: literature review, document analysis, and thematic analysis.

A systematic literature review enabled a comprehensive exploration of moral philosophy and educational leadership theory. Drawing on materials used in my university teaching and research since 1980, cross-referenced with ERIC and JSTOR databases (Torraco, 2016), a review established a preliminary overview of the intersections between Indigenous and modern Western ethical thought within contemporary educative leadership theories. This process allowed for the identification of both canonical texts and contemporary academic discussions, laying the groundwork for further analysis.

The document analysis phase focused on seminal works within Indigenous and Western moral philosophical traditions. Williams (2012), for example, examines the Western emphasis on individualism as distinct from Indigenous frameworks of communal ethics, illuminating the philosophical conflicts embedded in these traditions. His analysis highlights how Indigenous philosophies prioritise collective well-being, contrasting with individualistic Western perspectives. Similarly, Miller (2003) explores the ethics of recognition and sovereignty, analysing Indigenous relational identity in contrast with Western constructs of individualism. LaDuke (2005) further reinforces these themes by emphasising Indigenous responsibilities toward cultural preservation and environmental stewardship, challenging exploitative aspects of Western ethical frameworks.

The thematic analysis engaged with recent OECD (2023) findings on moral philosophies underpinning current Western educative leadership theories. The OECD review identifies virtue ethics as central to ethical and authentic leadership, where the focus on leaders' character and integrity aligns with self-awareness and resilience as essential traits for managing ethical complexity (Riggio et al., 2010; Knights & O'Leary, 2006; Jennings et al., 2019). Care ethics, which prioritises empathy and relational values, appears in ethical and transformational leadership, promoting inclusivity and responsiveness to community needs (Noddings, 2003; OECD, 2023). Deontological ethics, focusing on justice and duty, is embedded within instructional and distributed leadership, reinforcing leaders' accountability in upholding educational standards (OECD, 2023; Strike, 2007). Pragmatism emphasises adaptability and practical problem-solving, relevant to distributed and system-level leadership models (Dewey, 1922; OECD, 2023). Finally, utilitarian ethics—oriented toward maximising collective benefit—is often reflected in transformational and instructional leadership, supporting decision-making aimed at optimising student outcomes (Bentham, 1789; OECD, 2023).

Using comparative conceptual analysis, this study mapped Indigenous and Western ethical concepts onto educative leadership frameworks, identifying both alignment and divergence. The

analysis was structured around three key parameters: (1) the integration of moral philosophy within leadership theories, with a focus on values such as justice, ethical reasoning, and inclusivity; (2) the relevance of these philosophical frameworks to current educative leadership practices; and (3) the broader context of these findings within trends such as equity, inclusion, and social justice, which often draw on 20th-century philosophical developments (Nash, 2010).

Together, these methodologies provide a rigorous exploration of how Indigenous and Western moral philosophies relate to each other and inform contemporary educative leadership theories, contributing to a nuanced understanding of ethical and educative leadership. The research question also reflects the author's interest in his dual Celtic and Māori cultural heritage, research and leadership service in New Zealand, Britain, North America, Australia and the United Arab Emirates, and adoption of a pragmatic and holistic epistemology (Macpherson, 2024).

Celtic moral philosophy

Celtic moral philosophy, grounded in the spiritual and social traditions of ancient Celtic cultures, is distinguished by its holistic worldview, deep reverence for nature, and emphasis on community. Predominantly an oral tradition, it was transmitted through myth and folklore, later documented by classical and medieval writers as it evolved within Western Europe, particularly in Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and Brittany (Green, 1995a).

Central to Celtic ethical principles are the concepts of *Anam Cara* (soul friend) and an interconnected cosmos where spiritual and natural realms coexist. This cosmology integrated gods, ancestors, and natural spirits, which were believed to influence moral and social behaviour, encouraging harmonious coexistence with the environment and community (MacCulloch, 2003).

Key principles of Celtic moral philosophy reflect these beliefs. Celtic ethics promote harmony with nature, perceiving the natural world as sacred, with entities like rivers, trees, and animals imbued with spiritual significance. This worldview encouraged sustainable practices and environmental stewardship (Green, 1995a). Community and kinship were also central, with Celtic societies organised around clan structures that prioritised loyalty, mutual responsibility, and social cohesion through obligations and reciprocity. Additionally, values such as honour and bravery, celebrated in Celtic myths and heroic tales, underscored personal integrity and social responsibility as essential virtues (MacCulloch, 2003).

Celtic ethics evolved substantially with Roman conquest and Christianisation, incorporating elements of Roman law and Christian doctrine. Figures such as St. Patrick in Ireland helped document and reshape Celtic beliefs, merging them with Christian ethical frameworks. Texts like the Irish Brehon Laws reveal the adaptation of Celtic customs within a Christian context, while in modern times, a renewed interest in Celtic heritage has sparked efforts to reclaim these ethical traditions for contemporary application (Ellis, 1999; Ó Cróinín, 2005).

The strengths of Celtic moral philosophy include its integrated worldview, which links spiritual, social, and ecological dimensions; its focus on community and relationships; and its resilience in adapting to external influences while maintaining core principles (Green, 1995b; MacCulloch, 2003; Ó Cróinín, 2005). However, Celtic philosophy faces limitations, including the partial loss and fragmentation of its oral traditions due to conquest and colonisation, which led to reconstructed and potentially distorted versions of early beliefs. The blending with Christian ethics also transformed many traditional practices, sometimes obscuring distinctly Celtic principles. In modern interpretations, there is also a risk of romanticisation, particularly in New Age contexts, where simplified or idealised versions may overlook the complexity of Celtic ethics (Ellis, 1999; Ó Cróinín, 2005).

Celtic and modern Western ethics intersect significantly in environmental ethics, where Celtic reverence for nature aligns with contemporary conservation efforts (Green, 1995b). Both traditions also share values around community and social responsibility, with the Celtic focus on mutual support resonating with modern social capital theories (MacCulloch, 2003). Additionally, the Celtic emphasis on virtues such as honour and bravery parallels Western virtue ethics, which similarly promotes the development of moral character through exemplary figures (MacIntyre, 1981).

Nevertheless, distinct differences exist between Celtic and modern Western ethics. One is the role of spirituality: while Celtic philosophy integrates spiritual beliefs with ethical reasoning, modern Western ethics are often secular, separating moral considerations from spiritual frameworks (Green, 1995b). Moreover, Celtic ethics' collectivist orientation, emphasising communal welfare, contrasts with the individualism prevalent in Western ethics, which tends to prioritise personal autonomy and rights (Ó Cróinín, 2005). Finally, while Celtic ethics operate within customary laws based on communal consensus, Western ethics are typically embedded in formal legal systems, which can lead to tensions when integrating Celtic perspectives into Western institutions (Reynolds, 1981).

Celtic moral philosophy thus offers a dynamic ethical framework with an emphasis on harmony, community, and resilience, though it faces challenges from historical fragmentation and modern reinterpretation. While overlaps with Western ethics exist—particularly in environmental and social ethics—important distinctions remain, especially regarding spirituality and community values. Understanding these differences and intersections fosters a nuanced appreciation of Celtic ethics within a broader ethical discourse.

Māori moral philosophy

The moral philosophy of the Māori, the Indigenous People of New Zealand, is deeply embedded in their cultural traditions, spiritual beliefs, and communal way of life. *Tikanga Māori* (Māori rightness) is an ethical framework that emphasises principles such as *mana* (authority and respect),

tapu (sacredness), and *utu* (reciprocity and balance). Over centuries, Māori moral philosophy has evolved, encountering both internal developments and external influences, particularly from Western culture. This section explores the development of Māori moral philosophy, its main strengths and limitations, and its intersections and differences with modern Western ethics.

The development of Māori moral philosophy is deeply rooted in their historical and cultural context, with its foundations in a worldview that sees humans, nature, and the spiritual realm as interconnected. This perspective is manifest in several key concepts that guide Māori ethical thought and practice. Mana, for example, refers to authority, prestige, and respect, which are often conferred by ancestors and maintained through one's actions and behaviours (Mead, 2003). Tapu embodies sacredness, establishing restrictions that protect individuals and the community, reinforcing the sanctity of certain objects, persons, or places (Henry & Pene, 2001). Utu, the principle of reciprocity, plays a central role in maintaining balance within relationships, ensuring that actions are met with appropriate responses and reinforcing social harmony (Durie, 2001). Whanaungatanga emphasises the importance of kinship and the deep interconnections within families and communities, further strengthening the social fabric (Mead, 2003).

These principles were traditionally conveyed through oral traditions, including myths, legends, and proverbs, and were reinforced through communal rituals, ceremonies, and other cultural practices. Such practices not only ensured the transmission of Māori moral values across generations but also created a shared understanding of the ethical obligations that individuals had to one another, their communities, and the environment (Durie, 2001; Henry & Pene, 2001). This interconnected worldview highlights the holistic nature of Māori ethics, where spirituality, community, and respect for the natural world are inseparable components of moral conduct.

The arrival of European settlers in the 19th century brought significant changes to Māori society. Colonisation disrupted traditional ways of life, imposed new legal and social systems, and led to the disregarding of Māori culture. Despite these challenges, Māori communities have worked to preserve and revitalise their cultural practices and ethical frameworks (Walker, 1990).

In contemporary New Zealand, there has been a resurgence of interest in Māori culture and ethics, driven by efforts to address historical injustices and promote Indigenous rights. Tikanga Māori is increasingly recognised within legal and educational systems, and there is a growing emphasis on incorporating Māori perspectives into public policy and governance (Durie, 1998).

Māori moral philosophy is intricately connected to the cultural, historical, and spiritual framework of Māori society. A distinctive strength of this philosophy is its holistic worldview, which integrates spiritual, social, and environmental dimensions, fostering a profound sense of interconnectedness and responsibility. This worldview encourages sustainable practices and emphasises respect for the natural world, particularly through concepts like kaitiakitanga (guardianship) (Patterson, 2000; Pere, 1982). Another strength lies in the emphasis on community and relationships, where the well-being of the collective is prioritised. Concepts such as

whanaungatanga (reciprocal kinship) and manaakitanga (hospitality and kindness) help reinforce social cohesion and mutual support within Māori communities (Metge, 1995). Third, the resilience of Māori moral philosophy is notable, particularly in the face of colonisation. Despite significant challenges, the practice of rituals, ceremonies, and the transmission of traditional knowledge have helped preserve Māori identity and cultural continuity (Mead, 2003).

However, several limitations affect Māori moral philosophy. The most significant challenge is the impact of colonisation, which has marginalised Māori perspectives by imposing Western legal and social systems. This has led to the undermining of traditional governance and ethical frameworks, complicating the integration of Māori ethics within mainstream institutions (Walker, 1990). Additionally, the transmission of traditional knowledge to younger generations remains an ongoing struggle, as modern societal changes and urbanisation sometimes weaken the connection to ancestral values (Durie, 1998). Finally, Māori communities face the challenge of balancing traditional ethical principles with the demands of modernity, such as economic development and healthcare, which require adapting these principles to contemporary contexts (Metge, 1995).

There are significant intersections between Māori and modern Western ethical systems, particularly in the realms of environmental ethics, social justice, and communal well-being. Both traditions emphasise sustainability, with Māori *kaitiakitanga* aligning with Western environmental ethics that advocate for resource conservation and responsible management (Patterson, 2000). Furthermore, both value social justice and equity, focusing on promoting Indigenous rights and addressing historical injustices (Durie, 1998). The communal focus in Māori ethics, which emphasises the well-being of the collective, is similarly reflected in some Western ethical frameworks such as communitarianism and social capital (Pere, 1982).

Nevertheless, there are important differences. Māori ethics are deeply intertwined with spirituality, with ethical decision-making often guided by sacred values and ancestral traditions, whereas modern Western ethics tend to be more secular, often separating spirituality from ethical deliberations (Patterson, 2000). Moreover, Māori ethics prioritise collectivism, with a focus on community well-being, while Western ethics tend to emphasise individualism and personal autonomy (Durie, 1998). Finally, the legal and ethical frameworks of Māori and Western traditions differ significantly. Māori ethics traditionally operate within a framework of communal consensus and *tikanga* (customary law), whereas Western legal systems are often more formalised and codified, which can lead to tensions when integrating Māori perspectives into Western-dominated institutions (Borrows, 2010).

In conclusion, Māori moral philosophy provides a rich and dynamic ethical framework grounded in cultural values, spiritual beliefs, and communal practices. While there are meaningful intersections with modern Western ethics, such as in environmental sustainability and social justice, there are also significant differences, particularly concerning individualism, spirituality,

and legal frameworks. Recognising and respecting these differences while finding common ground is essential for fostering a more inclusive and equitable society.

North American Indian and Canadian First Nations' moral philosophies

The moral philosophy of North American Indian and Canadian First Nations Peoples is deeply rooted in their cultural traditions, spiritual beliefs, and historical experiences. Developed over millennia, North American Indigenous ethics prioritise harmony with nature, collective well-being, and intergenerational stewardship. In this section, I explore the historical development of Indigenous moral philosophy, its main strengths and limitations, and its intersections and differences with modern Western ethics.

North American Indian and Canadian First Nations' moral philosophy has its origins in the diverse cultural traditions of Indigenous Peoples across North America. Before the arrival of European settlers, Indigenous communities developed complex ethical frameworks that emphasised principles of reciprocity, respect for nature, and communal well-being (Deloria Jr., 1999). These frameworks were transmitted through oral traditions, ceremonial practices, and communal rituals, reinforcing values of kinship, cooperation, and stewardship of the land (Wilkins, 2005).

With the onset of European colonisation, Indigenous moral philosophy faced significant disruptions and challenges. Colonial policies, including forced relocation, land dispossession, and cultural assimilation, threatened the cultural continuity and integrity of Indigenous communities (Fixico, 2011). The imposition of Western legal and educational systems often marginalised Indigenous perspectives, leading to the erosion of traditional governance structures and the loss of ancestral knowledge (Borrows, 2010).

One of the main strengths of Indigenous moral philosophy lies in its holistic worldview, which emphasises the interconnectedness of all living beings and the importance of maintaining balance and harmony within the natural world (LaDuke, 2005). This perspective fosters a deep sense of respect for the environment and a commitment to sustainable living practices, which are increasingly recognised as essential for addressing global environmental challenges (Cajete, 1994).

Additionally, Indigenous moral philosophy prioritises communal well-being and collective responsibility, promoting social cohesion, cooperation, and mutual support within Indigenous communities (Deloria Jr., 1999). Concepts of relationality and reciprocity govern interpersonal relationships, reinforcing values of respect, empathy, and solidarity among community members (Wilkins, 2005). This emphasis on social harmony and inclusivity contributes to the resilience and strength of Indigenous communities, particularly in the face of historical and ongoing injustices.

Despite its strengths, North American Indigenous moral philosophy faces several limitations, many of which are rooted in the legacies of colonialism and ongoing systemic inequities. The impacts of historical trauma, cultural genocide, and socio-economic marginalisation have eroded traditional governance structures and undermined the transmission of Indigenous knowledge to

younger generations (Fixico, 2011). As a result, some communities struggle to maintain cultural continuity and adapt their ethical frameworks to contemporary challenges.

Moreover, the imposition of Western legal and educational systems has created tensions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous approaches to morality and justice (Borrows, 2010). In many cases, Indigenous perspectives have been marginalised or ignored within mainstream institutions, perpetuating cycles of injustice and reinforcing colonial power dynamics (Deloria, 2006). This lack of recognition and respect for Indigenous moral philosophy limits its influence and hinders efforts to address pressing social and environmental issues.

Despite their differences, North American Indian and Canadian First Nations Indigenous moral philosophy and modern Western ethics share certain intersections and commonalities. Both traditions prioritise the well-being of individuals and communities, albeit through different conceptual frameworks. For example, the Indigenous emphasis on collective responsibility and stewardship of the land aligns with contemporary environmental ethics, which advocate for sustainable practices and conservation efforts (LaDuke, 2005).

Additionally, both Indigenous and Western ethical traditions recognise the importance of virtues such as compassion, courage, and integrity in guiding moral conduct (Cajete, 1994). While the specific manifestations of these virtues may differ between cultures, the underlying principles of ethical behaviour remain consistent across diverse moral systems. Moreover, the emphasis on social justice and equity in Indigenous moral philosophy resonates with modern Western movements for human rights and social equality (Deloria Jr., 1999).

Despite these intersections, Indigenous moral philosophy also differs from modern Western ethics in significant ways. One of the key distinctions lies in their respective conceptions of the self and society. Indigenous ethics tend to prioritise communal well-being and interconnectedness, viewing individuals as inseparable from their social and ecological environments (Wilkins, 2005). In contrast, modern Western ethics often prioritise individual autonomy and rights, emphasising the importance of personal freedom and self-determination (Borrows, 2010).

Furthermore, Indigenous moral philosophy often incorporates spiritual and metaphysical dimensions that may be absent from secular Western ethical frameworks. Concepts of animism, sacred reciprocity, and spiritual interconnectedness shape Indigenous understandings of morality and guide ethical conduct (Deloria Jr., 1999). While Western ethics may acknowledge the importance of spirituality for some individuals, it typically does not occupy a central role in ethical discourse or decision-making.

In sum, the development of moral philosophy in North American Indian and Canadian First Nations Peoples reflects a complex interplay of cultural traditions, historical experiences, and contemporary challenges. Despite facing significant disruptions and injustices, Indigenous communities continue to draw strength from their ancestral teachings and spiritual practices, advocating for social justice, environmental stewardship, and cultural revitalisation. While there

may be intersections and commonalities between Indigenous and modern Western ethics, it is essential to recognise and respect the distinctiveness of each tradition and approach any comparison with sensitivity and nuance.

Australian Aboriginal moral philosophy

The moral philosophy of Australian Aboriginal Peoples is deeply intertwined with their cultural heritage, spiritual beliefs, and connection to the land. This rich ethical framework, often referred to as Aboriginal Law or Lore, is based on principles that have been passed down through generations via oral traditions, ceremonies, and daily practices. Over time, these philosophies have evolved while facing significant challenges from colonisation and modernisation. This section presents the development of Aboriginal moral philosophy, its main strengths and limitations, and its intersections and differences with modern Western ethics.

The development of Aboriginal moral philosophy reflects its cultural and spiritual foundations. Aboriginal moral philosophy is grounded in a worldview that sees the land, people, and the spiritual realm as deeply interconnected. Central to this philosophy are the Dreamtime or Dreaming stories, which describe the creation of the world and establish the laws and codes of conduct for living. These stories are not just myths but are considered living realities that guide ethical behaviour and social organisation (Rose, 1992).

Aboriginal moral philosophy is deeply embedded in the cultural and spiritual traditions of Indigenous Australian Peoples, reflecting a profound connection between individuals, their communities, and the land. Central to this philosophy is the respect for the land, which is viewed as a living entity with which people share a symbiotic relationship. This respect for the land underpins sustainable practices and the ethical responsibility to care for the environment (Rose, 1992). Additionally, Aboriginal ethics are rooted in complex kinship and social structures that dictate relationships, responsibilities, and social obligations, with an emphasis on community and the interconnectedness of all members (Swain, 1993). The principles of reciprocity and balance, guiding ethical behaviour, are central to maintaining harmony both within the community and with the natural world (Swain, 1993).

The arrival of European settlers in the 18th century led to profound disruptions in Aboriginal life, including the dispossession of land, the suppression of cultural practices, and the imposition of foreign legal and social systems. These disruptions severely impacted the transmission and practice of traditional Aboriginal moral philosophies (Reynolds, 1981). Despite these challenges, there has been a resurgence of interest in Aboriginal culture and ethics, with efforts to reclaim traditional lands, revitalise languages, and reassert cultural practices. The recognition of Aboriginal law in some legal contexts and the incorporation of Aboriginal perspectives into public policy and education reflect ongoing efforts to integrate traditional ethics into modern Australian society (Dodson, 2003).

One of the primary strengths of Aboriginal moral philosophy is its holistic worldview, which integrates environmental, social, and spiritual dimensions. This approach fosters a deep respect for the natural world and promotes sustainable living practices, which are particularly relevant in the context of global environmental challenges (Rose, 1992). Furthermore, Aboriginal ethics prioritise the well-being of the community, with kinship systems and communal responsibilities fostering strong social bonds and mutual support. This communal focus plays a critical role in maintaining social order and ensuring that individuals are cared for within a collective framework (Swain, 1993). Additionally, the resilience and adaptability of Aboriginal moral philosophy are notable. Despite the impacts of colonisation, the ongoing practice of ceremonies, storytelling, and the transmission of traditional knowledge have helped sustain cultural identity and ethical principles (Dodson, 2003).

However, Aboriginal moral philosophy faces significant limitations. The most prominent challenge is the legacy of colonisation, which has marginalised Aboriginal perspectives and disrupted traditional governance structures. The imposition of Western legal and social systems has led to ongoing struggles in ensuring the recognition and integration of Aboriginal ethics within mainstream institutions (Reynolds, 1981). Furthermore, the transmission of traditional knowledge to younger generations is increasingly difficult due to modern societal changes, urbanisation, and the influence of global culture. Efforts to revitalise languages and cultural practices are crucial, but they require substantial resources and support (Dodson, 2003). Aboriginal communities also face the complex task of balancing traditional ethical principles with contemporary realities, including economic development, education, and healthcare, which requires ongoing dialogue and adaptation (Swain, 1993).

Aboriginal moral philosophy intersects with modern Western ethics in several significant areas, particularly in environmental ethics, social justice, and communal responsibility. Both traditions place a strong emphasis on sustainability and stewardship of the land. Aboriginal concepts of caring for the land align closely with Western environmental movements that advocate for conservation and responsible resource management (Rose, 1992). In addition, both Aboriginal and Western ethical systems value social justice and equity, particularly in efforts to address historical injustices, promote Indigenous rights, and ensure equitable access to resources and opportunities (Dodson, 2003). The emphasis on community and collective responsibility in Aboriginal ethics shares similarities with Western ethical traditions that advocate for community-based approaches to social and economic development, such as communitarianism and social capital (Swain, 1993).

Nonetheless, significant differences between Aboriginal and modern Western ethics remain. A key distinction is the focus on collectivism in Aboriginal moral philosophy, which prioritises the well-being of the community and the maintenance of harmonious relationships, often placing communal needs above individual desires. In contrast, Western ethics tend to emphasise individual autonomy, rights, and personal freedom (Dodson, 2003). Moreover, Aboriginal ethics are deeply

intertwined with spirituality, with moral decision-making guided by sacred beliefs and practices. This spiritual dimension contrasts with the largely secular nature of modern Western ethics, which may not incorporate spiritual perspectives as central to ethical deliberations (Rose, 1992). Lastly, Aboriginal and Western legal systems operate within different frameworks, with Aboriginal ethics traditionally governed by communal consensus and customary law while Western systems are often codified within formal legal structures. For example, "rightness" in Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara (Central Australia) is "tjukurpa" which is often translated as "Dreaming" or "Law" but also encapsulates the moral order and how one should live correctly, in alignment with spiritual and ancestral paths. This divergence can create tensions when integrating Aboriginal perspectives into Western-dominated institutions (Reynolds, 1981).

In conclusion, Aboriginal moral philosophy is a rich and dynamic tradition that reflects the cultural, spiritual, and communal values of Indigenous Australian Peoples. Its holistic worldview, emphasis on community and kinship, and resilience in the face of colonisation are key strengths. However, challenges remain, including the impacts of colonisation, the transmission of traditional knowledge, and the balance between tradition and modernity. While there are meaningful intersections between Aboriginal and modern Western ethics, such as in environmental sustainability and social justice, significant differences persist, particularly concerning individualism, spirituality, and legal frameworks. Recognising these differences and finding common ground is crucial for fostering an inclusive and equitable society that honours the diverse ethical traditions of its people.

Emirati moral philosophy

Emirati perspectives can be regarded as Indigenous, especially when considering the deep connections of the Emirati people to their land, culture, and heritage. This section clarifies how Emirati moral philosophies are closely tied to the historical, social, and spiritual foundations of the region, which are rooted in Indigenous customs, Bedouin traditions, and Islamic moral principles that have evolved in harmony with the desert environment and the cultural practices of the Arabian Peninsula.

Emirati moral philosophy is deeply rooted in Islamic teachings, particularly within the framework of Sharia (Islamic law), which guides not only personal conduct but also influences the nation's legal and ethical landscape. Sharia is integral to the culture and values of Emirati society, shaping moral reasoning, individual behaviour, and social interactions through principles such as justice (*'adl*), mercy (*rahma*), honesty (*sidq*), and generosity (*karam*). The ethical framework within Sharia emphasises the importance of community welfare over individual interests, reinforcing collective responsibility and social harmony. This collectivist ethos, as explained by Al Faruqi (1986), aligns with the moral principles of beneficence and communal support, which encourage Emiratis to prioritise the well-being of others, a value also evident in the emphasis on family, tribal loyalty, and social obligations in Emirati culture.

One of the strengths of the UAE's Sharia-based moral philosophy is its capacity to foster a strong sense of identity and cohesion within society, especially in the context of rapid modernisation. The principles embedded in Sharia law have adapted to various contemporary social issues, enabling Emirati society to preserve its traditional values amidst globalising influences. However, the moral framework's collective orientation can sometimes conflict with more individualistic perspectives common in international human rights discourse, particularly in areas concerning personal autonomy and freedom. Scholar Abdullahi An-Na'im (2008) notes that while Islamic ethics emphasises the protection of human dignity, certain interpretations of Sharia may sometimes challenge the universal application of individual rights, a tension that requires careful negotiation within a pluralistic society.

A limitation of relying heavily on Sharia as a guiding moral philosophy lies in its varied interpretations. As with any legal and moral system, the interpretations of Islamic principles may vary among scholars, leading to differing views on how best to apply these values in a modern and diverse nation like the UAE. Scholars like Ramadan (2009) argue for a more flexible and dynamic interpretation of Sharia, one that can respond to the evolving social context of contemporary Emirati society while maintaining ethical coherence. This adaptive approach can ensure that the moral philosophy remains relevant without compromising its core values, yet it also raises questions about which interpretations to prioritise, especially given the diverse demographic and religious backgrounds within the UAE.

Intersections between Indigenous and modern Western moral philosophies

Indigenous moral philosophies intersect with modern Western ethics in areas such as environmental sustainability, social justice, and communal responsibility. Each tradition offers distinctive approaches to these values, often reflecting a deep-rooted connection to land, ancestry, and spiritual beliefs that is less prominent in secular Western frameworks.

In Celtic moral philosophy, for instance, an intrinsic respect for nature as a sacred force is embedded within ethical practices, aligning with modern environmental ethics but differing in its spiritual orientation (Ó Crualaoich, 2003). Celtic ethics value interconnectedness between people and nature, emphasising the need to honour natural cycles and maintain balance. In contrast, modern Western environmental ethics often approach sustainability from a scientific and policy-driven perspective, which may lack the same spiritual depth.

Māori ethics, as articulated within *tikanga* (customary values) and *whakapapa* (ancestral lineage), also place a profound emphasis on kinship with nature and a collective sense of duty to care for the land and all life. This worldview aligns with environmental stewardship yet diverges from Western individualism by prioritising communal well-being and intergenerational responsibility (Mead, 2003). For Māori, the concept of *manaakitanga* (hospitality and kindness) extends beyond humans to encompass the natural world, a

perspective that Western frameworks are increasingly adopting but from a more secular and rights-based approach.

Similarly, North American Indian and Canadian First Nations ethics view nature as a living entity with intrinsic rights, a concept increasingly recognised by Western legal systems but originating from Indigenous belief systems. These philosophies, based on reciprocity and respect for all beings, promote harmony and caution against exploitation of natural resources. This is evident in the work of scholars like Deloria Jr. (1999), who argue for a relational approach to ethics that contrasts sharply with Western notions of ownership and dominion over nature.

Australian Aboriginal moral philosophy, with its foundational concept of *Dreaming* or *Tjukurpa*, offers a unique understanding of time, land, and identity as interconnected aspects of ethical life (Stanner, 1979). In this view, land is not a resource but a vital aspect of self and community, with ethical practices rooted in maintaining harmony with the past, present, and future. Western ethics, with its historical tendency toward dualism and separation between humanity and nature, often lacks this integrated, spiritual perspective on the environment.

Emirati ethics, deeply embedded in Islamic moral philosophy, similarly emphasise social responsibility, environmental stewardship, and justice, but are underpinned by Sharia principles that integrate spirituality into everyday ethical decisions. In this context, individual actions are morally evaluated based on their impact on the community and adherence to divine guidance, which contrasts with Western secular ethics' emphasis on autonomy and rationality. According to Al Faruqi (1986), this collective and spiritual orientation reinforces ethical behaviour that prioritises communal harmony and social justice, while Western frameworks tend to focus more on individual rights and freedoms.

A shared challenge across these Indigenous moral systems is the impact of colonisation and globalisation, which has disrupted traditional practices and, in some cases, suppressed their transmission. Indigenous communities have faced direct colonisation, which eroded their cultural practices and displaced their lands, although many groups have shown resilience in revitalising and adapting their ethics in the face of these pressures. Emirati moral philosophy, though not directly colonised in the same manner, grapples with the influences of modernity and global economic integration, which can dilute traditional values rooted in Sharia and communal ethics.

Another challenge is the risk of modern misinterpretations and simplifications. Indigenous moral frameworks are sometimes reduced to stereotypes or romanticised concepts in Western contexts, which can obscure their complexity and richness. This misrepresentation risks undermining genuine understanding and prevents these philosophies from being fully integrated into broader ethical discourse.

To build a more inclusive and equitable society, it is essential to recognise and respect these differences while seeking common ground. This involves valuing the unique contributions of Indigenous philosophies, ensuring these traditions are honoured and their perspectives accurately

represented in ethical discussions. Institutions like the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London are pioneering efforts to "decolonise" philosophy, broadening the curriculum to incorporate perspectives from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, thus offering a more diverse and inclusive approach to ethics (Woodcock, 2024a, 2024b).

Discussion: Moral philosophies for educative leaders

Educative leaders who engage with both Indigenous and Western moral philosophies often navigate complex intersections and differences between these worldviews. This task is further complicated by the variances within and between the four dominant contemporary educational leadership frameworks—transformational, instructional, distributed, and ethical leadership—as identified by the OECD (2023). These frameworks have each evolved considerably since their initial conception, reflecting distinct emphases and methods that can align or conflict with Indigenous values.

Transformational leadership, originally conceptualised by Burns (1978) and later expanded by scholars like Berkovich (2016), emphasises inspiring change, fostering motivation, and encouraging followers to transcend self-interest for the greater good. This aligns with Indigenous moral philosophies, such as those found in Māori, North American Indian, and Australian Aboriginal cultures, which stress collective well-being and the importance of acting for communal and intergenerational benefit. In Māori culture, the concept of *manaakitanga* (care and generosity) resonates with transformational leadership's focus on inspiring others and lifting the community. However, transformational leadership's individual-centric model of charismatic change agents can diverge from Indigenous approaches that prioritise shared authority and communal decision-making, as seen in the decentralised structures of both Celtic and North American Indigenous societies. Leaders in these cultures act not as single agents of change but as facilitators of collective wisdom, valuing humility and responsibility to the group.

Instructional leadership, as articulated by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Hallinger and Wang (2015), centres on directly supporting and improving teaching and learning. This framework emphasises a principal or leader's role in shaping curriculum, assessing teaching effectiveness, and focusing on academic outcomes. Instructional leadership can resonate with the Māori philosophy of *ako*, which views teaching and learning as reciprocal. Similarly, in North American Indian and First Nations contexts, elders serve as instructional leaders, guiding community learning through storytelling and mentorship, aligning with the focus on lifelong learning. However, instructional leadership's traditional emphasis on academic outcomes and hierarchical structures may conflict with Indigenous philosophies that prioritise holistic education, cultural transmission, and knowledge as a communal resource rather than a product of institutional structures.

Distributed leadership, initially discussed by Spillane et al. (2001) and further developed by Tian et al. (2016), emphasises shared responsibilities and collaborative decision-making within

educational settings. This model strongly aligns with Indigenous leadership practices, which often operate on principles of shared governance and community involvement. For example, Australian Aboriginal leadership is deeply collective, involving a shared responsibility where decisions are made through consensus and respectful dialogue, reflecting a distributed approach. In Celtic traditions, the concept of shared wisdom among leaders mirrors distributed leadership's focus on empowering multiple stakeholders. Distributed leadership's inherent flexibility and emphasis on relational trust align well with Indigenous approaches, where authority is often fluid and grounded in community consensus rather than formal roles.

Ethical leadership, as proposed by Sergiovanni (1992) and elaborated by Shapiro and Stefkovich (2016), focuses on aligning actions with moral values, prioritising integrity, and ensuring that leadership decisions are ethically sound. This framework has a natural synergy with Indigenous moral philosophies, which emphasise ethical conduct as a central leadership duty. For instance, in the Emirati context, Islamic moral principles guide leaders to prioritise social justice, community welfare, and a sense of duty grounded in spiritual values, much like the ethical leadership model's commitment to principled decision-making. Similarly, in Celtic and Māori traditions, ethical responsibilities are intertwined with spiritual and environmental respect, emphasising the moral duty to care for the land and future generations. However, ethical leadership in Western contexts is often grounded in secular values and rational ethics, which may overlook the spiritual dimensions that Indigenous philosophies incorporate into moral reasoning.

Educative leaders working across these frameworks must therefore balance the inherent strengths and potential limitations of each model in light of Indigenous moral philosophies. Transformational leadership's potential for inspiring collective uplift, instructional leadership's focus on reciprocal learning, distributed leadership's collaborative ethos, and ethical leadership's moral integrity each have areas of convergence with Indigenous values. However, achieving harmony between these frameworks and Indigenous perspectives requires an adaptive approach, one that respects the spiritual, communal, and intergenerational elements intrinsic to Indigenous moral traditions. This approach also calls for a nuanced understanding of the different expressions of leadership within Western frameworks, allowing for an integration of diverse ethical perspectives into educational practice.

Conclusion

Both Indigenous and Western ethics emphasise environmental sustainability and social responsibility, although their motivations and frameworks often differ. Indigenous philosophies frequently view humans as integral to the natural world, fostering a holistic approach to sustainability. Western frameworks, while sometimes incorporating these views, typically emphasise ethical leadership through responsibility and sustainability. Educative leaders can benefit from integrating Indigenous perspectives on sustainability and social responsibility into

curricula, thereby promoting a more comprehensive understanding of these concepts and fostering a sense of global citizenship and ethical awareness among students.

A notable difference between Indigenous and Western moral philosophies lies in the role of spirituality in ethical deliberations. Indigenous moral philosophies often intertwine spirituality with ethical decision-making, while Western frameworks usually maintain a separation between the spiritual and secular. Leaders must respect and acknowledge the spiritual dimensions of Indigenous ethics in their decision-making processes and in shaping educational environments. This might involve creating spaces for spiritual expression and integrating Indigenous spiritual practices and teachings into the educational process.

Another key difference is the emphasis on collectivism versus individualism. Indigenous philosophies tend to prioritise collectivism, community well-being, and interdependence, in contrast to the individualism and personal achievement often prioritised in modern Western philosophies. Educative leaders can promote a more collectivist approach by fostering community-oriented projects and group activities that emphasise cooperation and mutual support. This approach aligns with distributed leadership, where shared responsibility and collective decision-making are encouraged.

Additionally, Indigenous moral frameworks often operate within customary laws and traditions, while Western ethics are typically grounded in formal legal systems and universal principles. Educative leaders should recognise and respect the customary laws and traditions of Indigenous communities. This involves consulting with Indigenous leaders and incorporating customary practices into the school's policies and practices.

Colonisation presents a significant challenge to the preservation and revitalisation of Indigenous moral philosophies, having disrupted traditional practices and knowledge transmission. Leaders can support decolonisation efforts by integrating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into the curriculum and promoting an inclusive and respectful school culture. This effort involves challenging colonial narratives and valuing Indigenous ways of knowing.

Modern interpretations can sometimes oversimplify or misrepresent Indigenous ethical frameworks, posing another challenge. Leaders must ensure the accurate and respectful representation of Indigenous philosophies in educational materials. Collaborating with Indigenous scholars and communities can help achieve this goal.

To build a more inclusive and equitable society, it is crucial for educative leaders to acknowledge the unique contributions of Indigenous moral philosophies and to seek common ground, particularly in areas such as environmental sustainability and social responsibility. Promoting mutual respect involves encouraging sensitivity and openness to different ethical traditions and fostering a culture of mutual respect and understanding. Examples like the SOAS toolkit for decolonising philosophy, which broadens the curriculum by incorporating diverse perspectives and reducing the dominance of Western philosophical traditions, provide valuable

models for how this might develop in educational institutions. By embracing these principles, educative leaders can create more inclusive and equitable educational environments that respect and integrate diverse moral philosophies.

References

Al Faruqi, I. R. (1986). *Al-Tawhid: Its implications for thought and life.* International Institute of Islamic Thought.

Alfred, T. (2009). *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom.* University of Toronto Press.

Anaya, S. J. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in international law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

An-Na'im, A. (2008). *Islam and the secular state: Negotiating the future of Shari'a.* Harvard University Press.

Barker, J. (2003). *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in Indigenous struggles for self-determination.* University of Nebraska Press.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Purich Publishing.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation.* Oxford University Press.

Berkovich, I. (2016). School leaders and transformational leadership theory: Time to part ways? *Journal of Educational Administration, 54*(5), 609–622. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2015-0100

Borrows, J. (2002). *Recovering Canada: The resurgence of Indigenous law.* University of Toronto Press.

Borrows, J. (2010). *Canada's Indigenous constitution.* University of Toronto Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Harper & Row.

Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education*. Kivaki Press.

Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence.* Clear Light Publishers.

Deloria Jr., V. (1972). *God is red: A Native view of religion.* Putnam Publishing Group.

Deloria Jr., V. (1999). *For this land: Writings on religion in America*. Routledge.

Deloria Jr., V. (2006). *The world we used to live in: Remembering the powers of the medicine men.* Fulcrum Publishing.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology.* Holt.

Dodson, M. (2003). *Conquest, coexistence and change: Australia 1788-1900.* ABC Books.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kāwanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, P. B. (1999). *Celtic dawn: A history of Celtic philosophy.* Constable.

Fixico, D. L. (2011). *The American Indian mind in a linear world: American Indian studies and traditional knowledge*. Routledge.

Green, M. (1995a). *The Celtic world.* Routledge.

Green, M. J. (1995b). *The world of the Druids.* Thames & Hudson.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217–247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale.* Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15533-3

Hele, K. S. (2023). Doctrine of discovery. *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/doctrine-of-discovery

Henry, E., & Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Māori: Locating Indigenous ontology, epistemology, and methodology in the academy. *Organization, 8*(2), 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082009

Jennings, P. A., DeMauro, A. A., & Mischenko, P. P. (2019). *The mindful school: Transforming school culture through mindfulness and compassion.* Guilford Press.

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the teachings of plants.* Milkweed Editions.

Knights, D., & O'Leary, M. (2006). Leadership, ethics and responsibility to the other. *Journal of Business Ethics, 67*(2), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9133-2

LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life.* South End Press.

LaDuke, W. (2005). *Recovering the sacred: The power of naming and claiming.* South End Press.

MacCulloch, J. A. (2003). *The religion of the ancient Celts.* Dover Publications.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory.* University of Notre Dame Press.

Macpherson, R.J.S. (2024). *Still approaching my prime: An autobiography.* SBPRA, in press.

Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori values.* Huia Publishers.

Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whanau in the modern world.* Victoria University Press.

Miller, B. G. (2003). *Invisible Indigenes: The politics of nonrecognition.* University of Nebraska Press.

Nash, R. J. (2010). *Moral conversations in the workplace: Using theoretical perspectives in practical ethics.* Information Age Publishing.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Ó Cróinín, D. (2005). *Early medieval Ireland 400–1200.* Longman.

Ó Crualaoich, G. (2003). *The book of the Cailleach: Stories of the wise-woman healer.* Cork University Press.

OECD. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/19991487

Patterson, J. (2000). *People of the land: A Pacific philosophy.* Dunmore Press.

Pere, R. R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Māori tradition.* Department of Sociology, University of Waikato.

Ramadan, T. (2009). *Radical reform: Islamic ethics and liberation.* Oxford University Press.

Reynolds, A. (1981). *Law and society in early medieval Europe: Studies in legal history.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Riggio, R. E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J. A. (2010). Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The Leadership Virtues Questionnaire. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(4), 235–250. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022134

Rose, D. B. (1992). *Dingo makes us human: Life and land in an Australian Aboriginal culture.* Cambridge University Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Simpson, L. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 3*(3), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.5206/decolonization.2014.3.3.1

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (2010). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* University of Otago Press.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023

Stanner, W. E. H. (1979). *White man got no dreaming: Essays 1938–1973.* Australian National University Press.

Strike, K. A. (2007). *Ethics and educational policy.* Pearson.

Swain, T. (1993). *A place for strangers: Towards a history of Australian Aboriginal being*. Cambridge University Press.

Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2016). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence, and future research focus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 44*(1), 146–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214558576

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316672222

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.5206/decolonization.2012.1.1.1

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end*. Penguin Books.

Wilkins, D. E. (2005). *American Indian politics and the American political system* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Williams, R. A. (2012). *Savage anxieties: The invention of Western civilization.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods.* Fernwood Publishing.

Woodcock, E. (2024a). *Decolonizing philosophy: A toolkit for inclusive education.* SOAS University of London.

Woodcock, N. (2024b). Schools urged to 'decolonise' their classrooms. *The Times*, 13 June, p. 12.

Author

Reynold Macpherson completed his PhD at Monash University, served as a senior lecturer at the University of New England, and was an associate professor at the University of Tasmania. He was Professor and Director of the Centre of Professional Development at the University of Auckland before being appointed as CEO of Waiariki Institute of Technology. He was then Foundational Chancellor, CEO and Professor of Strategic Management at Abu Dhabi University. He has also held a range of international consultancies and has published 17 books and over 70 articles in internationally refereed research journals.

Email: reynold@reynoldmacpherson.ac.nz

ORCID: 0009-0005-7207-1347