

CHAPTER THREE

CRITICAL THEORY

INTRODUCTION

Critical theory, or more appropriately Critical theories, encompass a diverse range of theorists and their work. Rex Gibson (1986) highlights the major concepts that underpin the development of critical theory as being

- (i) A preoccupation with theories, arising from a belief that theory and practice are inseparable.
- (ii) A process of engaging with 'real' problems, as both subject and justification for its theorising.
- (iii) An active critique of Positivism and rejection of the concepts of 'naturalness' or given-ness' in society.
- (iv) An understanding that all 'facts' are socially constructed and therefore humanly alterable.
- (v) That categories, concepts and 'facts' are constructed by people which serve the interests of particular groups in society and therefore the exposing of conflicting interests is necessary to identify the power relations that exist.
- (vi) Emancipatory objectives, that it seeks not simply to

describe or explain problems but to provide tools for resolving them by enabling people to gain more control over their lives. (Gibson 1986 Coxon 1992)

A focus within critical theory is therefore one of human agency, of people being actively involved in the construction of 'facts', and the concepts through which we see the world. These 'facts' are not, as is claimed within the positivist framework, objective but are constructed in relationship to theories that are developed by people and which benefit particular interest groups in society. (Gibson 1986, Coxon 1992, Blackledge & Hunt 1985)

Having noted the diversity within the framework of critical theory, the three theoretical positions which will be explored within this chapter are (i) Reproduction theories, (ii) Resistance theory and (iii) Kaupapa Maori theories.

The development of critical theories should not be viewed as a chronological progression, rather each of the theories discussed within this chapter may be found concurrently within society's discourses. They are theoretical responses in that within each paradigm there is an element of critical analysis of prior theories whilst at the same time they may be viewed as proactive in their offering of theoretical frameworks that seek to directly challenge systems of inequality.

THE CONCEPT OF EMANCIPATION

Perhaps the most vital concern of critical theorists is that of emancipation, that theory and practice are indivisible and must be viewed in a dialectical relationship. The emphasis on emancipation within critical theory is one that requires further investigation.

Emancipatory praxis operates from a basis that there is no 'neutral' education (Freire 1972, Lather 1986), accordingly the process of emancipation is one which is transformative, through which oppressed groups operate to free themselves from the imposition of dominant ideologies and hegemony.

Paulo Freire (1985) considers the development of liberatory praxis as essential to the emancipation of oppressed groups from the control and suppression of the oppressor. In order for emancipation to be realised theory and practice must be located in a dialectical relationship, where each is viewed as necessary to the other.

"Cut off from practice, theory becomes a simple verbalism. Separated from theory, practice is nothing but blind activism. That is why there is no authentic praxis outside the dialectical unity, action-reflection, practice-theory. In the same way there is no theoretical context if it is not in a dialectical unity with the concrete context."

(Freire P., 1985, 156)

Emancipation develops through a process of conscientisation, within which the oppressed identify the contradictions that exist socially, politically and economically, and in doing so seek to take action against the oppressive elements that perpetuate their

subordinate positioning. Conscientisation as an act of understanding allows the oppressed to identify the unequal power and resource distribution that exist and to devise means by which to transform an oppressive reality (Freire 1972).

However, according to Patti Lather (1991) emancipatory reason is "vulnerable to interrogation". Lather argues against a tendency to separate the "true from the false" and expresses a need for those involved in emancipatory praxis to shift emphasis from one of "interpretive validity" to one which explores the contextual locations within which meanings are produced. Furthermore, she states, audiences can not be considered homogenous, rather their production of meanings may be multiple and fragmented.

For Lather, emancipatory critical social science is premised upon the construction of approaches which are reciprocal and which create space for those involved in the process to promote transformation through their own understandings of the world. Emancipatory praxis is not something that may be done "to" or "for" someone, therefore a challenge for those involved in emancipatory critical social science is to ensure against positioning "emancipatory desires in the very cultural domains they are opposing" (ibid.:44).

Hence, the struggle for transformation and emancipation must be controlled by the oppressed themselves in order for them to resolve the contradictions which are a part of their own

understandings and experiences of the world (Freire 1972). Furthermore, the role of "intellectuals with liberatory intent" is to work towards making space for those involved to act and speak as they choose (Lather 1991). As Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) assert "emancipation cannot be delivered from the outside" (ibid:39).

THE REPRODUCTION APPROACH

Reproduction theories are based in the reproduction of economic relationships, within which the schooling system plays a major role. Therefore a central argument is that schooling is instrumental in the reproduction of structural inequalities (Connell 1982).

The reproduction approach operates at a structural level, that society is economically stratified and such stratification is reproduced by the various institutions that operate within the system.

"In effect, schools were portrayed as reproductive in three senses. First, the schools provided different classes and social groups with the knowledge and skills they needed to occupy their respective places in a labour force stratified by class, race and gender. Second, schools were seen as reproductive in the cultural sense, functioning in part to distribute and legitimate forms of knowledge, values, language and modes of style that constitute the dominant culture and its interests. Third, schools were viewed as part of a state apparatus that produced and legitimated the economic and ideological imperatives that underlie the state's political power."
(Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H.A., 1985:70)

Within theories of reproduction the school is an instrument through which dominant interest groups maintain, reinforce and legitimate the stratification of society through both economic and ideological reproduction. The structure of schooling is viewed as corresponding to the structuring of society, and schools are assigned a 'mirror' position, that is they are regarded by reproduction theorists as reflections of the society within which they are located (Gibson 1986).

THE CORRESPONDENCE PRINCIPLE

The work of Bowles and Gintis in their book "Schooling in Capitalist America" , highlights reproduction/correspondence theory in their claim that,

"The education system helps integrate youth into the economic system, we believe, through a structural correspondence between its social relations and those of production... Specifically, the social relationships of education- the relationships between administrators and teacher, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work- replicate the hierarchical division of labour."

(Bowles, S., and Gintis, H., 1976:131)

Gibson (1986) contends the correspondence principle as advanced by Bowles and Gintis is framed upon two claims firstly, schooling reflects the structure of the labour force, particularly factory work and secondly, that through this process schools are instrumental in the supplying of appropriate personnel to take their place in a stratified labour force. Like the labour force schools perpetuate a "hierarchical division of labour" (ibid:47) and ensure the appropriate work ethic is transmitted to pupils

through the imposition of rules governing punctuality, conformity, attendance and acceptable modes of behaviour.

The correspondence principle can be located within economic determinism, as the theoretical underpinning of the concept is situated explicitly within an economic paradigm. The model produced by Bowles and Gintis and its centrality of the school as reflective of societal structures fails to provide any room for human agency (Gibson 1986, Blackledge & Hunt 1985). Pupils are seen as passive participants in a system which produces and reproduces workers according to the needs of the labour market, likewise teachers too are accorded a passive role in their involvement on the production line. As Gibson (1986) notes there is a "debilitating neglect of human action, of individual and group capacity to challenge and resist".

The failure of reproduction theories to provide analysis of the ways in which those people involved in schooling participate in the process of reproduction effectively denies any hope for human participation in the challenging and potential transformation of the conditions within which they are located (Aronowitz & Giroux 1985). Further to which, the focus remains one of the 'process' of schooling and omits any discussion of the 'content' of education which denies the extent to which content can influence the positioning of pupils within schooling and society alike.

CULTURAL REPRODUCTION THEORY

A fundamental basis of theories of cultural reproduction is the assumption that acts of "symbolic violence" reproduce and mediate both the ideological and material structures which maintain class divided societies (Giroux 1983).

Pierre Bourdieu, a leading theorist of cultural reproduction theory, claims schools are instrumental in the transmission and reproduction of particular forms of culture and in doing so are a vehicle for the reproduction of social class stratification. According to Alison Jones (1990)

"Bourdieu looks at schooling in cultural and political terms. Put simply, he suggests that what happens in the classroom must be understood as an expression of the interaction between the culture(s) of social classes and the routines, values, style (the culture) of the school. It is this relationship - between class cultures and school culture - which is not only crucial for understanding schooling, but which is central to the schools ongoing 'transmission of power and privileges' to the already privileged."
(Jones, A., 1990:93)

In the relationship between class culture and school culture, Bourdieu (1977) maintains that the school culture is defined by the dominant groups within the class structure. A pivotal concept to this analysis is one of 'cultural capital'. Gibson (1986) contends the concept of cultural capital may be viewed in contrast to economic capital, in that not all people hold economic capital whereas all people possess cultural capital, which according to Gibson (1986) includes language, meanings, styles of thought and behaviour, values and human qualities. However, the education system places value only on particular

forms of cultural capital, that which has been defined and legitimated by the dominant group. Analysis of power relations is therefore an integral and necessary part of Bourdieus writings, with cultural capital being defined clearly in line with the relationship to dominant class positionings

"Cultural capital, i.e. the cultural goods transmitted by the different family pedagogic action, whose value qua cultural capital varies with the distance between the cultural arbitrary imposed by the dominant pedagogic action and the cultural arbitrary inculcated by the family pedagogic action within the different groups or classes."

(Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J., 1977:30)

The schooling system is framed within dominant cultural arbitrations, with those pupils who enter the schooling system with cultural capital that matches that of the school culture having greater access to the credentials that are made available to those whom 'succeed', on the other hand those pupils that enter the schooling system with cultural capital that differs from that of the dominant group (the definers of cultural capital) are less likely to have access to credentials.

In this light differential school success can be seen not as a consequence of cultural differences but as a result of the way 'success' is connected to familiarity with the dominant cultural capital (Jones 1990). The habitus, i.e. the "embodied" or "internalized" cultural capital, of the dominant classes is legitimated through agencies, such as the school, controlled by dominant groups in order to effectively reproduce existing power relations, an aspect which is referred to by Bourdieu as the "social reproduction function of cultural reproduction" (Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J., 1977:10).

Dominant classes legitimate their own cultural norms through processes of symbolic violence through which occurs the "imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power" and is couched within societal power relations. Symbolic violence refers then to the imposition and legitimation of meanings by the dominant group, whilst simultaneously concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force (ibid.). Therefore, symbolic violence may be identified as the covert practices imposed by dominant groups that serve ultimately, and often indirectly, to preserve the power relationships that exist and reproduce dominant definitions and constructions of habitus that maintain the status quo (Jones 1990, Gibson 1986, Smith G. 1986, Giroux 1983).

CRITIQUES OF REPRODUCTION APPROACHES

Both Gibson (1986) and Giroux (1983), acknowledge the work of Bourdieu, in particular, the way in which his thesis provides analysis of the subtle ways that dominant power relationships is reproduced and the political nature of culture within schooling, however both writers note cultural reproduction theory requires serious critique.

A major point of critique of cultural reproduction is that it remains caught in a deterministic notion of power and domination (Giroux 1983), a notion which implies the subordinate classes are constructed as passive recipients. Human agency and actions are disregarded within a theory that focuses on the imposition of

dominant ideologies in what Giroux terms a "reductionist view of human nature" (ibid.), which locates subordinate groups and classes in a position of hopelessness. Such reductionism may be contributed in part to the notion of Habitus which according to Giroux stifles the potential for struggle and social change.

A criticism waged at cultural reproduction theory by Gibson is the failure of Bourdieu to acknowledge the complexity of schooling and school activities thereby neglecting to recognise the multiple intentions, purposes and results of what happens in schools (Gibson 1986). The focus of Bourdieu's analysis then lies in the style of schooling rather than the content and ignores the influence that curriculum content and knowledge can have on the emancipation of subordinate classes or groups.

Perhaps the most notable criticism aimed at cultural reproduction is that of the neglect of the concepts of resistance, which serves to deny the ways in which subordinate groups struggle and contest the imposition of dominant culture, as Michael Apple notes

"Whatever reproduction goes on is accomplished not only through the acceptance of hegemonic ideologies, but through opposition and resistances."
(Apple, M., 1982:25)

THEORIES OF RESISTANCE

Resistance theory as an approach seeks to counter the determinism inherent in radicalist reproduction approaches (Gibson 1986).

Gibson identifies resistance theories as drawing on distinctive bodies of work concerning the reproduction of inequality and based on four common characteristics:

- (i) That reproduction is never fully accomplished, rather some groups in society actively oppose and resist dominant ideologies.
- (ii) In order to sustain resistance and opposition groups draw upon their culture as resource.
- (iii) Acts of resistance can often contribute to the maintenance and reproduction of inequalities.
- (iv) The basis of emancipatory education can be seen in the values of oppositional groups.

Gibson's discussion is based upon the work of Henry Giroux, a leading resistance theorist, who challenges both radical reproduction theories which ignore classroom experience and conservative theories, which construct 'resisters' as deviant and inferior. For further insights into resistance theory it is essential to turn to the works of Giroux.

Giroux (1983) establishes resistance theory as an approach that "undermines" the oversocialised, deterministic paradigm of reproduction theories that attempt to provide a neatly packaged correspondence between the school and labour force.

Giroux argues theories of resistance point to

"...a dialectical model of domination that often valuable alternatives to many pessimistic models of schooling that reduce the logic of domination to external forces that appear impossible to challenge or modify. Instead of seeing domination as simply the reflex of external forces - capital, the state etc - Willis (1977), Apple (1982), Olson (1981), and others have developed a notion of reproduction in which working-class domination

is viewed not only as a result of the structural and ideological constraints embedded in capitalist social relationships but also as part of the process of self-formation within the working-class itself."
(Giroux, H.A., 1983:100)

Clearly such a theory allows for the active participation of subordinate groups in oppositional behaviour, hence acknowledging that schools and what happens in the classroom is not entirely dependent on or totally reflective of the hierarchical structuring of the labour force. Central therefore to resistance theory is a notion of critical human agency and a rejection of the conceptualisation of dominant ideologies as all encompassing, instead dominant ideologies are viewed as complex and at times contradictory (Ibid., Giroux 1985). Consequently, a key concept within theories of resistance is emancipation, in which the concept of resistance must have a revealing function that seeks to not only critique domination but which provides room for processes of self-reflection and for emancipatory practices.

Reflecting critically Giroux highlights aspects of resistance theory he considers warrant further development. Firstly, a lack of analysis of the conditions that promote and reinforce a range of resistance behaviours including contradictory oppositional behaviour. Resistance can not be viewed homogeneously, neither can class groupings be viewed as single entities. There exists complex ways in which subordinate groups resist, oppose or accommodate dominant ideologies and express or embody a range of ideological positionings (Giroux 1983, Giroux & Aronowitz 1985).

Secondly, resistance theories have on the whole failed to incorporate gender or race analyses. An implication of the

failure to incorporate these strongly interrelated forces is that such accounts have, on the whole, neglected to accommodate how these factors mediate the sexual and social divisions of labour in the education system (Giroux 1983)

Finally, a third criticism outlined is the failure of resistance theorists "to reach into the structure of the personality" (Ibid) and the ways in which understanding and action can be contradictory, one does not necessarily lead to the other in a causal relationship. Such an analysis requires a notion of how "unfreedom reproduces itself within the psyche of the human being" (Ibid). A notion which Giroux terms 'alienation', the investigation of which necessitates a questioning of peoples need and desires rather than focusing solely on ideology and consciousness.

The value of resistance theory, Giroux maintains, lies in its critical function. A necessary requirement in working towards a theory of resistance is an explicit definition of resistance and what behaviours or actions are to be designated resistance. In emphasising the necessity of this Giroux highlights the heterogeneity of oppositional behaviour and rejects any assumptions that all oppositional behaviour is necessarily resistance. Therefore, a theory of resistance must incorporate a concept of power that is both exercised on and by people in a range of contexts that "structure interacting relations of dominance and autonomy" (Ibid.:108).

KAUPAPA MAORI THEORY

In the New Zealand context distinctive modes of theorising have emerged, from Maori communities, which have as a common element the validation of Te Reo and Tikanga Maori. These movements have been framed under a range of broad terms, 'Tino rangatiratanga', 'Maori Sovereignty', 'Maori perspectives', and 'Kaupapa Maori'. These modes of analysis and theory are by no means contemporary phenomena. Since colonisation Maori people have been actively asserting their positioning in this land as Tangata Whenua. Inherent in these struggles has been an ongoing demand for the recognition and legitimation of Te Reo Maori and Tikanga. The objective of this section is to engage with the dialogue surrounding 'Kaupapa Maori' theory and the potential of such a theoretical framework as a tool of resistance and emancipation.

Maori resistance has been evidenced throughout the period of contact between Maori and Pakeha. Resistance has taken many forms: military, pacifist, religious, political and has encompassed many Iwi, Hapu and Whanau groupings. Ranginui Walker (1984), in his article "Genesis of Maori activism" highlights Maori resistance through movements such as the Kingitanga, Kotahitanga and Pai marire, stating "Maori activism...is not an aberration of our times" (Walker,R.,1984:280).

Since its inception the Treaty of Waitangi has been a document of contestation. The Treaty has appeared in a plethora of contexts including Hui, the Courts, Parliament, Waitangi Tribunal

meetings and has undergone multiple deconstructions, defining and redefinition. Discourses surrounding the interpretation and translation of the Treaty are multiple, complex and at times contradictory. It is necessary however to recognise that much Maori discussion surrounding the Treaty of Waitangi has been couched in a belief that it is a document which both validates and legitimates Te Reo Maori and Tikanga.

This is highlighted in the submissions to, and findings of the Waitangi Tribunal in relation to Te Reo Maori.

"The claimant called Professor Hirini Moko Mead of Victoria University of Wellington who produced for us a carefully prepared submission on the meaning of Article II and Article III of the Treaty. The general thrust of his view of the treaty so far as Article II is concerned is that the phrase "O ratou taonga katoa" covers both tangible and intangible things and can best be translated by the expression "all their valued customs and possessions" ...When the question for decision is whether te reo Maori is a "taonga" which the crown is obliged to recognise we conclude there can only be one answer. It is plain that the language is an essential part of the culture and must be regarded as "a valued possession". The claim itself illustrates that fact, and the wide representation from all corners of Maoridom in support of it underlines and emphasises the point. ...In the Maori perspective the place of the language in the life of a nation is indicative of the place of the people."
(Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori, Wai 11, 1986:26-7)

According to Hastings (1988) the Maori Language Act 1987 further legitimated Maori views of Te Reo Maori through its recognition that Te Reo Maori is a taonga that is guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi. Clearly then, the establishment of monolingual/monocultural Pakeha structures in this country have contravened the Treaty through the marginalisation and

suppression of Te Reo Maori (for more in depth discussion of Treaty issues see: Orange,1987; Walker 1987,1990; Kawharu 1989; Kelsey,1990).

The establishment of Missionary schools in 1816, under the umbrella of the Church missionary society, saw the commencement of an education system that was based within a philosophy of 'civilising the natives'. A philosophy that was to become further entrenched with the introduction of State control of Maori schooling in 1867. Debates in the House of Representatives, surrounding the 1867 Native Schools Act, note the general feeling of the time as encompassing the beliefs that

- (i) In order for Maori people to 'progress', in 'civilised' Pakeha terms, the initial requirement was education.
- (ii) Increased expenditure of Native education would be beneficial in the saving on future expenditure in areas such as police and gaols.
- (iii) In order for Maori people to obtain other knowledge there must be a knowledge of the english language.
- (iv) For Maori people to fully appreciate the benefits of schooling they must be "required to do something towards their own education, as they would then value it more".

(AJHR 1867 Part2)

The education system was designed to be a vehicle for through which to further the settler defined agenda for Maori people, an agenda that sought the complete assimilation of Maori people (Smith,L. 1989). The imposition of Pakeha schooling was not

accepted unproblematically by all Maori people and schooling became a site of struggle and Maori resistance.

Hariata Huata (1991) notes that an example of such resistance can be seen in the banishment of government funded schooling from the Waikato district in 1858, and the subsequent establishment of a Kura Maori at Matamata in 1865. Huata contends that Wiremu Tamehana, a prominent person in the Kingitanga, was influential in the establishment of Maori schooling in Waikato, in which the curriculum content, appointment of teachers and economic sufficiency remained in the control of Tamehana and his Iwi.

Contemporary expressions of Kaupapa Maori theory have been summarised by Graham Hingangaroa Smith in the following way

"A Kaupapa Maori base (Maori philosophy and principles) i.e. local theoretical positioning related to being Maori, such a position presupposes that:

- * the validity and legitimacy of Maori is taken for granted
- * the survival and revival of Maori language and culture is imperative
- * the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well being, and over our own lives is vital to Maori survival"

(Smith, G.H., 1990:100)

Within such an analysis dominant discourses that have historically positioned Te Reo Maori and Tikanga as deficient are marginalised, and Maori language and culture are moved from a position of marginalisation to become a focal point from which to operate. As suggested, by Smith, Kaupapa Maori theory necessitates a stance in relation to Maori language and culture where their validity and inclusion is a 'given'.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1992) discussed the processes by which Maori people have been historically constructed as 'other' to Pakeha.

"As Maori we have been defined in terms of our differences to our colonisers...the way 'other' has been historically structured has denied us our own ways of defining and relating to differences. In creating a 'new' nation, the colonisers placed greater emphasis on how different they were from (and much 'better' than) the inhabitants. The emphasis placed on the constructed dualising of savage and civilised, heathen and christian, immoral and moral, provides examples."

(Smith, L.T., 1992:33)

The construction of Maori people in binary opposition to Pakeha culminated theoretically in a position of Pakeha as the norm and Maori theories as "alternatives" (Irwin 1988), thereby reinforcing the dominant discourses of Maori theory as 'other'.

In light of historical suppression of Te Reo Maori and Tikanga, intrinsic to Kaupapa Maori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Maori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist within society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of 'common-sense' and 'facts' to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Maori people.

Kaupapa Maori theory necessarily expresses a belief that existing oppressive regimes are socially constructed and as such are humanly alterable. However the economic positioning of Maori people can not be located purely in a focus of human agency.

Essential to any theories of change for Maori people is an acknowledgement of a dialectical relationship of micro-macro analysis. The oppression of Maori people does not operate solely on an ideological level but is also an economic one.

Land confiscations, the land wars, individualisation of titles and questionable land 'sales' have seen Maori people alienated from the land base. Land tenure was directly related to rights and obligations required by and for the collective group. Rangatira retained a trusteeship role for the Hapu and Iwi. Inclusive in this role was both responsibility and accountability to the collective group. Land tenure therefore operated as an integral part, and a basis for mediating, the social structuring of Maori society (Kawharu 1977, Pihama 1991).

As a countering force Kaupapa Maori theorising rejects dominant group constructions of Maori as 'other' and emphasises the status of Maori people as Tangata Whenua, thereby encompassing the ongoing struggles of Iwi to reclaim the land that is rightfully theirs, and in doing so including Maori aspirations for control of Maori land that will reinforce Maori spiritual links to Papatuanuku and provide a basis for future economic development.

Kaupapa Maori theory is a politicising agent that acts as a counter-hegemonic force to promote the conscientisation of Maori people, through a process of critiquing Pakeha definitions and constructions of Maori people, and asserting explicitly the validation and legitimation of Te Reo Maori and Tikanga. Such

a process is not unproblematic. Dominant discourses have been internalised many Maori people and as a consequence, transmitted into realms of our language and culture. At a recent seminar Rangimarie Rose Pere noted that translation of Te Reo Maori was increasingly being influenced by Pakeha definitions, an outcome of which has been the interpretations of Maori text in a 'sexist' manner, which according to Pere is both culturally and linguistically incorrect (Pere 1992:verbal communication).

Te Reo Maori is imperative to the development of Kaupapa Maori theory, as it is through language that social realities are expressed and, in part, constituted. It is therefore through Te Reo Maori that Tikanga Maori is expressed and, in part, constructed. In examining colonial impacts on Maori people Donna Awatere (1984) states "Today much of what is considered the 'Maori way' is actually the missionary way". Such a statement infers the need for Kaupapa Maori theorists to undertake a process of deconstruction and reconstruction of Te Reo Maori and Tikanga to ensure that Kaupapa Maori theory is couched within Maori perceptions and constructions rather than those as defined by the dominant group.

Questions of who constructs, defines and controls knowledge provide a basis which Kaupapa Maori theorists may challenge dominant constructions. Sid Mead (1983) discusses the concept of "knowledge managers" as advanced by Bullivant. Knowledge managers are the "formal agents appointed by the group to ensure that its culture is transmitted" (Bullivant 1981 cited in

Mead, S., 1983:334) and therefore are instrumental in the control of knowledge and its transmission.

Knowledge managers in New Zealand have on the whole been members of the dominant group, i.e. Pakeha. Maori people that have been co-opted into such positions have been so either in light of their compliance or accommodation of dominant ideologies or have been 'pepper potted' within institutions where they have little or no power. Within Kaupapa Maori theory the knowledge managers are Whanau, Hapu, Iwi. Maori people have control over knowledge and culture transmitted, pedagogy, language of transmission and methodologies. As such it is a reclaiming of Maori culturally preferred notions of knowledge control as was the case prior to the imposition of Pakeha ideologies and dominant group control.

Kaupapa Maori theory is not solely an academic or intellectual exercise. Crucial to Maori theorising is the dialectical relationship of action - practice (Freire 1985). Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori may be viewed as Kaupapa Maori theory in action. The development of Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori as acts of resistance to dominant Pakeha ideologies illustrates the concrete context within which Kaupapa Maori theory is located.

Research by Tania Ka'ai (1990) and Margie Hohepa (1990) advocates that distinctive Maori pedagogical structures clearly exist and operate within Te Kohanga Reo, this is further advanced by Tuakana Nepe (1991)

"Both Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori are self-determined educational interventions aimed at ensuring the survival of the Maori language, reestablishing through the medium of Maori its own body of Kaupapa Maori knowledge, and redressing the educational crisis caused by the monocultural practices of the New Zealand system on the majority of Maori children who pass through it."
(Nepe, T.M., 1991:3)

Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori are Maori educational structures that exemplify and regenerate Kaupapa Maori theory and which, by their very existence, reveal the inequalities and inadequacies that exist in Pakeha controlled schooling (Smith, G.H., 1988).

A significant point to make at this time is that Kaupapa Maori theory is committed to the notions of conscientisation and emancipation. The initial establishment of Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori outside the State system has meant that whanau groups have been alerted to the contradictions that exist within Pakeha structures. The experience of dealing with institutions has meant Maori people, and in particular Maori women, have taken on roles as decision makers both administratively and politically, that has facilitated an awareness and understanding of the cultural and social inequities that exist within New Zealand society. According to Kathy Irwin (1990) Maori people have through these initiatives been "mobilised in culturally appropriate ways to participate in social change".

Kaupapa Maori theory provides a basis from which to actively critique dominant discourses that marginalise or invisibilise Maori people. Operating from within Maori culturally preferred

methodologies Kaupapa Maori theory validates Te Reo Maori and Tikanga Maori as constructed by Maori people. It is a theory of resistance which reveals the power relations within society and in exposing dominant and subordinate positioning works toward their transformation at both macro and micro levels.

SUMMARY

Critical theories have arisen from a belief that all 'facts' are socially constructed and insomuch are determined by those that define and control their construction. Theorists operating from within critical theory actively oppose positivist assertions that 'facts' are objective or neutral and seek to provide theories of the world that encompass human agency and wider societal structural influences.

Reproduction theorists Bowles and Gintis provide analysis that locate social structures as corresponding to capitalist imposed economic structures which reproduce inequalities that exist within the economic structures through the social institution of schooling. Pierre Bourdieu, on the other hand, focuses on schooling as a site of cultural reproduction. Schools are perceived as key social institutions in the reproduction of particular cultural forms, which are determined and legitimated by those that hold power within society. The legitimation of dominant group cultural capital and marginalisation of subordinate group cultural capital, within agencies such as

schooling, leads to the reproduction of existing social class inequalities.

Reproduction theories have provided valuable contributions to theoretical analysis of the education system however they have tended to be overdeterministic and position subordinated classes as passive recipients in a top-down power structure. The marginalisation of human agency within reproduction theory is countered within the work of resistance theorist Henry Giroux.

Resistance theory considers the education system as a site of struggle between dominant and subordinate groups. Subordinate groups are viewed as active agents drawing upon their own cultural capital to contest dominant power relations, therefore reproduction is never fully recognised. The notion of emancipation is central, as it provides a process through which some subordinate groups in society are able to transform oppressive conditions that are imposed through dominant ideologies. Criticisms directed at resistance theories, particularly that of its failure to incorporate analyses of race and gender are particularly pertinent to this thesis in that there exists an emphasis on Maori positionings as a subordinate group.

The ongoing development of resistance theory and its application to the situation within Aotearoa has been drawn upon by Maori academics in the reassertion of Kaupapa Maori theories. Originating from a traditional paradigm Kaupapa Maori theory is

indigenous to Aotearoa and may be viewed as a resistance theory that accommodates ethnic, class and gender considerations.

Kaupapa Maori theory is a vehicle through which contemporary constructions of resistance is expressed, whilst acknowledging past Maori resistance movements that sought to challenge Pakeha domination in this land. The centrality of Te Reo and Tikanga Maori is an assertion of the validity and legitimacy of Maori knowledge forms which moves Maori knowledge from the margins to the centre, thereby locating it as a tool of emancipation. Emancipatory acts can be seen in the developments of Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori, educational institutions that are defined, constructed and controlled for Maori people by Maori people.