INDIGENOUS PEOPLE: EMANCIPATORY POSSIBILITIES IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Colleen McMurchy-Pilkington
Ngati Pikiao, Nagati Rongomai[1]
University of Auckland

In this article, I argue that emancipatory possibilities for Mäori, the Indigenous people of New Zealand, rely on structural changes that enable them to have control over resources, decision making, and meaning, and that emancipation is a journey traveled by oppressed groups as they exercise their collective agency. The 1990s development of *Pängarau,* the national mathematics curriculum policy in the medium of Mäori, provides the context for this discussion. Recent developments indicate that state structures have shifted towards giving Mäori more control in curriculum writing.

Key words: collective agency, state structures, Indigenous curriculum development, New Zealand education, Mäori education, mathematics education,

Dans cet article, l'auteure soutient que les possibilités d'émancipation des Maori, le peuple autochtone de la Nouvelle-Zélande, reposent sur des changements structuraux qui leur permettent d'avoir la haute main sur des ressources, la prise de décisions et l'orientation générale et que l'émancipation est un chemin parcouru par des groupes opprimés qui exercent une action collective. L'élaboration dans les années 1990 de *Pängarau,* le curriculum national de mathématiques en maori, fournit le contexte de l'analyse présentée ici. Des faits récents indiquent que les structures de l'État évoluent vers la remise d'un contrôle accru aux Maori pour ce qui est de l'élaboration des programmes d'études.

Mots clés : action collective, structures étatiques, élaboration de programmes d'études par des autochtones, éducation en Nouvelle-Zélande, éducation dispensée aux Maori, enseignement des mathématiques

_____

[1]Tribal affiliations of the author

Mäori are the Indigenous people of Aotearoa[1] New Zealand. Pakeha (non-Mäori) achieved dominance during the early years of colonisation in the 1800s. Colonisation processes and the education system rejected Mäori language and culture because they were deemed to be obstacles for the educational and social progress of Mäori. Mäori-Pakeha social relations since then have largely been typified by Pakeha dominance. Mäori as a group have been marginalised through legislation and educational policies, although some Mäori became implicated in their own hegemonic positioning.

Mäori have not always been compliant or passive recipients of these policies; like Indigenous peoples around the globe, they had "well-developed strategies of resistance" (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 81). Although Mäori eagerly sent their children to European-based schools to learn new knowledge and skills to enhance their own knowledge base, they were also active in writing to the provincial, and later the central, Education Department to protest the moralising and manual nature of the curriculum taught to their children (Simon, & Smith, 1998). Groups of Mäori parents have throughout the years raised their voices about the absence of Mäori knowledge in the curriculum and the marginalisation of their language from formal schooling (Adams, Clarke, Codd, O'Neill, Openshaw, & Waitere-Ang, 2001; Durie, 1998; Simon, 1990).

The 1970s saw the reassertion of traditional pedagogies and values become central strategies of resistance by Mäori groups (Stewart-Harawira, 2005). By the 1980s a strong movement had emerged for the renaissance of Mäori language and culture. Smith (2003) alleges that Mäori conscientization witnessed "a shift away from [Mäori] wanting things to be done to them, to doing things for themselves; a shift away from an emphasis on reactive politics to and an emphasis on being more proactive" (p. 2). The state supported this renaissance at one level through being more inclusive and consultative with Mäori, but at another level few if any major structural changes occurred, that is, changes in the economic power or ideological structures. I argue in this article that emancipatory possibilities for Mäori rely on structural changes that give Mäori more control over resources, decision making, and meaning.

The question I have explored in this article is: How have Mäori, the Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand, used their agency to exercise power, that is, to resist or accommodate in national curriculum policy development? I have used the term agency to denote reflection and action that involves consciously or unconsciously challenging and contesting (i.e., resisting) the formal structures to intervene or bring about changes in these structures (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). Accommodation is a willingness to adjust or modify one's actions in response to the needs of someone else, or to be adaptable enough to allow something to happen without a major change.

AN INDIGENOUS CASE STUDY

I consider this research question as a case study in the context of the development of Pängarau (mathematics), the first national document in the Mäori language. This question arises from a larger qualitative research project, undertaken by the writer (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a), that examined the development of Pängarau in the medium of Mäori in the early 1990s. In this larger study, I explored the micro-politics of the policy actors involved in Pängarau development, including their intentions, their engagement with state structures, and some of the outcomes of their activities. I conducted semi-structured interviews with 17 participants, mainly Mäori educators, who were involved directly (as curriculum writers) or indirectly (in a formal advisory role or in a state overseer capacity), interviewing some participants, like the contracted lead curriculum developer, more than once. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and presented as narrative voices to justify the research findings. As the research writer and Mäori, I was an interested observer rather than an insider to the development process. In this article, I report on one aspect of this larger study.

Critical theory and Kaupapa Mäori approaches underpin this research; the stance that I take is that curriculum development is a contested process among competing interest groups. As Apple (2003) argues, the official knowledge contained in curriculum policy is the result of compromises and conflicts between the state and civil society, in this instance between the state and a group of Mäori writers.

Mäori researchers have a strong attraction for critical theories because critical theorists question the inequalities and social malfunctions; they are committed to make changes towards a more just and fair society (G. Smith, 1997; L. Smith, 1999). Thus human agency is a focus within critical theory. Indigenous scholars including Mäori have developed Indigenous critical theories in response to researchers who have historically regarded Indigenous peoples as inferior objects of study "and whose research has been applied to the benefit of all but those whom they researched" (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 21).

Kaupapa Mäori theory is one such critical theory approach that examines resistance and struggle, and has an emancipatory focus (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; G. Smith, 1997; L. Smith, 1999). It is recognized that Indigenous struggle is neither singular nor homogenous, and that there is a need to struggle on several levels and in several sites, often simultaneously. There is an attempt to challenge unequal power relations and dominant/subordinate politics, and to work towards economic and structural changes (Smith, 2003). It is therefore transformative. Kaupapa Mäori theory promotes the validity of Mäori language, knowledge, and culture and creates political space to enable and legitimise the centring of matters Mäori. Further space is given over to Mäori voices that have long been silenced in the retelling of history.

A brief overview of the historical background of curriculum development and Mäori education in Aotearoa New Zealand is a necessary part of understanding Mäori involvement in policy development. Selected aspects of the development of Pängarau are discussed in this article, where Mäori voices demonstrate evidence of the exercise of power, resistance, and accommodation in their struggle for some control over resources, decision making, and meaning during the policy development process (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). According to Foucault (1990), resistance arises out of the exercise of power, and the notion of resistance links to people's ability as human agents to act in social situations. In the final section a brief discussion of current developments indicates that state structures have shifted towards enabling more control for Mäori in national curriculum development.

HISTORICAL ASPECTS

Curriculum Development and Education for Mäori

In the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, Aotearoa New Zealand's education system was built on an academic, formalised, and hierarchical structure with a centralised top-down system of curriculum. The curriculum, written in English, was controlled by external examinations and consistency was reinforced through school inspectors and officers from the Department of Education. Teachers' roles in curriculum development were minimal.

Mäori children were educated in missionary schools from 1814 until 1867 when they attended Native Schools set up under the 1867 Native Schools Act (Simon, 1990). These Native schools operated largely under Pakeha-defined (non-Mäori) structures, with curriculum and values using a Pakeha cultural perspective. The ultimate objective of the Native schools was to Europeanise Mäori by instilling those norms and values that the dominant Pakeha group deemed desirable (Simon, 1990; Stephenson, 2006). Non-Mäori teachers in Native schools were expected to take on the role of state agents in the inculcation of Pakeha middle-class norms not only at school but also within the entire Mäori community. They did so with varying levels of success; Mäori language and culture still remained strong in some rural areas, less so in the more populated towns. The 1877 Education Act established a national education system for all New Zealand children. Mäori children attended either state schools or the rural Native schools. Mäori language was banned in schools from the late 1800s (Ka'ai, 2004).

The colonization in Aotearoa New Zealand resonates with other Indigenous groups who have engaged in struggles to retain their culture and historical identities in the face of cultural domination in educational systems that "deny, distort, and destroy indigenous cultures" (Fenelon & Le Beau, 2006, p. 22; for other examples see Cajete, 1999; Castellano, Davis, & Lahache, 2000; Lipka, 1998).

Until the 1980s, curricula were written in English and intended for all New Zealanders including Mäori. There were no formal curriculum statements written in the Mäori language, although there was a Mäori language syllabus, mainly written in English, for those communities

wanting to include some Mäori language and culture. If Mäori teachers were involved in curriculum development, it was usually as a minority member of a consultative group, or working under the supervision and direction of non-Mäori Ministry of Education (MOE) policy makers.

A national meeting of Mäori elders was called in 1980 to address concerns about the decline of the Mäori language, as indicated in Benton's (1979) report. After much discussion, the elders returned to their tribal areas to set up *Te Kohanga Reo*, early childhood language nests, to save the language (Durie, 1998; Ka'ai, 2004). In *Te Kohanga Reo*, babies and young children, along with some of their parents, learned Mäori through language immersion from elders and those fluent in Mäori. *Te Kohanga Reo* blossomed around the country to well over 500 centres in six years (Jenkins, 1994).

A group of Mäori parents, who were concerned that their children's Mäori language was not being maintained when they left *Te Kohanga Reo*, began the first *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* (Mäori medium) school in 1985. *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* like *Te Kohanga Reo* began outside the state system, funded by Mäori (Durie, 1998; Jenkins, 1994; Smith, 1997). *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* not only incorporates Mäori language and structures but it also provides a critique of the existing state schooling policies. In starting their own education initiatives, Mäori parents were saying state education was not meeting Mäori needs and was failing Mäori children (Smith, 1997). Features of the *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* include teaching and learning occurring within a Mäori framework, spiritual dimensions of the learners are given important consideration, and Mäori is the medium of instruction.

After political lobbying by Mäori and supportive non-Mäori, the *Kura Kaupapa* movement was incorporated into, and funded by, the state system (Ka'ai, 2004; Smith, 1997). The number of *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* schools has grown with state and Mäori community support. In becoming a part of the state system, both *Te Kohanga Reo* and *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* have given up some of their autonomy because they are now subject to controls by the state, for example through funding and national curriculum requirements. *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* is chosen by only about 20 per cent of Mäori; 80 per cent of Mäori families send their children to state public schools.

POLITICAL AND CURRICULUM CHANGES

The election of the Labour party in Aotearoa New Zealand in 1984 saw the beginning of a neo-liberal transformation (Adams, et al., 2001; Jesson, 2001). This ideological shift brought about major reforms from the mid 1980s in many of the activities of the state. Because New Zealand Treasury was of the opinion that the middle level of governmental bureaucratic structures was costly and unnecessary, sections of the state such as the Curriculum Division of the Department of Education were downsized. In line with new public management models, an increased emphasis occurred on a separation of policy advice from policy implementation, and a separation of funding from providers (Adams, et al., 2001). Policy advice and policy development became services provided to the state through the mechanism of external contracting. Contracted agents delivered curriculum policy to specifications set by the Ministry of Education (MOE), for a price, and in a particular time frame, both of which were specified in a contract (Jesson, 2001).

Throughout the early 1990s, the Ministry of Education contracted out the writing of national policies for each of seven curriculum areas. Mathematics was the first curriculum policy developed under contractual arrangements. These policies were written in English. After lobbying from various Mäori groups over a number of years, such as *Kura Kaupapa Mäori* schools and teachers, bilingual teachers, Mäori parents, and non-Mäori educators, the Minister of Education made the decision to write curriculum policies in the Mäori language. Whereas a collective Mäori voice had been largely absent from curriculum policy development, 'contracting out' was enabling for Mäori; Mäori became contract devel-opers for curriculum written in Mäori (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a).

PÄNGARAU DEVELOPMENT

Two years after the beginning of the national curricula in English, the MOE employed a Mäori educator to oversee first the Mäori medium mathematics curriculum and then four of the subsequent curricula written in Mäori (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). Stewart-Harawira (2005) suggests that the state's response to Mäori initiatives was to co-opt Mäori aspirations and Mäori people into the state structures. The Mäori

Project Manager began with the MOE in 1992. Her first job was to become famil-iar with ministry structures and in particular the processes for national curriculum development in the contracting out system. An advertisement was placed in *The Education Gazette*[2] on 16 June 1992 for expressions of interest for Mäori contract writers to develop Pängarau. A Mäori lead writer/contractor was eventually appointed, and after negotiating aspects of his contract, he assembled a team of 10 Mäori teachers to write Pängarau. The writers met nationally as a group on a number of occasions, also working in pairs or individually on sections, coming back to the main group to share their progress and gain feedback from each other. The lead writer collated the writing and wrote regular milestone reports for the group, which were presented to the MOE through the Mäori Project Manager.

An integral aspect of the MOE contracting process was the establishment of external advisory groups: a Policy Advisory Group (PAG) and a Contract Review Committee (CRC) who assisted the MOE to oversee the process and make decisions. These two groups ensured the Mäori writers did not capture the process or the policy content. Mäori curric-ulum writers provided milestone reports and written drafts to these groups on a regular basis. The CRC regularly reviewed the writing progress to ensure the Mäori contractors were keeping within the timeline and the allocated budget, thus giving value for money within the contract requirements. The PAG, who were Mäori, gave feedback for the writers through the Mäori Project Manager on the content and the Mäori vocabulary in Pängarau drafts.

Although Mäori either in small groups or as isolated individuals had never relinquished the contested nature of their relationship with the authoritative state, the cycle of Mäori resistance and the exercise of collective power were rekindled during the curriculum development process.

MANAGEMENT OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

In exploring the multifaceted way in which power works, Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan (1998) suggest a useful four-dimensional model to demonstrate that power works at several levels. In the following section, I discuss the development of Pängarau under the headings of

management (or control) of the resources, decision making, meaning, and power in the system.

Management of Resources

The focus of the first dimension or level of power is management of resources (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). Power is exercised through using or controlling scarce resources on which groups depend. These resources include not merely control of money, rewards, and sanctions but also information, expertise, and access to those higher up the hierarchy. In the development of Pängarau, the MOE controlled both the financial and people resources. A contract price was clearly stated and the MOE laid down the processes so that the writers did not have direct access to those above them – the Policy Advisory Group and the Curriculum Review Committee.

On appointment as the Pängarau development contractor, negotiations began between the MOE Mäori Project Manager (MPM) and the lead contractor. From the outset, the lead Mäori contractor, Tony[3] wanted to consult with various *iwi* (tribal) groups around the country for appropriate Mäori language terms for the mathematics curriculum. Finding relevant technical mathematical language in Mäori was one area that concerned the Pängarau writers. They did not believe they had the mandate from Mäori for some of the decisions that had to be made for the Mäori vocabulary necessary to discuss mathematics in Mäori. The MOE did not allow resources in the budget for this process. There was no budgeted allowance in the English medium curriculum because mathematics vocabulary in the English language has had hundreds of years to evolve and develop; this has not been the case for mathematics vocabulary in Maori. Early in Pängarau development, some Mäori writers used their agency to make unofficial visits to several of the writers' tribal areas, "at our own cost," to discuss the Mäori vocabulary. As one of the Mäori writers noted:

That was always the issue from [Mäori] people, not just for that [Pängarau] but all the other documents – no time, no resources were allowed for research . . . . I remember I took Tony to Ruatoki,[4] and he used to go to his own people. We used to go to our own communities, our own *kuia, koroua* [Mäori elders] to ask what

was the word for such and such. We had to do this in our own time. There was no money. (MW, Mäori writer)

However after some resistance by the writers and further debate, the MOE accommodated. "A budget was eventually set aside for this consultation" (Tony).

This consultation process also necessitated extra time to travel around the country visiting various *iwi* (tribes) to ensure that the mathematics vocabulary did not merely reflect minority views or specific tribes. The Mäori Project Manager (MPM) acknowledged the importance of this consultation and the extra costs involved. She exercised her power to justify to her MOE senior manager why an extension of the timeline and an increased budget were necessary.

Yes . . . I was spreading it out over a longer period of time and justifying to my manager why. Because that included costs and I had to say well, the reason we are doing this is because we just haven't got the number of [Mäori] mathematicians and the *reo* [language] is brand new, that we have all these other issues that we had to face and get our heads around. (MPM)

A number of other areas in the development process caused debate and although the Mäori writers resisted, in many instances they eventually accepted the MOE contract conditions. "Yeah, we generally accepted it and got on with the job, you just had to. In the end they [MOE] held the purse strings, they were the boss" (MW: Mäori Writer).

The writers did not have direct access to the Policy Advisory Group and the Curriculum Review Committee; instead the Mäori Policy Manager communicated the feedback of these groups on the draft writing to the Mäori writers. The Mäori writers having direct access to the advisory groups for discussion not only had resourcing implications (everyone would need to be flown to the capital city plus accommodation costs) but this policy also placed limits on the human resources available to the Mäori writers thus restricting the decision-making processes.

Management of Decision Making

The second dimension of power involves management or control of decision making (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). It may be assumed that those who do not access or participate in decision making do not engage because of satisfaction and consensus. However, those who control the decision making can make or determine outcomes from behind the scenes, allowing only safe issues or questions to appear on the agenda.

The PAG and the CRC determined outcomes for the writers from behind the scenes, through an arms-length relationship. They made comments and gave suggestions in written reports, which were given to the Mäori Project Manager. The MPM revealed that she would often rewrite the advice in the report from the Advisory groups to the Mäori contractors, changing the language so the contractors did not take the comments personally and would be more likely to accept the recommendations made. There was an expectation that the Mäori writers would comply with the feedback and decisions of these Advisory groups. At times this meant the PAG feedback given on behalf of the Ministry changed what the writers wrote, a process in which the MOE was clearly in charge.

Tony was accountable, and this [the curriculum] was not going to happen unless we complied with what they [MOE] wanted . . . .

But when it went down there [to the MOE] as a draft and the document actually came back, I looked at it and I thought this is not what I wrote. I was really devastated [at the changes] . . . if they didn't want us to write it why didn't they write it themselves and save that money. (MW)

These quotations highlight the MOE endeavors to manage the meaning of Pängarau for Mäori.

Management of Meaning

The third dimension involves management of meaning (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). A considerable difference in assumptions occurs between the first two dimensions and this third one. Power is used not just to fight conflict, but power can also be the reason why conflict does

not arise in the first place. Power shapes people's perceptions, preferences, and thinking such that they accept their role in the existing order of things. In this dimension conflict is unlikely to arise because people think there is no alternative, or that their state is natural and unchangeable, or divinely ordained and beneficial (Freire, 1972). Mäori voices indicated that although they resisted in some areas they eventually accommodated to the MOE requirement that a parallel curriculum be written because the Mäori writers believed there were no alternatives.

A strong area of contention between the Mäori contractors and the MOE was the content of the Pängarau curriculum. Mäori wanted a curiculum that reflected Mäori knowledge and how they thought about the world. However, the contract firmly stated that Pängarau was to have the same achievement objectives and structure as the English medium curriculum. Both the MOE advertisement calling for expressions of interest and the Pängarau development contract signed six months later con-tained the same clause: "The document will be parallel to the recently published curriculum statement *Mathematics in the National Curriculum*, maintaining the existing achievement objectives. . ." (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). The MOE remained adamant on this area. Although the Mäori writers initially resisted this requirement, Mäori eventually accommodated so the contract could go ahead. The meaning of mathem-atics for Mäori, based on Western ways of viewing the world, was being controlled by the non-Mäori MOE. Some of the Mäori writers noted,

Really what the government wanted was a document that, for whatever reasons . . . they're [Mäori learners] doing exactly the same things as their Pakeha [non-Mäori] counterpart . . . for what they wanted I think we delivered. (MW)

But then that was not the way we were allowed to write. There was a format, MOE said we had to follow [and we followed it]. (MW)

Defining the Mäori word for mathematics was a further area where the MOE controlled the meaning.

[In the end] we were pretty unanimous as a writing group that the mathematical word we would use was *tatai* because we felt it encapsulated all the things that we thought mathematics was. However the ministry at that time was using the word *Pängarau* . . . in their literature and in the resources, so we had to use *Pängarau*. (MW)

Power in the System

The fourth dimension largely rests on the ideas of Foucault, who proposed that power is embedded in a system (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). Foucault challenged the idea of sovereign power that underpins the first three dimensions. Power is not something that is static, nor is it possessed by someone to share or use over another; rather it circulates within and between individuals (Foucault, 1990). Both Mäori and non-Mäori (MOE) involved in Pängarau development used their agency, exercising their power at times to resist the processes, while at other times to accommodate in accepting the process or the content (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). Power was by no means something that the ministry possessed, to be exercised authoritatively over Mäori. Power flowed in both directions.

Both groups, the Mäori writers and the MOE, engaged in an exercise of power to make changes in the system or the processes. For Mäori it was important to incorporate Mäori ways of doing and thinking in the curriculum although this added to the time frame and the cost of processes. The MOE requirements and budget for Pängarau development did not allow for many of these to take place. However, Mäori ensured Mäori processes happened despite the MOE requirements. For example, Mäori went ahead with consultations and giving *koha* (a donation when visiting tribal *marae[5]*); *kaumatua* and *kuia* (Mäori elders) became an integral part of the writing and consultations; the lead contract writer ensured the writing team represented most of the large tribal areas; *whanaungatanga* (relationships and connections); *karakia* (prayer and spirituality) and *kai* (food) were a normal part of meetings.

We didn't always seem to [be allowed] time for Mäori processes; they [MOE] just assume that things can be done in a similar time frame [as the English medium curriculum]. We get around it by using our processes anyway. (MW)

In the national development of the 1990s curriculum, writers were not permitted to meet and talk to other curriculum writers. In line with the practice of separating policy advice from policy development and implementation, Advisory Group members were kept separate from the writers, despite the perceived advantages of face-to-face interactions. The Mäori world places strong importance on the value of *kanohi ki te kanohi*: the *seen face* where respect is gained from face to face interactions. Mäori processes and protocols of making connections with people (*whanaungatanga*) mean that one way or another, Mäori educators meet other Mäori educators during the course of their involvement in wider education or Mäori contexts. Therefore, despite expectations of the MOE, Mäori, kept apart through formal processes, still engaged in informal *kanohi ki te kanohi* interactions.

When the writers completed the final draft of Pängarau (Te Tahuhu o te Matauranga, 1994), it was submitted to the MOE. The MOE was unhappy to discover that the Mäori writers had not directly translated the learning outcomes from the English medium curriculum; rather the writers had written the essence of the learning outcomes in Mäori. As the lead writer indicates, the MOE exercised their power in getting aspects of the draft rewritten.

We had translated the concept of each learning outcome [from the English medium curriculum]. The Ministry then contracted *Te Taura Whiri* [Mäori Language Commission] to rewrite all the learning outcomes, in other words to translate the English medium ones [and include them in the Mäori curriculum]. (Tony)

The Mäori writers relate further examples of both resistance and accommodation during the development of Pängarau to show that power circulates and flows in both directions.

I think over the development of all the curriculum she [Mäori Project Manager] was more able to say to the ministry, no we're going to do it like this, and the ministry has probably become more accepting that it doesn't have to be done exactly the same as the Pakeha [English medium] ones have been done. (MW)

We [Mäori] are also gaining more confidence about our *take* [causes] and we're more likely to say what we think now. (MW)

These Mäori voices indicate that Mäori gained more confidence in being assertive and resisting (being empowered). Mäori also knew that at times they could gain positive benefits from exercising agency by accommodating, especially to meet the greater goals and aspirations of Mäori in the revitalisation of their Mäori language and culture. As a Mäori writer explained,

I don't ever think anyone really doubted that this first one [curriculum] was just a political document . . . . The feeling was . . . the document's got to be done . . . the document has got to be done because it's got to be there. Whether it's used or not, it's actually irrelevant here, this is a political document. We knew it was never going to be perfect but that didn't matter because the political imperative [of language revitalisation] over-rode all those things, because next time we knew . . . we will be much better prepared [to resist]. (MW)

The MOE exercised agency by giving the completed draft to the Mäori Language Commission to rewrite the learning outcomes. Their actions could be considered an attempt by the MOE to control the meaning of mathematics for Mäori. The MOE further contracted Tony the lead writer to sit beside the Commission to assist them in this re-writing. In the following quotation, he indicates how rather than get into a conflict situation with MOE, he accommodated to the wishes of the MOE so that Mäori gained the benefits that he believed Mäori would achieve from having a Pängarau policy written in Mäori.

Yes I assisted in that process [of helping the Mäori Language Commission to rewrite the Achievement Objectives in Mäori]. I didn't translate it but I helped the translator interpret the mathematics . . . . It was because we [Mäori] were at a point where we needed that curriculum document to get out. It was a credibility thing . . . . We felt the message in the *marautanga* [curriculum] was important, but we also wanted the professional development for Mäori teachers and the resources that would come with it. The only way that was going to happen was if we got the *marautanga* out, so if we had resisted, it was out of our hands anyway, it was going to happen whether I helped or not. (Tony)

On the surface, power is exercised through mobilizing scarce and critical resources, and through the control of decision making. At a deeper level power is exercised by managing the meanings that shape

others' lives. Deeper still, power is embedded in the fabric of the system, constraining how Mäori see, what they see, and how they think, in ways that limit their capacity for resistance (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). However, it would be a mistake to assume that having no control over the management of resources, decision making, or meaning indicates that Mäori without this control remain docile.

DISCUSSION

Although MOE structures were dominant and constrained Mäori agency through laying down the requirements for Pängarau policy, Mäori were not passive recipients of policy development. In the previous section, Mäori voices recalling their actions and those of the MOE testify that dominance and control were not unidirectional, or top-down from the authoritative state to the Mäori writers. It is evident that "Power is not simply what the dominant class has and the oppressed lack" (Hoy, 1986, p. 134). In opposing state dominance, the Mäori actors asserted some control, to varying degrees, in overt and covert ways.

The notion of resistance highlights the ability as human agents to act in social situations as well as to be acted upon (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993). But resistance is not a straightforward concept as the above examples suggest. Mäori curriculum developers both acted (resisted or accommodated) and were acted upon by the MOE. The importance of the notion of resistance lies "in the connections it makes between structure and human agency . . ." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993, p. 101). Some of the MOE structures like the resourcing, the contract requirements, and the prescribed nature of the curriculum had the potential to constrain agency but were also points of resistance (exercising of power or agency). In using their agency, Mäori in Pängarau development sometimes accom-modated, having decided that was the best course of action at that point, rather than resistance. A good example of this accommodation occurred when Tony decided to assist rather than resist the Mäori Language Com-mission's rewriting of the Achievement Objectives. Other MOE struc-tures enabled or assisted Mäori agency, such as having a process for con-tracting out curriculum development and eventually extending the time frame and extra funding for travel to tribal areas.

Aronowitz and Giroux (1993) note power is usually defined as a negative force and recognized in contexts where it is claimed to "reproduce relations of domination and subordinacy" (p. 150). However they allege

. . . power is both a negative and positive force. Its character is dialectical, and its mode of operation is always more than simply repressive. In actuality, power is the root of all forms of behavior in which people say no, struggle, resist, use oppositional modes of discourse, and fight for a different vision of the future. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993, p. 150)

Power usually arises from an active struggle, and those in subordinate positions who appear powerless are by no means always the losers. Although Mäori may not have met all their aspirations, Mäori made some positive gains from the policy development through their active struggle and their reflexive action. For a start, Mäori had not previously had an opportunity "to discuss at a reasonably deep philosophical level what mathematics was . . . or curriculum issues" so it "gave an oppor-tunity for a large number of people to up-skill themselves in both Mäori language and mathematics content, and in developing a curriculum" (Tony).

We felt it was an opportunity to engage . . . in some real mathematics education issues that in the past we'd been totally excluded from. We also saw it as an opportunity to develop the vocabulary further . . . a better understanding of what Mäori mathematics was all about if there was such a thing . . . to develop our own understanding of western mathematics . . . because in order to translate a lot of it, we had to go back to the origins of western mathematics, and so it was really a huge up-skill for all of us. . . . Further in consulting with our Mäori communities it had an educative function [in mathematics] for them. We also knew that once it had become a nationally recognized curriculum statement that the state and educational institutions were obliged by law to support it . . . in one way or another through professional development, through resource develop-ment, and that's I guess at the end of the day the huge positive out of it if I look back. (Tony)

Mäori were empowered through the development process. They became more confident, assertive, and their confidence and self-efficacy

in mathematics increased. Nonetheless, although they became aware of the power of the state, Mäori worked largely within the existing structures. Mäori as a collective critically analyzed, resisted, and challenged the system and some of the structures of power, but at the end of the day the structures largely remained the same. Mäori writers' resistance or collective agency brought about limited changes to the structures. Mäori achieved empowerment but not emancipation (Inglis, 1997). Conscien-tization can bring about enlightenment and empowerment, but knowing about the oppressive structures does not necessarily change them. Eman-cipation is about using the knowledge attained so that power is exercised collectively to bring about changes to dominant macro structures. It is essential then for both empowerment, with individuals being conscien-tized, and emancipation, with those who are empowered, working as a collective to transform social and political structures that oppress them.

Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan's (1998) model rests on the assumption that power is exercised through dimensions of power (control of resources, decision making, meaning, and power in the system). For Mäori having control of the first three dimensions necessitates changing the structures, that is, emancipatory action. Emancipation can only be achieved through acquiring those dimensions of power that were denied to Mäori. Mäori need to gain greater access to avenues of control and resources (Adams et al., 2000). During the development process of Pängarau, the state was largely dominant in controlling these dimensions. At times, Mäori were assertive in gaining some control in the process (i.e., the fourth dimension of power), for example, for approval for cultural processes like *iwi* consultation, and an additional contract to collate the vocabulary. However, these gains were limited because Mäori had no control over meaning (the third level of power). The MOE's contract was very clear: that Pängarau was to be a parallel curriculum. Mäori knowledge was deemed not worthy, although Mäori language, the language of the curriculum, was legitimated, a gain for Mäori. Through control of meaning, the MOE endeavored to constrain how Mäori saw and thought about the world through mathematics.

Apple (2003) questions whose knowledge is selected in curriculum and he reminds educators that the official knowledge that is selected "is

the result of conflicts and compromises both within the state and between the state and civil society" (p. 7). Hegemony involves the power to decide what counts as legitimate but there is a sense of constant movement, of conflict, dynamic contestation, and unstable compromises that ultimately lead to further movement between the state and its relations with civil society, in this instance a group of Mäori writers. For Mäori, curriculum is still a site of contestation about whose knowledge is valued (Adams et al., 2000).

Some of the state's processes and structures to regulate Mäori to ensure they incorporate what was considered important knowledge included the setting up of the PAC and CRC and the utilization of the Mäori Language Commission. However, Mäori also engaged in counter-hegemonic processes as they contested, negotiated, and accommodated to the state during the development of Pängarau, for example meeting face-to-face and incorporating Mäori processes regardless of Ministry and the Advisory group's expectations. Thus policy was not done to Mäori because they have become more conscientized in their dealings with the state and more sophisticated in their resistance to state structures. The words of Touraine are a relevant reminder: "We must resolutely reject all discourses that try to convince us that we are powerless" (as cited in Apple, 2003, p. 17).

Nonetheless there is a need to be cautious about romanticizing resistance and making an assumption that acts of resistance always lead to progressive policies (Apple, 2003, p. 13). There is no guarantee that counter-hegemonic action will bring about desirable change for those engaged in exercising agency. There are both limits and possibilities in counter hegemonic activity. "The key is to recognize the possibilities of both without romanticizing the later, since this is decidedly not a level playing field politically, culturally, or economically" (Apple, 2003, p. 17).

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

In 2004 the MOE completed a curriculum stock take of both English and Mäori medium curricula. The stock take, 10 years on from the development of the first national curricula in the Mäori language, included a commissioned literature review of what Mäori communities were saying, and summaries of Mäori teacher interviews expressing

their thoughts about curriculum (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004b). Recommend-ations from the report stress the importance of having an inclusive philosophy for curriculum that is underpinned by Mäori beliefs and values and Mäori ways of viewing the world: links to be made with *Te Köhanga Reo* and other Mäori medium early childhood organisations to enable a more seamless curriculum development, and a more comprehensive, inclusive, holistic, integrative curriculum framework that reflects Mäori status as *tangata whenua* (Indigenous people of the land).

Work has begun on rewriting the national curriculum framework that underpins the seven national curricula. Writers have been commissioned, advisory groups have been established, with significant stake-holder involvement. For the Mäori curricula, this process includes Mäori teachers, educators, *kaumatua* (elders), sub-tribe and tribal input. Together they are building the curriculum framework and the curricula. This process suggests that the culture of Mäori communities, and the knowledge and values of the curricula "coevolve" (Lipka, 1998, p. 176) as connections are strengthened among community practices, Mäori knowledge, and schooling. The MOE has developed a formal process to foster diaogue among Mäori policy developers inclusive of community at both horizontal and vertical levels as an integral aspect of policy development and educational planning. What Mäori are seeing is a more ecological process of education "that allows Indigenous people to become agents of transformation in their own social and cultural contexts" (Cajete, 1994, p. 218).

In returning to the original question of this article, I point out that Mäori voices have testified to the presence of the exercise of power, resistance, and accommodation in Pängarau, at multidimensional levels and in bi-directional ways. At times power was exercised and flowed both from Mäori writers to the state, and vice versa. Curriculum development occurred in the tensions and negotiations between structure and agency.

Although Pängarau was written in Mäori but not based on a foundation of Mäori knowledge or Mäori ways of understanding the world, Mäori feel they have made some positive gains, in particular a revitalization of the language. In the 1990s two Mäori curriculum writers

declared, "We realize that curriculum are all the result of human hands, that we can change them" and that "there never is a final curriculum . . . . curriculum will continue to evolve and change" (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a). Curriculum like emancipation is a progressive journey.

Through asserting some control in covert or overt ways, Mäori actors exercised power to change the process, or at least to register a hegemonic protest to the dominant view of Western mathematics and the oppresssive MOE structures. In doing so, some positive gains were made for Mäori in the form of national curricula written in Mäori, Mäori language development, curriculum resources in Mäori language, and professional development for teachers and Mäori communities. Mäori exercised power in an endeavor to obtain a different vision of the future than has been available under the effects of colonisation.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I have highlighted some of the oppressive state structures that have constrained Mäori agency in curriculum policy development: the state's domination in the control of the resources, decision making, and management of meaning. The contention is that Mäori were empowered during the process, such that Mäori demonstrated that they can produce a mathematics curriculum policy written in Mäori language, albeit one parallel to the English medium policy. Evidence was also presented to demonstrate that Mäori exercised collective agency, acting assertively in an endeavor to change the structures. At times Mäori achieved some limited success in changing the structures. But what is also evident is that the bureaucratic state remained dominant, using its legitimate authority to control Mäori if they did not carry out the wishes of the state. Mäori may have become empowered during the process, but overall Mäori were not emancipated. Although exercising some power and agency, Mäori largely worked within the state structures, rather than effected changes to them. The state still managed and controlled Mäori, especially in the area of knowledge construction. For Mäori to continue on an emancipatory journey, the state must work with Mäori and make structural changes, giving them more control over the resources, decisions, and meaning.

During 2006 and 2007, Mäori have been involved in the rewriting of the national curriculum framework and national curriculum policies in Mäori. These have been published in draft form and feedback from communities has been invited with submissions closing in April 2008. At this point Mäori feel optimistic about future curriculum policy. There are indications that the state has listened to Mäori voices, and Mäori are being given more control over resources, decisions, and meaning than in the past. In their journey of language and knowledge revitalization, Mäori are continuing to exercise their agency in their engagement with state structures. However it is imperative that Mäori continue to share devel-opments and success stories with other Indigenous and non-Indigenous educators across the globe so they can learn from, and be supportive of each other.

NOTES

[1] Aotearoa is the name many Mäori use for New Zealand.

[2] *The Education Gazette,* a fortnightly Ministry of Education official publication, announces new state policies, education initiatives, and vacant positions in schools and educational institutions throughout Aotearoa New Zealand.

[3] Tony is the first name of the Pängarau lead contractor. Because Tony's strong involvement in Mäori medium education and in particular curriculum development is well known in Aotearoa New Zealand, it was decided not to use a pseudonym. His name has been used in this article and other writing with his permission (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2004a).

[4] Ruatoki, a town on New Zealand's east coast, has a predominantly Mäori population.

[5] *Marae* are Mäori communal facilities on tribal lands, which include open areas, a large meeting house, often carved and decorated, a dining hall, and other facilities. Mäori *hui* (meeting and debates) often take place at *marae*. Many educational institutions including high schools have a pan tribal *marae*.

REFERENCES

Adams, P., Clarke, D., Codd, J., O'Neill, A-M., Openshaw, R., & Waitere-Ang, H. (2000). *Education & society in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Apple, M. W. [with] Aasen, P., Cho, M. K., Gandin, L. A., Oliver, A., Sung, Y-K, Tarares, H., & Wong, T-H. (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Aronowitz, S. A., & Giroux, H. A. (1993). *Education still under siege* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Benton, R. (1979). *The legal status of the Maori language: Current reality and future prospects. A special report.* Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Maori Research Unit.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

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

Cajete, G. (1999). *Igniting the sparkle: An Indigenous science education mode*l. Skyand, NC: Kivaki Press.

Castellano, M. B., Davis, L., & Lahache, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Aboriginal education: Fulfilling the promise.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Durie, M. H. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of Maori self-determination.* Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

Fenelon, J. V., & Le Beau, D. (2006). Four directions for Indian education: Curriculum models for Lakota and Dakota teaching and learning. In I. Abu-Saad, & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (pp. 21-68). Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1, trans. R Hurley). London, UK: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (trans. M. Bergman Ramos). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Hardy, C., & Leiba-O'Sullivan, S. (1998). The power behind empowerment: Implications for research and practice. *Human Relations,* 51(4), 451-483.

Hoy, D. C. (1986). Power, repression, progress: Foucault, Lukes, and the Frankfurt School. In D. C. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 123-148). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Inglis, T. (1997). Empowerment and emancipation. *Adult Education Quarterly,* 48(1), 3-17.

Jenkins, K. (1994). Mäori education: A cultural experience and dilemma for the state – A new direction for Mäori society. In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins, J. Marshall, & L. Massey (Eds.), *The politics of learning and teaching in Aotearoa - New Zealand* (pp. 148-179). Palmerston North, NZ: The Dunmore Press.

Jesson, J. (2001). Transforming New Zealand education. In V. Carpenter, H. Dixon, E. Rata, & C. Rawlinson (Eds.), *Theory in practice for educators* (pp. 89-108). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Ka'ai, T. M. (2004). Te mana o te reo me ngä tikanga – Power and politics of the language. In T. M. Ka'ai, J. C. Moorfield, M. P. J. Reilly, & S. Mosley (Eds.). *Ki te whaiao: An Introduction to Maori culture and society* (pp. 201-213). Auckland, NZ: Pearson Education.

Lipka, J. (1998). Expanding curricular and pedagogical possibilities: Yup'ik-Based mathematics, science, and literacy. In J. Lipka, G. V. Mohatt, & The Ciulistet Group. *Transforming the culture of schools: Yup'ik Eskimo examples* (pp. 139-182). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2004a). *Pängarau Mäori medium mathematics curriculum: Empowerment or new hegemonic accord.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2004b, October 18). *Literature review Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa.*: Final Research Report Commissioned for the Ministry of Education, Wellington, New Zealand.

Simon, J. A. (1990). *The place of schooling in Mäori Pakeha relations.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Simon, J., & Smith, L. T. (1998). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the New Zealand native school system.* Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.

Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Mäori: Theory and praxis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Smith, G. H. (2003, October). *Indigenous struggle for the transformation of education and schooling.* Keynote address to the Alaskan Federation and Natives (AFN) Convention. Anchorage, Alaska, US. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from http://www.kaupapamaori.com/assets//indigenous_struggle.pdf

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.*

Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.

Stephenson, M. (2006, October 26-29). Education, state formation and nation building: Explaining institutional differentiation in New Zealand education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American History of Education Society, Ottawa, ON.

Stewart-Harawira, M. (2005). *The new imperial order: Indigenous responses to globalization.* London, UK: Zed Books.

Te Tahuhu o te Matauranga. (1994). *Pängarau te tauaki marautanga: He tauira*. Whanganui a Tara, NZ: Te Pou Taki Korero.

Colleen McMurchy-Pilkington, from Ngati Pikiao, Ngati Rongomai, is a Principal Lecturer and co-Head of the School of Te Puna Wananga, Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand. She lectures in Mäori education, teacher education, policy studies, politics, and culture of education on the Bachelors and Masters programme. Colleen's research interests, underpinned by social justice, include curriculum policy development, Kaupapa Mäori and cross cultural research, politics of education, low-decile schooling, the achievement of Mäori learners, and the gate keeping role of mathematics education.

Contact: c.mcmurchy@auckland.ac.nz