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Educational Leadership and Indigeneity: 
Doing Things the Same, Differently

MARGIE KAHUKURA HOHEPA (NGĀPUHI) 
*University of Waikato, New Zealand*

Educational leadership, it is argued, must play a critical role in improving student outcomes, especially those of minoritized and Indigenous students. In the process of improving education and schooling for Indigenous students, Indigenous educational leadership needs to be considered alongside educational leadership more generally. This article focuses on a particular Indigenous landscape—Māori—and examines tensions relating to a project about educational leadership linked with desired student outcomes. The tensions are located in identifying generic aspects of educational leadership in relation to desired student outcomes on the one hand and ensuring that distinctive features of Māori leadership are recognized on the other. Indigeneity is identified as a space in which such ongoing tensions can be addressed and in which what is wanted from Māori educational leadership can be examined and established.

Introduction

Educational leadership has come under close scrutiny in order to identify and understand what kinds of leadership knowledge, skills, and practices facilitate the achievement of valued or desired student outcomes (Witziers et al. 2003). Of noted concern is the identification of aspects of educational leadership that can address underachievement among students from marginalized and poorly served groups. In many countries, particularly those that have experienced colonization, those groups poorly served by education systems include Indigenous students (Hughes et al. 2007; Shields 2004). That countries on the North American continent are included in the above is reflected in the development of this special issue on leadership in American Indian and Alaska Native education. *Aotearoa*-New Zealand is another such country.
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Introducing a Riddle

My father often asked this riddle when I was a child—“What is the difference between a duck?” The answer being, “one of its legs is both the same.” Maybe it is a kind of humor that an Indigenous person or linguist (my father is both) and their children might find excruciatingly funny (my siblings and I did anyway). It is a riddle that also encapsulates some not-so-funny tensions that emerged for me as an Indigenous cowriter of a best evidence synthesis on educational leadership (Robinson et al. 2009).

The best evidence synthesis program in Aotearoa-New Zealand aims to “systematically identify and bring together, evaluate, analyze, synthesize, and make accessible, relevant evidence linked to a range of learner outcomes in a timely manner, to facilitate the optimising of desirable outcomes for the diverse learners in the New Zealand education system” (Ministry of Education 2004, 5). As such, the program has resulted in the provision of valuable insights from certain bodies of research literature, which helps to inform the delivery of education in our country.

The best evidence synthesis on school leadership involved the identification of leadership characteristics linked to improving a range of desired outcomes for diverse learners in English and Māori medium education. English medium education refers to schooling that delivers curricular content and instruction in the English language. Māori medium education is a term used to umbrella a range of schooling provisions in which students are taught either all or some curricular content through the Māori language in immersion or bilingual programs. Māori medium education provisions range from classrooms or units in largely English medium schools through to stand-alone schools that operate within explicit Māori cultural, philosophical, and tribal frameworks (Ministry of Education 2008a).

I was brought into the best evidence synthesis work on school leadership initially to focus on educational leadership in Māori medium schooling, although the brief was soon expanded to include the synthesis work more generally. The tensions that emerged out of the work, and that I sought to manage, encompassed identifying generic aspects of educational leadership linked to desired student outcomes from existing research literature on the one hand, and on the other hand, recognizing that there are distinctive features of Māori Indigenous educational leadership that are not necessarily captured in literature fitting within the parameters of “relevant evidence.” I also had to manage
tensions related to acknowledging intimate, lived experiences of Māori educational leadership, while undertaking a task involving the identification of overarching principles or generalizations about effective educational leadership, synthesized from a circumscribed literature base.¹

The tensions also related to potential limitations of so-called universal concepts of educational leadership for guiding effective educational leadership in Indigenous contexts. As Manulani Meyer (2005) has observed, only when quality is able to be expressed in a manner that is distinct to place, culture, and people can we truly consider pathways to universal principles. “The lesson here can become a dialectic one that honors what distinctness is as it inevitably becomes the pathway to universal principles that have endured the test of time. The seeming contradiction of collective excellence flowering as individual expression is an ancient way of developing unity. When quality is expressed in this manner it is distinct to place, people, and culture” (Meyer 2005, 2). Rather than being constructed as a leadership “type” or “style,” Indigenous educational leadership as “different” may be better understood in terms of the enactment of leadership, which is located in and guided by Indigenous knowledge, values, and practices, in order to realize Indigenous educational aspirations.

Educational Leadership in Aotearoa-New Zealand

The focus on educational leadership in Aotearoa-New Zealand has resulted in a number of documents prepared under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. Documents include the best evidence synthesis mentioned above (Robinson et al. 2009), “Kiwi Leadership for Principals” (Ministry of Education 2008b), and Tū Rangatira: Te Kaumatua i te Mātauranga Kaupapa Māori (Māori medium education leadership) (Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga 2010). A central purpose of such leadership work is improving student outcomes, especially for Indigenous Māori students as well as students from minoritized immigrant backgrounds.

A methodological requirement of the best evidence synthesis on school leadership was an explicit yet inclusive conception of educational leadership, which delimits the educational leadership field without privileging a theoretically or culturally specific view. The methodology called for attention to theoretical pluralism and responsiveness to diversity (Ministry of Education 2004). Responsiveness to diversity itself can be problematic for Indigenous peoples like Māori, as it potentially locates Māori in a “state of ‘sameness’” because everyone is diverse (Lee 2008, 252). Sandy Grande (2000) argues on similar lines that the “deep structures of the ‘pedagogy of oppression’ fail to
consider American Indians as a categorically different population, virtually incomparable to other minority groups” (468).

The best evidence methodology, however, also required specific attention to Māori as tangata whenua (people of the land), the Indigenous people of Aotearoa-New Zealand (Ministry of Education 2004). This, among other things, involved serious consideration of the relationship between Māori and the Crown (Government), underpinned by Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Kawharu 1989; Orange 2004).2

The writers of the best evidence synthesis on school leadership read the requirement of specific attention to Māori as a requirement to give special attention not only to Māori as Indigenous students but also to Māori as Indigenous leaders. Indigenous educational leadership is a critical element in the process of improving education and schooling systems for Indigenous students (Smith 2009).

There are fundamental tensions in attempting to fit Māori leadership into generic conceptions of educational leadership that are developed largely from research findings that sit outside of a Māori worldview and Māori knowledge, understandings, and experiences of leadership. These tensions connect with concerns relating to the impact of education systems, which were introduced as part of imperialistic and colonizing practices undertaken across the world, on Indigenous epistemologies, values, beliefs, and practices (Grande 2000; G. Smith 1997; L. Smith 1999). They also connect with efforts to conceptualize, articulate, and enact Indigenous education and Indigenous ways of knowing and being within such systems (Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Macfarlane et al. 2008). The tensions have heightened as Indigenous peoples have increasingly turned to schooling, historically a site of colonization and assimilation, as a contemporary site of language and cultural regeneration and transmission (Grande 2000; Penetito 2010).

The approach taken in the writing of the synthesis was to acknowledge and seek to address tensions through examining critically the extent to which the best evidence synthesis account of leadership could resonate with Māori conceptualizations of leadership (Robinson et al. 2009). The synthesis resulted in the identification of leadership dimensions derived from research and studies that directly or indirectly linked to increased student achievement. There were relatively rare occasions when the writers of the best evidence synthesis on school leadership were able to consider Māori educational leadership in the context of research literature that could be identified as “relevant evidence,” as information about leaders’ cultural and ethnic backgrounds was not generally provided.3 We were successful in managing the tensions to the extent that we were able to inform our identification and understandings of the dimensions via knowledge and understandings we were also developing about traditional and contemporary Māori leadership. The leadership dimensions,
how they were derived, and the degree to which they resonate with historical and contemporary Māori conceptualizations of leadership, are discussed in depth in Hohepa and Robinson (2008).

Indigenous Educational Leadership—Educational Leadership: There Is a Difference

The question can be raised as to whether there are distinctive forms of Indigenous educational leadership, given that many schooling systems and contexts experienced by Indigenous peoples, and in which educational leadership is enacted, are in essence colonial impositions (Penetito 2010; Simon and Smith 2001; Smith 2009). And, more important, assuming that they do exist, to what extent is Indigenous educational leadership able to enact distinctive forms within these imposed contexts?

The position taken in the synthesis is that there are features of Māori leadership, as leadership that is indigenous to Aotearoa, which are distinctive. There is, however, a danger of developing an essentializing and homogenizing discourse about Māori educational leadership. The position taken is that the identification of a Māori educational leadership style would encourage stereotypical views and misrepresent the wide range of approaches to be found within Māori educational leadership. In cognizance of the danger of locating Māori educational leadership as a unitary construct, and in binary opposition to Pākehā (European New Zealander) leadership, distinctions are described in terms of knowledge, values, nature of duties, practices, commitments, and responsibilities that underpin leadership, rather than in terms of a leadership style (Hohepa and Robinson 2008; Robinson et al. 2009).

Māori education leadership requirements include leadership within the school, the classroom, and the community, and leadership that ripples out “into the wider corridors of Māori development” (Durie 2001b, 11). Thus, Māori educational leaders are expected to establish positive relationships with a variety of institutions, communities, sectors, and iwi (tribes) and to be familiar with systems of knowledge, from the past, present, and future. Māori educational leaders are expected to know how to lead and to carry out Māori culturally preferred practices in social situations and to operate appropriately in Māori cultural contexts. They are also expected to know how to conduct themselves in professional educational settings and activities that may have little link to Māori society in general. Durie (2006, 14–15) sees effective Māori leadership as that which is “expert in navigating within te ao Māori” (Māori society) “and exploring te ao whānui” (wider society). In addition, Māori educational leadership has a significant responsibility in trying to ensure that
Māori students both acquire universal knowledge and skills and Māori knowledge and skills, which will help realize aspirations held among Māori.

Understanding distinctive features of Māori educational leadership is important because it reflects the broader position that “fundamentally Māori still want to be Māori” (Smith 2009, 7). Choosing to carry out one’s professional role as an Indigenous person in educational contexts, however, can place one in tenuous, unsafe positions. Maiki Marks (1984) has likened working as a Māori educator in the New Zealand education system to being invited to be a mourner at the tangihanga (funeral) of your culture and your language. Jenny Lee (2008) has critiqued how Māori cultural values have been positioned as a disadvantage to leadership practices of Māori senior educational managers and principals. She notes the implications were “that had these senior managers been cultureless—they may have been more successful” (Lee 2008, 273).

First-time Australian Aboriginal principal Susan Matthews provides another graphic example of how enacting Indigenous educational leadership can be dangerous. She set up a classroom for new entrant Aboriginal students that drew its curriculum from culturally lived knowledge and preferred student outcomes. The classroom was forcibly closed down and she questioned this: “[Was it because] I was an Aboriginal principal that tried to put in place something that was so totally different and built upon my beliefs as an Aboriginal person? Can we as Aboriginal principals be allowed to use our own cultural knowledge about leadership, teaching and learning and more importantly Aboriginal ways of learning, to reinvent education within a school environment with a predominately Aboriginal population?” (Hughes et al. 2007, 43).

Indigenous educational leaders are not simply leaders who happen to be Indigenous. They are leaders who choose not to compromise their Indigenous identity simply because they are an educational leader. Putting Indigenous knowledge, culture, and language at the center of Indigenous education leadership is important, so that emotional and moral energy related to identity may be harnessed to enhance Indigenous student learning more generally (Smith 2009). As Hine Waitere (2008, 37) explains, “We need to find the courage to ask today what are the implications for educational leadership when framed within the needs of a cultural group to retain a cultural identity?” What is required is Indigenous educational leadership, located within and informed by our own cultures. Also required are policies and procedures that protect and support and grow such leadership, in order that it can help make a positive difference to Indigenous student outcomes.

Leadership to intervene in Māori underachievement and to realize Māori potential (Ministry of Education 2008b) will require leadership that is consistent with Māori perspectives, values and practices pertaining to leadership (Waitere 2008). Indigenous leadership, however, does not presume leadership
that is restricted to Indigenous knowledge only. Māori educationalists, be they teachers or leaders, “are not necessarily effective by virtue of their ethnicity” (Lee 2008, 278) or cultural membership alone. Māori educational leadership, and Indigenous educational leadership more widely, can also require understanding of, and critical reflection on, what is known about effective educational leadership practices. Indigenous educational leaders can consider how their leadership is different, as well as how it might need to be similar to educational leadership per se, in order to ensure positive changes to Indigenous educational outcomes.

Difference in Sameness—Assimilating or Accommodating?

Some argue that living in today’s increasingly globalized world necessarily involves taking on more globalized practices and knowledge (Durie 2005). Others argue that applying educational practices and knowledge of a powerful or dominant group onto Indigenous peoples constitutes ongoing colonization (Awatere 1984; Smith 1999) and that globalization itself “is simply a new metaphor for imperialism” (Grande 2000, 469) that will continue to undermine Indigenous cultural integrity.

Taking a purist line in either direction is at odds with the “real-life” situations that Māori not only find ourselves in but also in many instances choose to construct. These situations seldom reflect either a sense of “cultural purity” in any traditional shape or form, or a wholehearted embrace of “the new world.” Education “should not be an ‘either / or’ choice with respect to Indigenous peoples access to their own cultural knowledge or indeed world knowledge forms” (Smith 2009, 2). Jennie Joe (1994) makes similar distinctions between imposed and selected changes and accommodations by Indigenous North American cultures within a Western national milieu.

Joe (1994) draws a distinction between “acculturation” and “assimilation” that is pertinent to the contrasting views described above and issues underlying debate around whether or how Indigenous knowledge and non-Indigenous knowledge should be brought together. While Joe observes that Native Americans experience significant social pressure to take on non-Indian knowledge and practices, in effect to become assimilated, many in turn “strive instead to become acculturated” (109). In this sense acculturation involves the acceptance and use of tools, technology and skills of the non-Indian world and the retention of an Indian worldview and its incumbent values. “Values may be in conflict between the two worlds, but an acculturated Indian person may accept the means, tools, technology, and skills used in the non-Indian world while still retaining the Indian values. On the other hand, an assimilated
Native American accepts non-Native values and tools, and therefore becomes the same as a non-Native in act, word, and deed” (Joe 1994, 109–10).

A way of exploring the implications of modifying Indigenous educational leadership practices is to consider how leadership practices sourced from non-Indigenous evidence can be engaged with in ways that identify, emphasize, and articulate preferred values, beliefs, and practices of Indigenous peoples—that is, how might this be done, in order that the tension of the duck riddle of encapsulating difference in sameness and sameness in difference is addressed? For those working in Māori-initiated and -designed educational initiatives, such as Kura Kaupapa Māori (Māori language immersion schools based on Māori philosophy and practice), tensions may apply across a range of areas. This is because teaching, learning, and leading can actively involve using knowledge, skills, technologies, and resources generated out of non-Māori worldviews while working to reclaim and regenerate Māori knowledge, language, values, and beliefs (Penetito 2010).

Indigenization

How might non-Indigenous constructions of educational leadership, and non-Indigenous constructions and conceptualizations more generally, be accommodated within an Indigenous worldview? Critiques of so-called Western academic and intellectual fields by historically marginalized groups—Indigenous, colonized, minoritized, women (Awatere 1984; Burman 1994; Grande 2000; Mama 1995)—have begged the question, Is it possible to use and to develop knowledge in empowering ways in fields that themselves have played fundamental roles in disempowerment? I first came across the notion of indigenization as a doctoral student in the early 1990s as I sought out psychological approaches that might provide valid and appropriate means to study and understand Indigenous development and learning as an Indigenous person.

Virgilio Enriquez (1989) proposed a model of indigenization as a means to transform psychology as a discipline to fit with the Filipino local culture. Enriquez described two broad approaches in his model, which position Indigenous cultures in two contrasting ways. One approach involves indigenization from within; the other involves indigenization from without. Indigenization from within uses the Indigenous world as the source of theoretical concepts and methods, which emerge out of experiences of people from the Indigenous culture (Pe-Pua and Protacio-Macelino 2000). These are then elaborated into theoretical frameworks for use and application. Indigenization from without locates culture as the target of theoretical concepts and methods by modifying an existing area of academic study, and its theories, concepts,
and approaches, to create or maximize its degree of alignment or fit with a culture.

The sources and directions proposed by Enriquez suggest a kind of exclusive parallelism. That is, the process of indigenization is unidirectional in nature, where its course is largely shaped by particular histories and circumstances. However, culture flow in one direction does not preclude flow simultaneously occurring in the other. In reality, while there could be a particular directional emphasis depending on a set agenda, either process of indigenization is just as likely to be composed of multidirectional interactions. Although Enriquez holds that the perspectives motivating either process of indigenization can work at cross-purposes, the two processes identified can also take place in a more symbiotic interaction.

What are the benefits and dangers inherent in a strict adherence to either process orientation of indigenization as described by Enriquez? Indigenization from within can make sense of and validate Indigenous practices and experiences from the firm base of Indigenous knowledge and worldviews. But a strict adherence to an Indigenous worldview as the only source of theories and practices may also lead to little more than sentimental revivalism of what is, or is perceived to be, “traditionally Indigenous” intellectual theorizing, methods, and technologies. Indigenization from without can provide a greater range of theoretical tools and technologies to derive meaning out of, and theorize about, Indigenous experiences. Exclusive attention to modification of theories, concepts, and approaches only emanating out of a non-Indigenous worldview could also lead to uncritical transfer and translation of non-Indigenous intellectual technology into Indigenous knowledge bases. Dangers of “parochialism,” of “cultural dogmatism,” of “assimilation,” and of “hegemony” abound. Avoidance of sentimentalized reification and essentialism of what is considered cultural tradition, as well as avoidance of naive and inappropriate co-option of knowledge from a non-Indigenous cultural worldview, is critical (Joe 1994; O’Sullivan 2007a; Paradies 2006).

Along the same vein, it is perhaps timely to argue for moving beyond an unquestioning view that the legitimacy and validity of all so-called Indigenous knowledge, values, and beliefs is “taken for granted.” For example, non-challenging and uncritical acceptance of what are presented as traditional Māori beliefs, knowledge, and practices is not necessarily productive or beneficial. What count as Māori beliefs, knowledge, values, and worldviews deserve being shown the respect of rigorous interrogation.

Working from an indigenization perspective that sees Indigenous cultures, such as Māori, who have experienced colonization as either recipients or sources of “culture flow” (Enriquez 1989, 71) does not address the right to be different in sameness. What occurs between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge is not linear. There is potential for reciprocal engagement and
impact at many given points. What exists is fundamentally relational, involving multidirectional exchanging and interchanging of ideas. In this sense Indigenous conceptualizations can contribute just as much to the revisioning of non-Indigenous conceptualizations and theories. Barnhardt and Kawagley (2005) made the observation that

Until recently, there was very little literature that addressed how to get Western scientists and educators to understand Native worldviews and ways of knowing as constituting knowledge systems in their own right, and even less on what it means for participants when such divergent systems coexist in the same person, organization, or community. It is imperative, therefore, that we address these issues as a two-way transaction. Native people may need to understand Western society, but not at the expense of what they already know and the way they have come to know it. Non-Native people, too, need to recognize the coexistence of multiple worldviews and knowledge systems, and find ways to understand and relate to the world in its multiple dimensions and varied perspectives. (9)

What is needed is an approach that recognizes that to be effective, Indigenous engagement with non-Indigenous ideas needs to be active, dynamic, and selective.

Indigeneity—An Alternative Answer to a Riddle

Indigeneity has been described as a set of rights that an Indigenous people might reasonably expect to exercise in today’s world (Durie 2001a). Those rights encompass the right to be the same in some senses and to be different in others and the right to live in today’s world while ensuring the survival of one’s traditional culture (Fleras and Elliot 1996, O’Sullivan 2007b), much as the duck can be different in its sameness.

Māori have drawn on indigeneity as a principle and theoretical approach to affect Māori-valued outcomes in education, research, health, and many other areas (see, e.g., Durie 2001b, 2003; Smith 1999). Indigeneity provides a way of addressing tensions alluded to in the riddle about the difference between a duck. That is, the complexities of recognizing and maintaining a focus on Indigenous ways of knowing and doing things, in this case enacting Indigenous educational leadership while also investigating non-Indigenous, often-dominant leadership approaches. This necessarily includes investigating and debating whether there might be universal aspects of educational leadership.
The politics of indigeneity provides space to be different and same. It helps to create spaces outside of majority-minority or colonized-colonizer positioning. For Māori it moves beyond Tiriti-/treaty-defined relationships, where Māori can think critically about what we want from, and about what is needed from, education. Strong Māori leadership ensures a strong focus on challenges and issues experienced by Māori, as well as the aspirations and potential of Māori. Mason Durie (2001a) argues that this focus includes not only an understanding of historical issues that emerge out of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, but also an understanding of issues that occurred before its signing. As such it includes an understanding that Indigenous rights are not the same as treaty rights. Durie notes, “Indigenous rights have a longer memory. 1840 is somewhat incidental to a set of customs and lores that evolved over some hundreds of years . . . and . . . an understanding of indigeneity is about a set of rights that Indigenous peoples might reasonably expect to exercise in modern times” (2001a, 8).

Māori educational initiatives and institutions, such as Te Kōhanga Reo (Māori language immersion centers that cater for preschool children), Kura Kaupapa Māori, and Wānanga (Māori institutions of higher learning, akin to universities) are “tangible outcomes of the politics of indigeneity” (O’Sullivan 2007a, 103). O’Sullivan observes that indigeneity enables Māori to approach “questions from an unapologetically Māori-centred position. Answers to what Māori want from education can therefore be considered beyond compromise co-option of western ideas and from a coherent set of pragmatic principles as indigenous paradigm” (2007b, 1–2).

With regards to leadership, the development of educational initiatives such as Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori has drawn on many types of Māori educational leadership. Included are leaders with professional and leadership knowledge of Aotearoa-New Zealand’s national education system, in which Māori have developed Māori medium schooling options that are both unique and distinctive from, as well as similar to, English medium schooling (Penetito 2010). Parents, grandparents, and community members have also enacted leadership and have typically played crucial leadership roles in the establishment of Māori medium educational initiatives (Skerrett 2010; Tākao et al. 2010). These educational initiatives focus on Māori-identified and Māori-specific aspirations and needs in terms of the regeneration and continuation of Māori language and culture. They also focus on needs that are similar to those facing English medium schools and their communities, which relate to the provision of quality education that prepares students to function successfully on national and international stages (Durie 2001a).

Māori educational leadership requires an enactment of indigeneity in order to continue to contribute to the transformation of education in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Indigeneity assumes that Māori have rights in the control and de-
cision making relating to the education of Māori children. These rights extend to control over defining what counts as desired or valued educational outcomes and what kinds of Māori educational leadership are required in order to realize such outcomes. Indigeneity as a principle and as an approach provides a space in which Māori educational leadership can do at least two things. One, Māori educational leaders can practice leadership that is Māori. Two, Māori educational leaders can engage with available knowledge, theories and information about effective educational leadership in ways that may result in enactments of Māori educational leadership that appear relatively the same as “non-Māori” leadership, while located in Māori cultural knowledge and cultural frameworks.

Conclusion

Educational leadership has been identified as a key factor in raising achievement, particularly among Indigenous and other minoritized students. While there has been a strong focus across the globe on identifying generic characteristics of leadership and leadership practices that make a positive difference for students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of leaders themselves have often been given less consideration. A focus on leading education and schooling in order to bring about better outcomes for Indigenous students, however, requires an accompanying focus on Indigenous ways of enacting educational leadership.

This article began with identifying tensions arising out of synthesizing best evidence on effective educational leadership, and discussing the potential that such work may have for rendering Māori, and Indigenous education leadership more generally, into sameness through the identification of generic characteristics of educational leadership. The synthesis does, however, provide important information on what particular forms of evidence tell us about educational leadership that makes a difference to certain student outcomes. I have argued that indigeneity provides a space in which Māori leadership can critically engage with this information, on the basis that Māori educational leadership may have needs and goals similar to those found across educational leadership more generally. Indigeneity also provides the space in which Māori educational leadership can expect to have those needs addressed and those goals met in different culturally preferred ways and contexts, drawing on different kinds of evidence and knowledge bases. Indigeneity concerns the right to conceptualize, articulate, and address Māori educational leadership differently—in ways that are distinctly Māori.

I have argued against relegating Māori educational leadership itself into sameness, be it in terms of a singular style or approach. Māori educational
leadership will not fit into a unitary construct or definition. It may be exercised in many ways, and across different educational contexts, yet still remain Māori.

In summary, indigeneity is identified as a principle and theoretical approach that is playing an increasingly critical role in Māori education today in “the creation of an education system that integrates culture with education” (O’Sullivan 2007a, 4). Indigeneity enables the realization of Māori aspirations and the meeting of Māori needs, including those pertaining to Māori educational leadership.

Notes

1. As young parents, my husband and I were actively involved in early developments of Māori medium education programs, namely Te Köhanga Reo (language “nests” for preschool children) and Kura Kaupapa Māori (Māori immersion schools), which our children all attended. We continue to be involved as grandparents of children in these programs.

2. Te Tiriti o Waitangi—written in Māori—was first signed on February 6, 1840, between a number of chiefs from northern tribal groups to which I belong. Te Tiriti o Waitangi provides for Māori control of resources and for protection of Māori knowledge, language, and culture, while guaranteeing Māori the same rights and opportunities as non-Māori. The English version, called the Treaty of Waitangi, cedes sovereignty to the English Crown; this is not the case, however, in the Māori version, which agrees to the Crown having governorship and to Māori retaining “rangatiratanga” (sovereignty).

3. An exception to this is research that was undertaken in Māori medium schooling contexts. A significant corpus of this type of research is reported on in chapter seven of Robinson et al. (2009).
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