

*Tā te Pūnaha Mātauranga o Aotearoa he
Kaikai Haere i te Oranga Tonutanga o te Reo:*
**The Perpetuation of Māori Language Loss
in the New Zealand Education System – A
Pākehā Perspective**

by
Sarah Naylor

A research report submitted for the degree of
Master of Indigenous Studies
at the University of Otago, Dunedin
New Zealand

28 February 2006

Abstract

This research report examines how the New Zealand education system has perpetuated language loss for Māori, both historically and contemporarily. Colonisation is not simply an historical concept but it remains embedded within society and its effects are felt throughout history and therefore it is important to look at the past in order to understand the present and to shape the future.

Chapter One provides insight into the methodology employed to provide the foundation and theoretical framework from which the historical data and research can be best understood.

Chapter two will take an historical look at education for Māori in New Zealand. The New Zealand education system holds its genesis in eurocentrism beginning with the first missionary school in 1814. Education for Māori began as a means of ‘civilising the natives’, to spread the Gospel and was used as a tool to assimilate Māori to the ways of the European, this was ensured through various acts and legislation.

The Education Ordinance Act of 1847 introduced English as the language of instruction in all schools and in 1867 the Native Schools Act was introduced. This act established a number of secular village primary schools known as Native Schools. These schools were used for the education of Māori children. By the 1900s the Māori language was forbidden completely in schools and corporal punishment was administered to children who disobeyed. This had a devastating effect on the Māori language.

Chapter three will look at the effects that early education had upon *te reo Māori* (the Māori language). Many of those children who were punished in school for speaking the Māori language stopped speaking *te reo Māori* completely for fear of further punishment; this led to generations of Māori who were raised as English speakers as their parents did not want them to be punished for speaking *te reo Māori* as they once were.

Chapter four will examine a contemporary context. It will begin with a look at educational reforms such as Tomorrow's Schools (1989) and the development of the current national curriculum and examine the effect these have had on *te reo Māori* in New Zealand schools today. This will include a critique of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, its discrepancies and how this document affects the inclusion of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* (the Māori language and customary lore) in the New Zealand curriculum.

It was Māori themselves who took a stand against language loss through the development of Te Kōhanga Reo and Te Kura Kaupapa Māori.

Chapter five will take a look at the development of Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori as well as the effect these Māori initiatives have had upon language revitalization in New Zealand. This chapter also examines the effect the transition from *kaupapa Māori* (Māori-based) education into mainstream has upon a student's use of *te reo Māori* by showing the contrast between the two types of schooling and therefore highlighting how mainstream education perpetuates language loss.

Chapter six looks at Ngā Haeata Mātauranga, the annual report on Māori education. This chapter will explore the various initiatives aimed at increasing Māori achievement while looking at how these initiatives relate to increasing the status of *te reo Māori* within education.

Chapter seven is the final chapter and will sum up the whole report as well as propose recommendations for the future in terms of ensuring the survival of *te reo Māori* in New Zealand schools.

Acknowledgements

I'd like to start by thanking my supervisor, Professor Tānia Ka'ai. Thank you Prof for talking me into the MIndS, I wouldn't be doing this if it wasn't for you. I admire you for standing up for what you believe in and never backing down when it comes to your culture. You are such a wonderful source of knowledge and I always enjoy our meetings. Thank you for guiding me throughout the year (and even before then) with all of your support, information and your time. It has meant so much to me. You are truly an inspiration.

Thank you to all of my interviewees. Thank you for your time. Thank you for sharing your stories with me. Thank you for your voice. I couldn't have done this without you.

I'd like to acknowledge the staff of Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies, who have aided me in various ways during my research and writing, Dr Brendan Hokowhitu, Associate Professor Michael Reilly, Dr Rawinia Higgins, Professor John Moorfield, Pesamino Tili, Tania Smith, Glenys Russell and anyone else I've forgotten - some of you provided information, some of you set me on the right path and others were simply a smiling face or a word of encouragement at the right time. Thanks heaps.

To my fellow post grads, Abby, Ngahuia, Sarah and Marcia - I wish you guys the best of luck in the future.

Abby - Thanks for all your support, you've been such a motivating force, probably without even realising how much. You're awesome! If I ever need a good lawyer, I'll call you.

Ngahuia – I don't think I would have made it without you keeping me company and feeding me on a regular basis. Thanks for putting up with all the random, crazy thoughts in my head (“Ngahuia, do you think in Māori or English?”).

Sarah Cripps (“the other Sarah”) – Thanks for stressing with me when things were crazy. Thanks for letting me know that I wasn’t alone.

Marcia – I’m so glad you were a part of our class. Thanks for saving me walking up that hill after long days at uni. I look forward to hearing how your dissertation goes.

I’d like to say a huge thank you to my family for your continuing love and support.

My sisters, Laura and Olivia – I love you guys. Thanks for just being you. Good luck with your studies, I look forward to watching you guys progress throughout life. You rock!

Mum – I owe you so much. Thank you so very much for transcribing my interviews; it was the hugest help and took a lot of stress off for me. Thank you for always being there for me and for helping me become the person I am today. I admire you more than you could possibly know. I love you so much!

Dad – I wish you were here to share all of this. I miss you and I love you.

To my friends:

Kate Timms – I really wouldn’t have made it without your help. Thanks for providing me with so much information and support.

Anna-Kate – You’ve been such a blessing. Thank you for listening. Thank you for being there when I was stressing. Thank you for assuring me when I was feeling insecure. Thanks for accountability, chai lattes, fries and aioli and general craziness. I couldn’t have got through it without you. You’re beautiful. I love you.

Kat, Jo, Matt, Dana & Liz – Thanks for smiling faces to come home to. Thanks for all the crazy randomness. Sorry about all the late dinners and thanks for putting up with me when I was stressing, thanks for supporting me through those times, too. Thanks for letting me talk your ears off about Indigenous Studies. I hope you learnt heaps. Love you guys!

Catherine – Thanks for being there for me through the big stuff. You've been with me from the very start and I couldn't have got here without you giving me a second opinion on all those important life changing decisions. Thanks for all the crazy times in education (“Well there was this racoon...”). You're the greatest. Love you heaps!

Sally, Taylor & Callum – I love you guys. Thanks for always being there (in spirit if not in person but I know you're always there when I need you).

In the event that I may have overlooked any person who has played a direct or indirect role in supporting me through to the completion of this work I acknowledge you now. My sincere and gracious thanks - thank you, thank you, thank you.

Above all, thank you to my God and Creator. Thank you for the person you've made me. I can do all things through you who strengthens me.

Preface

All Māori words (with the exception of proper nouns and common words such as 'Māori' and 'Pākehā') have been italicised which is the policy of Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies. In the first instance the word is used, a translation of the word has been provided in brackets, however, a full list of Māori terms can be found in the 'glossary of terms' as further reference.

Long vowels in *te reo Māori* are denoted with a macron with the exception of direct quotes which will be followed by the Latin [sic].

I have followed an author-date-page style of referencing whereas direct quotes are followed in brackets by the author's name, the date of publication and the page number. For example (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190).

All direct quotes have been incorporated into the text in quotation marks whereas long quotes of three lines or longer have been typed in 11 point font, single spaced and indented so that it stands out from the text. In this case quotation marks will not be used. This style is also used in Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies.

I have also used footnotes on several occasions to make comment on certain parts of the text without interrupting the flow of thought provided in the text.

The names of *kaupapa Māori* education institutions such as Te Kōhanga Reo, Te Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Whare Kura have been referred in the first instance using 'Te'. Thereafter, 'Te' has not been used.

I have spelt indigenous with a capital 'I' because this is the convention used by many Indigenous writers including my supervisor, Professor Ka'ai.

I have chosen to separate out the bibliographic references for ease of referencing for the reader under the following categories: books and chapters within a book, documentaries, internet articles and websites, journal articles, oral sources, reports and unpublished works.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Preface	vii
Foreword	x
Chapter 1	1
Introduction and methodology	
Chapter 2	9
Eurocentrism as the genesis for New Zealand schools	
Chapter 3	24
A language in decline	
Chapter 4	40
The New Zealand Curriculum: foundation for learning or tokenistic tool	
Chapter 5	54
Mainstream education versus <i>kaupapa Māori</i> education	
Chapter 6	69
Future initiatives of future domination	
Chapter 7	77
The outlook for the future	
Glossary of Terms	91
Bibliography	95

Foreword

My name is Sarah Naylor and I am a Pākehā. I enrolled with the University of Otago for the first time in 2000 when I began a Bachelor of Teaching in primary teaching through the School of Education. Throughout my time with the School of Education, we were always taught the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi and the necessity of including *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in our planning. I took a break from the Bachelor of Teaching after my second year to undertake further study in *te reo Māori*, through my studies with Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies where I developed a deep passion for *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. My marks were good as I enjoyed the work and I had a strong desire to teach *te reo Māori* in schools. However, upon entering primary schools, there was very little Māori content evident in most classrooms other than basic greetings, commands, and very simple lessons such as songs, colours or numbers. I would try and incorporate Māori language into my practicum lessons, however, it was difficult to do if it was something which the children were not familiar with.

I decided in my final year of the Bachelor of Teaching that teaching was not for me. However, with a strong desire to continue with Māori Studies, in 2004, I enrolled in a Diploma for Graduates, majoring in Māori Studies. During this year, I enrolled in MAOR 213: Te Mana o Te Reo. This paper taught the history and development of the Māori language as well as its cultural contexts and the various issues facing the language in today's society. One of the requirements of this paper was an oral assessment; alone or in a group, we were to present a case to the British Crown against injustices to Māori in education since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. This was to be done using personal experiences. I joined a group with two other girls who had also been in my class in the Bachelor of Teaching. They were also Pākehā, like me. These oral assessments occurred over several days and we heard the various stories brought by our peers, truly heart wrenching stories about their *whānau* (extended family), of physical punishment for speaking the Māori language, of racism and various other injustices perpetuated against

them as Māori were etched in our minds. We wondered how we could talk about injustices to Māori in education with personal experiences when we were not Māori ourselves. So we reflected on our own education and experiences and our stories focussed on how we had only received a very token knowledge of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. Furthermore, it was only because we had been fortunate enough to have come to university and been educated about issues surrounding *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* that we were not trapped into the mindset of many Pākehā who because of their own education did not see that *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* are a valuable part of New Zealand's past, present and future and that they are a necessity in our education system. It is because of this mindset that *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* continue to be devalued within education.

It saddens and nauseates me that children were once beaten for speaking their own language as Māori were. It saddens me to live in a country where *te reo Māori* is an official language but so few people are able to speak it fluently and it is unbelievable to me that it took until 1987 for *te reo Māori* to be recognised as such. These have been the motivations which have led me to focus my research report on this topic.

Chapter One

Introduction and Methodology

Overview of Chapter: This chapter will provide details on the research methodology used, descriptions of the primary and secondary sources used, research ethics observed and the theoretical framework employed which guided the research process and the analysis.

While the majority of my research came from books and articles it was important for me, as a Pākehā, to capture a Māori voice in my research report. I wanted to use actual stories and experiences from Māori people which was not something I was necessarily going to find in books. Therefore part of my primary research was to carry out a number of interviews with Māori people of their own experiences of education in New Zealand.

Sample of interviewees

I have not named the interviewees in my research. For the purpose of anonymity all interviews have been labelled 'personal communication' and they have been distinguished by gender (*wahine* [woman], *tāne* [man] or *kōtiro* [girl], *tama* [boy]), age and *iwi* (tribe) affiliation. Names of people and places have been removed from quotes where appropriate to preserve the anonymity of the interviewees. For this reason, full transcripts were also omitted.

My interviews fell into two categories. Firstly, I interviewed five *wahine* and one *tāne* on their use of *te reo Māori* at home and on their experiences of mainstream education.

Wahine, 59, Ngāi Tahu was raised in Canterbury. She spoke no Māori at home, her father was raised in a Māori speaking environment; he could understand the Māori language but never spoke it to his children. She attended

mainstream education. She came back to *te reo Māori* as an adult. She is currently a wife, mother and grandmother and is a resource teacher of Māori.

Wahine, 26, Ngāti Porou was raised in Invercargill. Her father is Māori and her mother is Pākehā. Her parents separated when she was young and she was raised by her mother. She attended mainstream education and began learning *te reo Māori* at high school and is currently a Māori language teacher.

Tāne, 51, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāi Tahu, Te Arawa was raised by his grandfather in Masterton. His grandfather spoke Māori to him as a child but this was stopped by his mother. His grandfather had been beaten at school for speaking *te reo Māori* and therefore raised his grandson to learn the ways of the Pākehā. He learned no Māori language after intermediate and left school at fifteen to enter a trade training programme. He is currently a husband and father working in Māori health.

Wahine, 35, Ngāti Kurī, Ngā Puhī was born in a small town in Northland but raised in Auckland until the age of seven when her family moved back to the family farm. She was not raised as a speaker of the Māori language although both her parents were fluent. She attended a Native School, where they learnt very little Māori other than *waiata* (song, chant). She is now a wife and mother; her children have attended a Māori bilingual unit.

Wahine, 22, Ngāti Tūwharetoa attended Kōhanga Reo in Wellington before her family moved to the Hawkes Bay area. She spoke some Māori language at home. She attended a bilingual unit at primary school and intermediate although she recalls “doing more religious studies than actual Māori studies . . . just real token stuff” (Personal communication – *Wahine*, 22, Ngāti Tūwharetoa). She did Māori by correspondence at high school and has just completed a major in Māori Studies at university.

Wahine, 69, Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Porou was raised in a small, rural community in the Hawkes Bay. Her grandparents were fluent speakers of the Māori

language, but were careful only to speak Māori between themselves or with other adult Māori but never engaged with their children or grandchildren, as *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* was discouraged in mainstream society. She progressed to tertiary education, qualifying as a secondary teacher from Teachers' College and served as a teacher for forty years. She married and had three children. She encouraged her children to pursue the Māori language and culture as subjects at school. One of her children developed this interest through to the tertiary level and postgraduate level. Her granddaughter is a graduate of Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori.

As well as interviews I was also fortunate enough to be able to attend the student oral presentations for MAOR 213: Te Mana o Te Reo. I had permission from the lecturer and the class to attend these oral presentations and several of these students gave me permission to use quotes from their seminar in my research. These students also remain anonymous and will be distinguished by gender, age and *iwi* affiliations like the interviewees; however, these will be labelled '*kaikōrero*' (speaker) to distinguish them from the interviewees (Personal communication). This data is relevant in that the students were presenting seminars on the failure of the Crown to deliver quality education to Māori in terms of recognising Te Tiriti o Waitangi (The Treaty of Waitangi) and *te mana o te reo* (the status of the language).

My second category of interviewees was for those people who had attended, or had children who attended both *kaupapa Māori* education (Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Te Whare Kura or bilingual education) and mainstream education and the effect mainstream education has upon a student making the transition from *kaupapa Māori* education, with a high level of fluency in *te reo Māori*, into mainstream education in terms of maintenance of their language.

Wahine, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu attended Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Kura before entering a mainstream high school. She was raised in a Māori speaking environment and *te reo Māori* continues to be her first language. She took Māori by correspondence as her competency in *te reo*

Māori was much greater than her secondary school Māori teacher. I also interviewed her mother, *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu. Working in education she was committed to *kaupapa Māori* education because she could see how mainstream education was failing Māori students and that *kaupapa Māori* schooling was her daughter's cultural right.

Tāne, 19, Ngā Puhī attended Te Kōhanga Reo and then attended a mainstream school with an immersion unit in it. He did not describe *te reo Māori* as his first language and although he could speak *te reo Māori* to his brothers (who attended the same schools as he did); his parents were unable to speak *te reo Māori*.

Wahine, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu attended Kōhanga Reo and then Kura Kaupapa Māori; she entered a mainstream intermediate where she did School Certificate Māori by correspondence. She spoke *te reo Māori* to her brother who also attended Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori. Her father was Pākehā and unable to speak *te reo Māori*. Her mother could understand *te reo Māori* but did not speak it. She described *te reo Māori* as her first language.

Wahine, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri attended Kōhanga Reo then went into a bilingual unit at primary school. Her mother was Māori and able to speak the Māori language whereas her Pākehā father was unable to speak the Māori language, therefore she spoke a mixture of *te reo Māori* and English at home. She described *te reo Māori* as being her first language as a child although she lost the ability to speak *te reo Māori* upon entering mainstream high school.

I also interviewed a mother and her daughter and another mother and her son.

Wahine, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui was raised in the Dunedin area; she went to a mainstream school and was not raised with the Māori language. Since the birth of her daughter she has been learning the language.

Kōtiro, 15, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui attended Kōhanga Reo then a bilingual unit at primary school. She sat School Certificate Māori and *te reo Māori* was her first language until she entered mainstream high school where she is currently doing Māori by correspondence.

Wahine, 44, Ngāi Tahu entered her son (*Tama*, 11, Ngāi Tahu) into Kōhanga Reo because of her own inability to speak the Māori language. She then enrolled him in Kura Kaupapa Māori. I was surprised to learn that unlike my other interviewees who had entered mainstream education because there was no Whare Kura in the area they were living, *Wahine*, 44, Ngāi Tahu actually withdrew her son from Kura Kaupapa Māori because she was dissatisfied with the school and she wanted her son to learn English. This is something I have aimed to address in my fourth chapter.

In the process of my interviews, I have followed University of Otago ethics whereby I received ethical approval from the University of Otago Ethics Committee and the Te Tumu Postgraduate Committee under Category B approval which ensures participants remain anonymous. Each interviewee received an information sheet outlining the aim of the project and guaranteeing that they were able to withdraw at any time. This also outlined how the data was collected and how the data will be used. Participants also signed consent forms guaranteeing that their participation was voluntary and they could withdraw at any time.

I also followed *tikanga Māori* (Māori protocol, customs) by providing participants with a small *koha* (gift) for their involvement in the project, in appreciation for their contribution to my research. This is in keeping with the cultural concept of *tautuutu* (reciprocity).

All interviews were recorded on cassette. I had a number of set questions which I used as icebreakers as the questions allowed for the development of discussion and for other questions to develop from the interview.

Research Ethics

All students and staff in Te Tumu – School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies conduct research in a manner which observes cultural principles commensurate with Indigenous peoples and communities. These include the following:

1. the Indigenous community must be consulted about the nature of the research and it is important that they are in agreement that the research may be conducted;
2. all research on or about Indigenous Peoples must be mutually beneficial to that community and the researcher;
3. the researcher, in conducting research in an Indigenous field, has an obligation to regularly inform, consult and update that community throughout the course of the research including the research methodology to be employed and the outcomes of the research;
4. the researcher recognises the honour and privilege of accessing Indigenous knowledge. It should be recognised that some people who may contribute to the research may be chronologically young, but their wisdom is valuable. To adopt an attitude as a researcher that one is merely a vehicle for the expression of Indigenous knowledge in an academic context, provides a sound basis from which to work among Indigenous communities;
5. the researcher accepts unconditionally that there are reciprocal obligations to the Indigenous community in agreeing to their research to proceed. The obligation may well be in terms of unpaid time to undertake a task or several tasks requiring academic expertise for their community. This is based on the Māori notion:

*Nō te kōpū kotahi
i kai tahi, i moe tahi,
i mahi tahi.*

6. the researcher observes Indigenous protocol at all times in the context of conducting research and allow for this in the preparation of their design. This includes the set timeframe not only to negotiate access to the sources of Indigenous knowledge and collect data, etc., but also to take into consideration those cultural events and practises which are mostly unplanned. In the Māori world, this may included *te whānau mai o te tamaiti* [birth of a child], *hura kōhatu* [unveiling of a headstone], *tangihanga* [funeral, rites for the dead], *te rā o te tekau mā rua* [the day of prayer for the Ringatū church], *poukai* [hui held on *marae* where people who support the Kīngitanga demonstrate their loyalty, contribute to funds and discuss movement affairs], *kawe mate* [mourning ceremony at another *marae* subsequent to the *tangihanga* and burial], *whakataetae* [race, competition, contest, match, tournament], *pōhiri* [welcome],

manuhiri [visitor, guest], *hui* [gathering, meeting], and *ngahau* [entertainment, dance]. The researcher must be prepared to participate if that is the expectation of the Indigenous community;

7. the researcher must acknowledge and cite all sources of knowledge in the text of the research;
8. the researcher, on completion of the research with the Indigenous community, appropriately inform the Indigenous community of the completion of their work in the community and thank them appropriately through *koha aroha* [gift of appreciation] which may include *kai* [food], *taonga* [treasure], etc.
9. the researcher, on completion of the research document, presents a copy of the document to the Indigenous community from which the information was obtained.

(Te Tumu, 2004: 18-19)

Theoretical Framework

As previously mentioned in the opening paragraph of this chapter, I felt compelled to ensure ‘a Māori voice’ underpinned the research report for the following reasons:

- I am a Pākehā woman and therefore merely a vehicle for the expression of Māori views on the failure of the education system to meet the needs of Māori children.
- As a researcher, I wanted to conduct research from a Māori Studies paradigm which recognises cultural values and imperatives alongside the western conventions of conducting research.

It is against this background that *kaupapa* Māori was chosen as the theoretical framework for this research.

From a pure Māori Studies perspective, the term *Kaupapa Māori* means the “groundwork” or the “medium” from which Māori knowledge, including *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* can be validated (Higgins, 2004: 8). “*Kaupapa Māori* paradigms . . . develop values, actions, customs and reflections of realities that are intrinsic to Māori identity” (Higgins, 2004: 5).

(Ka’ai, 2005: 6)

Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Wānanga and University Māori Studies departments are expressions of *kaupapa Māori* ideology.

Ka'ai explains this further:

Māori Studies at the University of Otago is a space for undertaking teaching and research which recovers our histories, reclaims our lands and resources, restores justice and preserves our language and traditions within a culturally specific framework called, *Kaupapa Māori* . . . herein lies the theories generated by Indigenous scholars and *tohunga* . . . who have constructed models to explain a Māori way of thinking (epistemology) and a Māori way of doing things within the western academy.

(Ka'ai, 2005: 6)

Furthermore, Ka'ai explains:

Kaupapa Māori is best understood as a culturally specific framework. It is located in *te ao Māori* (the Māori world) and reflects the relationship Māori have to the land and the environment, to Māori socialization patterns and cultural nuances and to Māori identity. It is a framework which is best understood by other Indigenous peoples as it corresponds philosophically with what underpins Indigenous peoples as it corresponds philosophically with what underpins Indigenous peoples in colonized contexts, that is, their struggle for self-determination and the right to have their voices heard as they constantly fight against the disadvantaging consequences of the colonial legacy.

(Ka'ai, 2005: 6)

Therefore the theoretical framework adopted is commensurate with the nature of this research in that Māori voices are being given paramount importance and rightly so as it is their language which has been eroded by the advancement of State education. This demonstrates an ability to draw from primary and secondary sources as well as grounding this work within a *kaupapa Māori* ideological framework.

Chapter 2

Eurocentrism as the genesis for New Zealand schools

Overview of chapter: Prior to the arrivals of Europeans in 1642, Māori had their own forms of education. The pursuit of knowledge is something which is grounded within Māori mythology. This chapter takes an historical look at New Zealand's education system. The chapter begins by looking at Māori education prior to the arrival of the first Europeans. Formal education in New Zealand began in 1814 with the first missionary schools. Beginning with missionary schooling this chapter explores the development of education for Māori up until the early 1900s where corporal punishment was administered in schools to those children who were caught speaking the Māori language.

The Māori people have always been concerned with education and the transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next, passing on values and the collective knowledge of the society on to its members. The Māori world view is “holistic and cyclic, one in which every person is linked to every living thing and to the *atua*” (ancestor of on-going influence) (Ka'ai & Higgins, 2004: 13). The acquisition of knowledge is something which is deeply rooted in Māori mythology as stated by Dr Pita Sharples “the way Māori people locate the learner begins with the genesis of Māori people from the sky father, Rangi-nui and the earth mother, Papa-tūā-nuku” (Ka'ai, 2004: 207).

Māori mythology tells the story of how Tāne-nui-a-rangi was selected by Io (Io taketake – the source of all [Shirres, 1997: 33]) to be the one who would introduce knowledge into the world. It was Tāne-nui-a-rangi who climbed up into the highest heavens and brought back with him *ngā kete mātauranga* (the baskets of knowledge). There are three *kete* (basket, kit, bag) and within traditional Māori thinking these *kete* contain all the knowledge and skills necessary for the survival of the Māori people.

The first *kete*, *te kete aronui* is the basket of *aroha* (love), peace and arts and crafts which benefit the Earth and all living things (Moorfield, 2005: 55). This

kete contains the knowledge of what we see; it is the knowledge of the natural world as perceived by the senses (Shirres, 1997: 17).

The second *kete*, *te kete tūāuri* is the basket of evil as well as war (Moorfield, 2005: 55). The Reverend Māori Marsden described *te kete tūāuri* as containing knowledge 'beyond' – "It is the understanding we build up of "the real world of the complex series of rhythmical patterns of energy which operate behind this world of sense perception." (Shirres, 1997: 17)

The final *kete*, *te kete tūātea* is the basket of *karakia* (prayer-chant, religious service, incantation) connected with the Earth and sky and the control of all things performed by the offspring of Papa-tūā-nuku (Moorfield, 2005: 55). This basket contained the knowledge of the spiritual realm; this is knowledge which is beyond space and time.

The story tells how after selecting a suitable location for the sacred lore Tāne-nui-a-rangi ascended into Rangitāmakū, the second over-world. It was in the second over-world that Tāne-nui-a-rangi found the pattern for the *whare wānanga* (university, house of learning), a depository for the knowledge contained in *ngā kete mātauranga*. Tāne copied this pattern and the *whare* (house, building) became known as '*wharekura*' (and this name has been given to other houses of instruction since that time) and following this, Tāne-nui-a-rangi continued his journey. Tāne-nui-a-rangi ascended further to the tenth over-world where he received purificatory rites to proceed into the eleventh over-world and through Pūmotomoto, the entrance to the twelfth over-world where he was led into the presence of Io. It was here that Tāne-nui-a-rangi received *ngā kete mātauranga* (Reed, 2004: 24).

The twelve over-worlds also represent twelve levels of thought from the very simplest level to the domain of Io, the esoteric domain. Much like the journey of Tāne-nui-a-rangi through the over-worlds to obtain *ngā kete mātauranga*, the twelve levels of thought represent one's journey to develop their own skills and knowledge.

A Māori child's education usually began with their *whānau* beginning with language and vocabulary. When a child reached their teens they had passed through a primary stage of education. During the secondary phase of education they fell under the influence of the orators of their *whānau* or *iwi* to facilitate their language. During this phase, children would help their parents with manual tasks. For boys this meant fishing, building *whare*, cultivating crops and other activities while girls were taught to prepare food and do *raranga* (flax weaving). For more specialised crafts an adolescent was taught by a *tohunga* (expert, specialist, priest, artist). Depending upon which *atua* a child had been dedicated to, would determine which craft they would be skilled in. For example, children who had been dedicated to Tūmataurangi, the *atua* of war were given military instruction and children who had been dedicated to Rongomātāne, the *atua* of peace, cultivated foods and kumara, were trained in agriculture.

The sons of chiefs and priests received a higher education; it was these adolescents who were submitted to the *whare wānanga*.

The first *whare wānanga*, Rangiatea pertained to Io; however the first *whare wānanga* on earth was the *wharekura* (school, house of mystic learning) (as named by Tāne-nui-a-rangi). Situated in Hawaiki-nui, this is the place where the souls of the dead receive purifactory rites before they pass on to the spirit-worlds (Best, 1996: 7).

All *wharekura* were used to conserve the teachings of the gods and of men.

Prior to European contact, *wharekura* were used to educate the sons of the *ariki* (paramount chief, high born chief). It is here that they would receive all the skills, knowledge, power and prestige which they would need as *ariki* of their *iwi*.

As well as the *wharekura*, there was also a school in every village for the study of agriculture and similar pursuits such as food gathering, cultivating crops and catching birds and fish. Those attending *wharekura* were not permitted to enter these institutions; however, it was common to all others. Although these schools were sacred places, women were allowed to attend (Tregear, 1976: 381).

There were also schools of astronomy outside all of the important villages; these institutions were also for the *ariki* where they would gather to talk about planting crops, hunting and gathering food but particularly in relation to how the stars would govern these activities. Common people were not allowed to enter these schools of astronomy.

There were also *wharemata* in villages with no school of astronomy, these *whare* were for teaching the art of snaring birds.

As there was no written form of the Māori language before the arrival of Europeans, the *wharekura* conserved oral tradition. These oral traditions were used as a way of retaining and transmitting knowledge. This was achieved through names, *waiata*, *haka* (posture dances of various types), *whakairo* (carving), *tā moko* (tattoo) and *whakapapa* (genealogy) and memory. It was the power of memory which really proved the success of the *whare wānanga*. Elsdon Best tells of how in the winter of 1896 he received from a native of the Ruatahuna district the words to approximately 406 *waiata* and an explanation of each *waiata*, all told from memory (Best, 1996: 5). This power of memory is evident today in the retelling of *whakapapa*.

On 13 December 1642, Dutch explorer, Abel Tasman arrived to the shores of New Zealand. He and his men were greeted with hostility by the Māori people. It was over one hundred years till the arrival of Captain James Cook on the Endeavour in 1769. Cook was followed by sealers, whalers, traders and the arrival of Samuel Marsden and the missionaries in 1814. The arrival of Europeans had a devastating effect upon Māori society in general, and upon the

traditional forms of Māori education such as the *whare wānanga*, to be replaced with new, European schools and styles of teaching, which would lead to the erosion of Māori society and the decline of the use of the Māori language.

Until the arrival of Europeans, the Māori people had no concept of race (Wall, 1997: 40). Because until that point, “there was no need to distinguish such ordinary people from others until the land was shared by others; a group long separated from other races and cultures had no concept of race or culture” (King, 1997: 10). Māori soon became the savage ‘Other’ to the civilised European ‘Self’¹.

The missionaries brought with them many assumptions about the Māori people. Māori were seen as a race of savages in desperate need of civilisation, it was this context under which missionary education began. The missionaries saw the “civilisation of Māori through education as an evangelical and humanitarian duty” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190). On Charles Darwin’s ‘Great Chain of Being’, Europeans saw Māori lying somewhere between their civilised selves and the ape, close to animalistic and not fully human. They saw their need to civilise the Māori as being similar to a parental figure disciplining a small child. This parental guise was a way of justifying colonisation; that what they were doing they were doing for the good of the Māori people. It was a “humanitarian but paternalistic desire to protect the Māori from the disasters that other ‘native’ peoples had suffered through contact with colonists... they [Europeans] genuinely believed they were bestowing benefits upon Māori by ‘civilising’ them” (Simon, 1998: 3). However, Māori were not in need of civilising, they had survived for hundreds of years without the aid of Europeans.

It was Samuel Marsden who recommended the construction of missionary schools. Marsden saw the Māori as being “a nation who have derived no

¹ “The gradual establishment of an empire depended upon a stable hierarchical relationship in which the colonized existed as the **other** of the colonizing culture. Thus the idea of the savage could occur only if there was a concept of the civilized [Self] to oppose it” (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffins, 1998:36).

advantages hitherto either from commerce of the Arts of Civilisation, and therefore must be in a State of Heathen Darkness and Ignorance” (Harvard-Williams, 1961: 115). The chief purpose of the missionary schools was “to further the spread of Christianity and show the natives the way to salvation” (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974: 2). It was believed by the missionaries that only a ‘civilised’ person would ever be accepted as one of God’s flock. It was the view of many of the missionaries that ‘civilisation’ and Christianity went hand and hand and the Māori people needed to become civilised to prepare them to receive the teachings of Christ more readily (Simon, 1998: 2).

The “amalgamation of the races” (Sorrenson, 1975: 97) was another aim of the missionary schools, to assimilate Māori into European culture by encouraging them to adopt “European customary, moral and commercial practises” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190). Māori customs, values and attitudes were condemned by most missionaries.

The first missionary school was established by Thomas Kendall in 1816 in the Bay of Islands. All teaching done at the missionary schools was conveyed in *te reo Māori*. This was the one redeeming feature of the schools; however, missionary schools provided only a very English curriculum consisting of the three Rs – reading writing and arithmetic as well as catechism (Walker, 2004: 85).

The missionaries were not teachers but within the missionary schools they became teachers as well as policy makers. With craftsmen as his missionaries, Marsden introduced a curriculum which provided Māori with not only religious training but industrial training as well (Simon, 1998: 3). Industrial training consisted of mainly agriculture and carpentry. Through this Marsden sought to “restructure the whole system of the Māori internal economy” (Nicholas, 1817: 17), therefore assimilating Māori further into European culture by replacing their own cultural values, attitudes and practises with those of Europeans.

Many Māori saw education and literacy as beneficial as it would give them the skills they would need to interact with Europeans, skills for trade and interaction. It was trade which was one of the main successes of the missionaries. It was the aim of the missionaries to convince the Māori that the material prosperity of the Europeans was connected with their religion and if Māori embraced Christianity, God would look upon them with favour (Binney, 1969: 152). This was a common attitude amongst many Europeans as stated by Henry Williams “Once we were as you are, clad as you are, living in houses similar to yours, but you see now we possess all things” (Binney, 1970: vii). Māori soon became interested in the missionary schools. However, they soon came to discover that the skills and knowledge taught to them by the missionaries was more of a hindrance than a help. The first missionary school closed within two years of it opening. Māori did not become genuinely interested in literacy until the 1820s and thirties when even adults as well as children were approaching missionary schools for lessons in reading and writing.

During the 1820s literacy flourished in New Zealand, in 1827 the Gospel was translated into *te reo Māori* and by the 1830s the missionaries had their own printing press. The missionaries were surprised at the ease of how well the Māori people responded to literacy, chiefs were even asking the missionaries to bring literacy to their own tribes as they saw reading and writing as an extension of their own forms of representation, the art of *whakairo* (Walker, 2004: 85).

Missionaries were surprised when arriving in remote communities to find that many tribes already knew how to read and write as Māori soon began teaching each other and setting up their own village schools. When the Reverend Johannes Riemenschneider arrived in Taranaki in 1846 he met Te Whiti who could recite long passages from the Bible from memory (Walker, 2004: 86). While this has been put down to the power of the missionaries in converting the Māori to Christianity, it has been contested by some, such as D.F. McKenzie that “most Maori [sic] responses to print did not constitute reading

but rather oral repetition from memory... masquerading as reading” (Simon & Massey, 1994: 54). This could be testament to traditional forms of Māori education and shows the power of the Māori people in memorising information, passed down from generation to generation through oral traditions and testament to the *whare wānanga* (Best, 1996: 5).

The progress of the missionaries to convert Māori to Christianity through literacy and education was slow but by the 1830s whole tribes were being converted to Christianity and “the focus through literacy on the Bible and European values served to marginalise Māori traditional culture and knowledge” (Simon, 1998: 5). This led to the slow erosion of Māori culture because although Māori eventually returned their attention to preserve Māori knowledge, they never fully regained the knowledge that was lost (Simon, 1998: 6).

The first formal policy document of New Zealand was the Treaty of Waitangi. Signed in the Bay of Islands on 6 February 1840, the Treaty of Waitangi is said to be the founding document of New Zealand (Hayward, 2004: 151) and was to establish “the concept of a partnership” (Ka’ai, 2004: 202) between the British Crown and the Māori chiefs and tribes of New Zealand. There were three articles to the Treaty. However, the translation of the Treaty has caused much conflict between Māori and Pākehā since the signing. The Māori translation of the first article states how the chiefs cede “complete government over their land” (Orange, 2004: 282) to the Queen. However, the English version states that the chiefs ceded sovereignty. It is believed that there is no way the chiefs would have ceded sovereignty to the Queen, if they had known what the English translation said they would not have signed. Article two was supposed to “protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftanship over their lands, villages and all their treasures.” (Orange, 2004: 282). The third and final article guaranteed Māori full rights as British subjects. This did not happen. This was apparent in education where research by historians has shown that education up until the

1960s was not of equal standard to education for Pākehā (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190).

By the 1840s, interest in literacy again began to wane as Māori became frustrated with missionary education, because at the missionary schools all teaching was done in *te reo Māori*. Furthermore, literature provided at these schools was predominately scripture. Many Māori saw that the only way in which they could successfully interact with Europeans, both settlers and the government, was if they spoke English. In response the missionaries established a number of boarding schools in which Māori children would be taught English. It was hoped that by removing these children from their families, the process of assimilation would be sped up (Simon & Massey, 1994: 55).

However, in 1847 Governor George Grey introduced the Education Ordinance Act. Grey had been appointed by Governor Hobson as Protector of Aborigines. The Education Ordinance Act was a way of disguising a policy, with aims of social control, assimilation and a means to further establish British rule in New Zealand. Under the Education Ordinance Act 5% of the government's revenue was set aside to be used for education (Bradly, 1966: 1). However, rather than use this money to build new schools Grey used the money to support the three missionary schools which already existed around the country on the condition that all teaching would only be conveyed in English. The following is from a letter Governor Grey sent to the Bishop of New Zealand:

All schools which shall receive any portion of the Government grant, shall be conducted as heretofore upon the principle of religious education; industrial training, and instruction in the English language, forming a necessary part of the system in such schools.

(Simon, 2001: 160)

This was the first of several policies which would serve to see the Māori language being pushed out of schools in favour of English.

These schools would be subject to inspections by government inspectors and the curriculum would include industrious training and religious training (as most Māori schooling was still undertaken by the missionaries). It was this ‘industrious training’ which first saw Māori children being channelled into non-academic curriculum areas because according to some, Māori children “had a country to create” (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974: 44). This showed that as well as assimilating Māori to European ways and converting them to Christianity, Māori children were used to cultivate and develop the land, demonstrating that this was another aim of the missionary schools as it was believed that Māori were better suited to physical labour rather than intellectual pursuits as affirmed by Henry Taylor:

I do not advocate for the Natives under present circumstances a refined education or high mental culture; it would be inconsistent if we take account of the position they are likely to hold for many years to come in the social scale, and inappropriate if we remember that they are better calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour.

(Simon, 1998: 11)

In 1852 the British Parliament released the 1852 Constitution Act under the recommendation of George Grey. Under this Act European education became the responsibility of the Provincial Councils. However, Māori education remained under government control. Education for European children was made compulsory in 1877. However, education for Māori children was not made compulsory until 1894 (Simon & Massey, 1994: 63).

By the 1850s Europeans exceeded the Māori population and the Māori language had now become a minority (Ka’ai, 2004: 202).

In 1867 the Native Schools Act was introduced, under this act a number of secular village primary schools were set up. These schools became known as 'Native Schools' and would be used for the education of Māori, although they were attended by some European children. Readings of the Māori Schools Bill in 1867 had received much debate in parliament but received acceptance as it appeared that some politicians had genuine concern for Māori interests, but the

bill was accepted for purely economic reasons and as a further means of social control.

Māori communities who wanted education for their children were required to form a committee and provide the land for the school where the government provided the building and the teachers. However, Māori had to provide half the cost of the building and one quarter of the teachers' salary. Under this act English was to be the language of instruction (Simon, 1998: 12).

An amendment to the act in 1877 meant that Māori communities no longer had to provide building costs or teachers' salaries however they still had to provide the land (Simon, 1998: 12).

In 1879 Native Schools came under the control of the Department of Education rather than the Department of Native Affairs therefore operating under this system as a separate system from the public schools. By 1879 there were fifty seven Native Schools in operation around the country. By 1907 there were ninety seven Native Schools and, by 1955 this number had increased to 166 schools. Although at this time there were more Māori children enrolled in public schools, racial discrimination was rife and these children received little support in learning English. It was thought by some that Māori children were better off in Native Schools than the public schools because at least in the Native Schools Māori children were in an environment with their peers (who largely consisted of *whānau*) who would help them in coping with a system of education which was largely foreign to them:

. . . he [the teacher] put me into the top stream of the third form year . . . you had to have a test to see what stream you would go into at high school and I don't know what happened I didn't get to do that test and so he made the decision... I ended up . . . in this classroom where there were three Māori students and all the rest were Pākehā, very intelligent compared to me and I felt like I struggled a lot and the only class I did feel comfortable in was my Māori class because you had to go into a different stream and none of these guys in my class would go into Māori and so I felt very comfortable in my Māori class, my friends were all in the lower streams and I suppose which made me more attracted to friends

that were tough gangster type friends only because I felt so uncomfortable where I was in my class.

(Personal communication – *Wahine*, 35, Ngāti Kuri, Ngā Puhi)

Throughout most of their existence the Native schools continued to follow a policy of assimilation, placing emphasis on a curriculum which focussed on practical rather than intellectual skills in order to provide students with “sufficient schooling to become law-abiding citizens” (Simon, 1998: 17).

In 1880, James Pope became the Inspector of Schools and he drafted the Native Schools Code. Pope was very influential in the development of Native Schools. This code outlined how the Native Schools would be run.

The role of the teachers were more than simply the education of Māori children, they also had to be role models for the entire Māori community, therefore linking with the assimilation policy. The school was generally run by a married couple who would be “exemplars of a new and more desirable mode of life” (Simon, 1998: 14).

Prior to the introduction of the Native Schools Code there had been no uniform curriculum, Pope established a curriculum for four out of the six standards. This curriculum consisted of reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and “such culture as may fit them to become good citizens” (Simon, 1998: 14).

The Native Schools Code allowed that teachers had some knowledge of the Māori language but only for use in the junior classes as a way of introducing new entrant children to the school routine or as an aide in teaching English (Simon, 1998: 16). The Code outlined how Native schools were to be run, from the appointment of teachers, to the curriculum for each class and the general running of the school. However, this practise was abandoned early in the twentieth century after William Bird replaced James Pope as Inspector of Schools and took over the management of Native Schools. At this time Bird introduced a new method of English language acquisition known as the ‘direct’ or the ‘natural’ method of teaching English. Under this method it was believed that Māori would learn English more rapidly if the Māori language was not

spoken at all. While many Māori parents desired for their children to gain competence in English, they wanted their children to be proficient in both *te reo Māori* and English. This was clearly not the aim of the state (Simon, 1998: 74).

Accounts from pupils of Native Schools vary from being positive to being negative. Some students had fond memories of their school days whereas others were more critical (Simon, 1998: 35). Many ex-pupils of the Native Schools were critical of the lack of support for *te reo Māori* in schools and believed that the Native School system led to “the present crisis of Māori language loss” (Simon, 1998: 35)

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the use of *te reo Māori* was completely forbidden from the playground and accounts tell of how children were physically punished if they even accidentally spoke the language.

It seems unbelievable to many people nowadays that caning was once an acceptable practise in New Zealand schools. However, what should be even more unbelievable and unacceptable is that fact that children were physically punished for speaking their own language. Imagine the confusion of a young child who has grown up speaking *te reo Māori* at home, attending a system of schooling which is already foreign and alien to them and being punished for speaking their native tongue. Children were often expected to speak one language at home and another at school:

. . . as an adult I heard my father tell us that he would be beaten at primary school . . . he didn't know how to speak English so when he went to school he got beaten . . . I suppose it was very traumatic for him and his eight brothers and two sisters and so they would go home and his parents would beat them for speaking English and they learnt English and they'd go out on the farm . . . and they're speaking English and trying to learn off each other and then they'd get a hiding because they're not speaking Māori.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 35, Ngāti Kuri, Ngā Puhi)

Rachael Selby in her book, *Still Being Punished*, records stories of five people who attended Native Schools and how they were punished for speaking *te reo*

Māori. Pat attended a Native school from 1951. The following is an excerpt of Pat's story from *Still Being Punished*:

I can remember one day being in class and Mrs Henderson was playing the piano, and she stopped playing... I sat quietly and one of the kids sitting beside me had a little drum and he was banging on it. I turned to him and said, 'Don't make a noise, you've been told to stop making a noise.' She pulled me up and sent me outside. Then she came out and said, 'I want you to go and see the headmaster.' And I got strapped – on the hand with the strap. I wanted to know when I went in there – why am I getting the strap? So I asked. No answer was given, except that I got another strap. So I got two straps, one for speaking to someone else. The only thing that I can put it down to would be the fact that I was speaking Māori.

(Selby, 1999: 32)

Mehira tells a similar story:

I can remember the teacher smacking me because I couldn't tell the time. I didn't know my figures in English. I remember it was three o'clock and I couldn't say 'three o'clock', so she'd smack me. I'd say something in Māori and she'd say 'No it's not! This is a time for English not Māori, you leave your Māori language at home.'

(Selby, 1999: 43)

Selby's book contains only a small snapshot of the emotional pain felt by those children whose only mistake was speaking their own language, stories of the on-going effects of corporal punishment. There are still many stories which remain unheard.

Some of these children stopped speaking *te reo Māori* and never started speaking it again as often the fear of punishment remained as a permanent scar, they had "effectively had the language beaten out of them" (Selby, 1999: 4):

. . . I made all sorts of excuses not to speak Māori. Sometimes, I'd be straight out and honest and say, 'I can't speak Māori' . . . People expected it. I've had to apologise for it. My head falls off, I break out in a sweat. I see myself being whacked on the backside over the piano with supplejack.

(Selby, 1998: 28)

I first came in contact with *te reo* as a baby when I met my great aunt . . . She was of the generation who was forbidden to communicate in her language and because of her severe punishments was very *whakamā* (shyness, embarrassment) to speak [Māori]. It wasn't until my mother assured her that it was OK that she spoke to me [in Māori].

(*Kaikōrero – Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

By 1896, Māori were very much the minority in their own country. The 1896 official census recorded the Māori population at an all time low of 42, 113 people.

In 1907 the Tohunga Suppression Act was released, outlawing *tohunga* and their practises. This along with the many education policies designed to assimilate Māori into European society had a negative effect upon Māori society as Māori were now forced to approach European style schools for the education of their children.

The effects of corporal punishment in the classroom echoes throughout history, the effects are still apparent amongst many Māori even now. History tells the stories of those Māori children who had their language beaten out of them. As a result, there are generations of Māori who never learned the Māori language from their parents because their parents had been beaten at school for speaking the Māori language. Because of this traumatic experience, parents chose not to pass the Māori language on to their children as they did not want their children to be punished for speaking *te reo Māori* as they once were:

Both of my parents didn't have the language . . . and this is from our grandparents' past, deliberately not giving my parents the language because of them going through the system and getting punished for speaking the language.

(*Kaikōrero – Wahine*, 21, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Kahungunu,
Ngāti Porou)

The education of Māori children by European educators had succeeded in creating a “cultural rupture” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190) between one generation of Māori and the next. This rupture was and still is evident in the use of *te reo Māori* in our society today.

Chapter 3

A language in decline

Overview of chapter: By 1913, 90% of Māori school children were native speakers of the Māori language, however, education had a devastating effect upon the Māori language and by 1986 the number of people fluent in te reo Māori had dropped to 50,000 people. This chapter looks at the effect early education had upon Māori society and the Māori language. The effects of colonisation can be seen throughout the history of New Zealand's education system. Education had caused a cultural rupture, from one generation of Māori to the next. This chapter traces the decline of te reo Māori, from the early 1900s through to the 1987 Māori Language Act, and the various factors which have led to this decline.

It is a common misconception amongst many people that colonisation is an historical concept and that because colonisation was something which occurred hundreds of years ago it does not hold any relevance for today's society. However, this is not true. Colonisation is not simply an historical concept, it remains embedded in society. Similar to a pebble which is dropped in a pool of water colonisation causes a ripple effect from generation to generation. While the effects of colonisation may not be as overt as they may have been 150 years ago this does not mean to say that Māori people are not being affected by the past actions of colonisation today.

Professor Virgilio Enriques of the University of the Philippines and advocate for the integrity of native wisdoms has suggested five processes of colonisation. These include denial and withdrawal, destruction and eradication, denigration, belittlement and insult, surface accommodation and tokenism and transformation and exploitation. All of these processes are apparent in the history of New Zealand's education system. This chapter will touch briefly on the first four.

The first process of colonisation is denial and withdrawal:

When a colonial people first come upon an indigenous people, the colonial strangers will immediately look upon the Indigenous people as lacking culture or moral values and having nothing of

any social value to merit kind comment. Thus, the colonial people deny the very existence of a culture of any merit among the Indigenous people. Indigenous people themselves, especially those who develop a closer relationship with the newcomers, gradually withdraw from their own cultural practises. Some may even join in the ridicule and the denial of the existence of culture among the Native people. They may become quickly converted and later lead in the criticism of Indigenous societies.

(Laenui, 2000: 150-151)

We have seen examples of denial in the existence of the missionary schools where Māori culture was looked upon as primitive and immoral. Teaching at missionary schools was conveyed in the Māori language. Māori began to buy into the hegemony² of missionary schooling in that they saw the English language as being the only way to succeed in a society which was becoming more and more Pākehā dominant. Rachael Selby (1999) found this to be prevalent amongst Māori teachers in Native Schools. One of her case studies, Lia attended Tawera Native School in Tūhoe in the 1950s:

When we were only five, we made lots of mistakes. The kids who were five to nine were just reminded they're not supposed to speak Māori at the school. Some of the teachers just let it go. But our Māori teachers that were there at the time, they were the worst. If they just heard you speaking one Māori word, you got a strap, or a clout around the head. Maybe they were trying to prove something to their colleagues.

(Selby, 1999: 48-49)

The Māori teachers at Lia's Native School show an example of withdrawal. Although Lia is uncertain of the true motives behind their treatment of students speaking Māori, perhaps these teachers were trying to prove something to their colleagues. Perhaps they were simply afraid. This story demonstrates Māori withdrawing from their own cultural practices and from using their own language. "Such a move marks the saddest phase of language loss in a colonial situation – when the colonized people co-operates in, or even seems to lead, the drive towards the loss of its own language (Bell, 1991: 67).

² Hegemony refers to a form of ideological control in which dominant beliefs, values and social practices are produced and distributed throughout a whole range of institutions such as schools, the family, mass media, and trade unions . . . The complexity of hegemonic control is an important point to stress, for it refers not only to those isolatable meanings and ideas that the dominant [culture] imposes on others, but also to those lived experiences that make up the texture and rhythm of daily life (Giroux, 1981: 4)

The second process of colonisation is destruction and eradication, defined by Enriques: “The colonists take bolder action in step two, physically destroying and attempting to eradicate all physical representations of the symbols of Indigenous cultures.” (Laenui, 2000: 151)

The decline of the Māori language began with the 1847 Education Ordinance Act which stated that English was to be the language of instruction in all missionary schools. Decline continued with the Native Schools where *te reo Māori* was banned from the playground and into the 1900s where corporal punishment was used to enforce this rule. Education was successfully leading to the erosion of Māori society through the devaluation and the outright denial of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* and the physical destruction of the Māori language.

This leads to the third process of colonisation, denigration, belittlement and insult where:

As colonisation takes a strong hold, the new systems created within Indigenous societies, such as churches, colonial-style health delivery systems, and new legal institutions, will all join to denigrate, belittle, and insult any continuing practice of the Indigenous culture.

(Laenui, 2000: 151)

It is within this third process, after having their language and culture belittled and denigrated by the coloniser that the “cultural rupture” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190) occurs as Māori further withdraw from their language. A cultural rupture which can be seen between the generations of many Māori families as shown in the following example:

This [*te reo Māori*] is a *taonga* that I’ve worked on for seven years to achieve, a *taonga* that should have been a birth right. My father was a fluent speaker of the Māori language but due to the devaluation of the Māori language through his education, he deemed it unimportant for me to learn the Māori language. Due to his passing . . . I never got to speak to him in his first language . . .

(*Kaikōrero – Tāne*, 25, Whakatōhea, Ngāti Ruanui)

From the late 1840s onwards, European settlers continued to pour into New Zealand. These new arrivals were welcomed by Māori in the interest of trade and commerce (Paterson, 2004: 165). The new settlers were reliant on Māori for food and shelter, however these new comers also brought with them the desire to buy land and increasing pressure was put on Māori to sell their land. The period after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi saw complex layers of land ownership for Māori and many disputes between Pākehā and Māori over various areas of land (Paterson, 2004: 165). This led up to the beginning of many battles over land in what became known as the 'New Zealand Wars' (Calman, 2004: 4). Beginning in 1845 the New Zealand Wars raged for nearly thirty years finishing in 1872, although disputes over land were far from over.

At the conclusion of the New Zealand Wars in 1872 New Zealand was now a country divided. Māori experienced a steep population decline as a result of these wars and it was believed by Europeans “that Maori [sic] as a people and as a culture were headed for extinction” (King 2003: 223). Māori people were further demoralised and marginalised by Europeans as Europeans moved into political and economic power based upon land ownership. Whereas previously Māori could co-exist with Pākehā in the interest of trade and commerce this became more difficult for Māori because of a loss of economic resources (King, 2003: 221). New Zealand was divided into two distinct zones, a Māori zone and a Pākehā zone where the majority of Māori were living in rural settlements. Although the English language was now widespread, *te reo Māori* was the predominant language within Māori communities (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001: 12). By the 1890s *te reo Māori* was still the predominant language of the Māori zone and many Māori language newspapers were being published such as *Te Puke ki Hikurangi* and *Te Mareikura*. These newspapers reported both national and international news. However, the New Zealand Wars did have a devastating effect upon the Māori population and would hold further consequences for the state of the Māori language.

By 1896 the Māori population had reached its lowest number yet, the official census at that time recorded the Māori population to be at 42, 113 people. This means Māori experienced a population drop of approximately 25% since the official census in 1858.

By 1913, 90% of all Māori school children were native speakers of the Māori language (Ka'ai, 2004: 203).

During the 1920s Māori leaders such as Sir Āpirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hīroa) began lecturing Māori communities about the importance of Māori language in the home and the community. However, they were still advocating for English language education in schools. We are aware of this even today by Sir Āpirana Ngata's famous statement:

*E tipu, e rea mō ngā rā o tōu ao.
Ko tō ringa ki ngā rākau a te Pākehā hei ara mō tō tinana.
Ko tō ngākau ki ngā taonga a ō tīpuna Māori hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga.
Ko tō wairua ki tō Atua nāna nei ngā mea katoa.*

Grow tender shoot for the days of your world.
Turn your hand to the tools of the Pākehā for the wellbeing of your body.
Turn your heart to the treasures of your ancestors as a crown for your head.
Give your soul unto God the author of all things.

(Walker, 2001: 397)

It had been over fifty years since English was introduced to New Zealand schools implementing a dramatic decline in the use of *te reo Māori*. Māori were still buying into the hegemony of English language education. It was thought by many people (mainly Māori) that people such as Sir Āpirana Ngata were promoting assimilation by their promotion of the English language over the Māori language. However, it was believed that the Māori language would continue on the *marae* (space in front of a meeting house, the *marae* and the buildings around it), in the homes of Māori families and in other areas of Māori society, thus ensuring its survival. The attitude of English as “a meal ticket to the future” (Selby, 1999: 16) was still predominant amongst many Māori and it was inconceivable that the Māori language could be lost.

Iritana Tawhiwhirangi, renowned for her leadership in the Kōhanga Reo movement, was a Native School pupil in Hicks Bay in the 1930s. Fluent in the Māori language, she reflects on her own family history:

. . . her elders were so secure and strong in their tikanga Māori they encouraged the pursuit of a Pākehā education, never envisaging that it was possible to lose their own language and tikanga . . . because they were so secure in tikanga Māori ‘they went after the unknown that was so highly prized.’

(Manchester & O’Rourke, 1993: 177)

However, Ngata and his colleagues still fought for the retention of Māori land. Ngata was concerned for the betterment of Māori and the retention of a distinct Māori identity. Unfortunately, he had no idea of the effect that World War Two and government policy would have upon Māori communities. By the 1930s *te reo Māori* was still the predominant language in Māori homes and communities however the use of English was increasing and Māori leaders such as Ngata were continuing to promote English only education (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001: 12). By 1939 Sir Āpirana Ngata had changed his mind about the exclusion of Māori language in schools as he wrote:

It explains the case of thousands of Maoris [sic], old and young, who entered the schools of this country and passed out, with their minds closed to the culture, which is their inheritance and which lies wounded, slighted and neglected at their very door... But there are Maoris [sic], men and women, who have passed through the Pakeha [sic] whare wananga [sic] and felt shame at their ignorance of their native culture. They would learn it if they could, if it were available for study as the culture of the Pakeha has been ordered for them to learn.

(Walker, 2004: 193)

The 1930s saw some aspects of Māori culture being included in schools after a review of education policy, signifying the beginning of the “cultural adaptation” policy (Simon, 1998 cited in Selby, 1999: 16). Aspects of Māori introduced in the curriculum included arts, crafts and music. However, the Māori language was not included at all. Furthermore, Māori had no say over what aspects of Māori culture should be included. This is what Enriques

defines as the fourth process of colonisation, which is surface accommodation and tokenism:

In this stage of colonisation, whatever remnants of culture that have survived the onslaught of the earlier steps are given surface accommodation. They are tolerated as an exhibition of the colonial regime's sense of leniency to the continuing ignorance of the Natives. These practises are called folkloric: "showing respect to the old folks and to tradition." They are given token regard.

(Laenui, 2000: 151)

There were other factors which led to the further decline of the Māori language. The 28th Māori Battalion joined the allied forces in World War Two. As a result, a generation of young Māori men never returned home to New Zealand and a generation of native Māori speakers were lost. The war years also saw the beginning of a Māori urban migration; firstly with the Manpower Act where Māori men who were not eligible to serve in the war, were made to contribute to the war effort by working in essential industries which meant a migration from rural Māori communities to urban areas. Urban migration continued after the Second World War as Māori people moved into the cities to pursue employment. This had a drastic effect upon Māori society. Prior to World War Two, 90% of the Māori population lived in rural areas. Urban migration continued into the 1950s and Māori families became pepper-potted in suburbs which were predominately Pākehā. Pepper-potting was an official government policy aimed at dispersing the Māori population to prevent residential concentration. As a result, Māori families were choosing to speak English and Māori children were being raised as English speakers.

The 1951 census recorded the Māori population at 134,097 people. According to the census 19% of the Māori population were living in urban areas. However, by the next census this figure had grown to 24%. The stage was set in that the survival of the Māori language was seriously threatened.

Urban migration also put an end to the Native Schools so that by 1969 all Māori were being educated in general public schools.

Surface accommodation and tokenism (Laenui, 2000: 151) continued into the 1960s. Data and statistics in education showed that Māori were being disadvantaged in education; these results were published in the 1961 Hunn Report (Simon & Massey, 1994: 71). The Hunn Report acknowledged that there was a Māori problem within education. However, the Hunn Report proposed an end to policies of assimilation and a new solution of integration was introduced to combine Māori and Pākehā within education. This proposed that “instead of the culture and language of the by now numeric group being destroyed, all minority groups were to be integrated into the culture of the dominant group” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999: 36). The Hunn Report sought to adopt some aspects of Māori culture into the school curriculum. However, the Hunn Report defined the only aspects of Māori culture worth preserving as “chief relics - interesting cultural fossils that might ‘keep Maoris [sic] happy but which otherwise had little relevance to modern life” (Butterworth, 1973: 15).

The Hunn Report is an example of what Paulo Freire calls false generosity, by including some small aspects of Māori culture in the curriculum as a way of appeasement, to give Māori something, some aspects of their culture and hope that it will keep them happy and quiet. However, this false generosity only serves to further oppress and patronise Indigenous people:

Any attempt to “soften” the power of the oppressor in deference to the weakness of the oppressed almost always manifests itself in the form of false generosity; indeed, the attempt never goes beyond this. In order to have the continued opportunity to express their “generosity”, the oppressors must perpetuate injustice as well.

(Freire, 1996: 26)

The Hunn Report blamed the Māori problem not upon state education but upon Māori parents and Māori communities. The report described Māori language as “a relic of an ancient life that would be difficult to keep alive” (Harris, 2004: 44) and by the 1960s the number of Māori people fluent in the language had dropped significantly from 95% to only 25%.

There were and still are many misconceptions about the Māori language. In the 1960s, the Playcentre movement expressed the opinion that “vernacular Māori is unlikely to survive more than one generation from the present” (Archives New Zealand, 2004) and the movement encouraged Māori parents to speak English to their children in order to prepare Māori children for primary school. It is a common myth amongst many New Zealanders that learning *te reo Māori* will hinder a child’s ability to speak English. Attitudes such as this have added to the decline of *te reo Māori*. It is untrue that learning another language will hinder a child’s ability to speak English as over half the world’s population are bilingual:

A large proportion of the world’s population even today is required to undertake formal learning in a language that is not its mother tongue because that is all that is available. In spite of this, where programmes aim explicitly to support and develop proficiency in two languages with a particular emphasis on ensuring the maintenance and development of the children’s mother tongue, the children have not suffered (Moorfield 1987).

(Hollings, 1991: 53-54)

Moorfield even lists advantages to being proficient in two languages including better first language skills, better cognitive, social and emotional development and a stronger relationship between home and school (Moorfield, 2001: 590). As long as a child is provided with enough time and support it is quite possible for them to thrive in two languages.

By the early 1970s Māori groups such as Ngā Tamatoa and the Te Reo Māori Society all expressed concerns over the survival of the Māori language. A national survey carried out by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) between 1973 and 1978 showed that only 70,000 Māori, that is, 18-20% of Māori were fluent speakers of the Māori language and the majority of these were elderly which meant “if nature were left to take its course, Māori would be a language without native speakers with the passing of the present generation of Māori speaking parents” (Benton cited in Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001: 13).

The next two decades saw the establishment of many language revitalisation movements. Ngā Tamatoa emerged from the 1970 Young Māori Leaders' Conference at the University of Auckland (Harris, 2004: 44). Ngā Tamatoa was a group (of predominately university students) who emerged from their own phase of mourning, as a group of young Māori who were unable to speak their own language (Ka'ai, 2004: 184).

Ngā Tamatoa lobbied for the inclusion of Māori language in New Zealand schools as well as advocating for the establishment of a one-year teacher education programme for native speakers of the language. They were also the instigators behind Māori Language Week.

The commitment and action of Ngā Tamatoa to the Māori language benefited younger generations of Māori, who were now able to learn the Māori language at secondary school.

In 1978 the first bilingual school was opened in Ruātoki in the Eastern Bay of Plenty. This was a new initiative in Māori education where previously Māori children had been discouraged from speaking their own language (Hollings, 1991: 53)

The Te Ātaarangi movement was developed in 1979 by the late Kumeroa Ngoi Pewhairangi and Dr Katerina Mataira. This was a language revitalization movement specifically for Māori women. Te Ātaarangi uses a method of learning and teaching *te reo Māori* using cuisenaire rods³. This movement was highly successful and a national association was formed in 1981.

Te Wānanga o Raukawa was established in Ōtaki in 1981 and the 1980s also saw experimentation in Māori broadcasting which led to the establishment of two Māori radio stations, Te Upoko o te Ika and Radio Ngāti Porou.

³ These are coloured rods of varying colours and length used in teaching mathematics to primary school children.

But perhaps the two most influential language revitalisation movements for the education of young Māori were Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori. Kōhanga Reo are early childhood centres. The aim of Kōhanga Reo is to cater for the needs of Māori children, providing an environment where they are immersed in the Māori language for a significant portion of the day. The first Kōhanga Reo was opened in 1982 in Wainuiomata. Kura Kaupapa Māori or immersion schools emerged out of the Kōhanga Reo movement (See Chapter 5).

These efforts (all initiated by Māori people) provided a bright start for language revitalization within New Zealand. However, the 1986 Te Reo Māori Claim brought before the Waitangi Tribunal estimated that the number of fluent Māori speakers had dropped to approximately 50,000 people or 12% of the Māori population.

Sociolinguist, Doctor Joshua Fishman has developed a sociolinguistic disruption scale known as the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS). This scale is a graded typology of the threatened status of a language, ranked from stages one to eight. Stage eight represents “a fundamental threat to the prospects for the language to be handed on generationally” (Fishman, 1991: 87). The survival of a language is dependent upon its transmission from generation to generation:

Languages die because they are no longer spoken... Usually it happens from generation to generation (it takes only three or four) the speakers shift to another language. Languages do not die natural deaths. They do not fade away without outside influence. Languages are killed by other languages.

(Bell, 1991: 67)

Stage eight of the GIDS represents communities of socially isolated old folks, the language needs “to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories” (Fishman, 1991: 88) to be passed on to the next generation.

At stage seven, the speakers of the language are “socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active” (Benton & Benton, 1999: 424) adults whose children have grown up.

Stage six is the most critical stage for reversing language decline. There are three components of stage six. Firstly, the establishment of informal, inter-generational links through the language. Secondly, these links must be anchored within a community or neighbourhood. The final factor is the institutional reinforcement of the language.

Stage five sees the expansion of oral communication through means such as immersion schooling and literacy. Literacy is a key mechanism in this stage as a means to social mobility.

Stage four is the incorporation of the language into elementary education.

Stage three incorporates the language into the lower work sphere outside of the community where the language is predominately spoken. As in previous stages, the language is limited to work spaces within these language communities. This may mean native speakers of the language are communicating in the language at work, keeping business records in the language or observing culturally relevant holidays.

Stage two sees the language being used in lower government circles and mass media, however, in both cases the language is only being used in the lower spheres of these domains and not at the higher levels.

At stage one the language is being used in higher education, occupations, government and the media although reaching stage one does not mean the end of reverse language shift problems.

The Māori language had gone from being a living, thriving language prior to the arrival of Pākehā but the introduction of state education lead to a steady

decline in the number of fluent speakers of *te reo Māori*, so that by the 1989 the Māori language was situated at stage eight of the GIDS. This was evident particularly in some areas of the country, as the NZCER survey had shown 222 out of 275 surveyed areas listed fluency in *te reo Māori* as limited to people over forty five and the language was considerably restricted in some areas. For example, the use of *te reo Māori* in the South Island was much lower than language use in the North Island (Benton & Benton, 2001: 425).

Movements such as Kōhanga Reo were introduced to remedy this situation. State education had manufactured generations of Māori who were unable to speak the Māori language and caused a stigma amongst many Māori that the Māori language would never take them anywhere and that English was still the only way to succeed. The following is an example of a Māori man, raised by his grandfather who had been beaten in school for speaking Māori:

I can always remember my grandfather telling me . . . stories of how he was strapped at school . . . for speaking *te reo Māori* . . . he knew very little English so he . . . began to teach me from a very young age . . . but then when my mother came back to live with us . . . she stopped my grandfather from teaching me anymore language . . . whenever my grandfather and mother used to get together they would only speak Māori . . . but she never wanted me to learn and so I was always pushed outside or told to go do something else or get away out of earshot . . . so when I was growing up as a kid I couldn't quite understand why on the one hand my grandfather was keen to teach me the language but then my mother wasn't . . . and subsequently I learnt that . . . one of the reasons why she didn't want me to understand the language was because of some of the things that she was told by my grandfather . . . I can remember him saying "whatever you do, always try to learn the way of the Pākehā and turn on him". That was his thing, so he never really ever trusted any system... and in particular the Pākehā people so and I guess that's mainly... because of the way he was treated...a lot of that rubbed off on me . . . when I was growing up.

(Personal communication - *Tāne*, 51, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāi Tahu, Te Arawa)

This excerpt shows the attitude many Māori held of Pākehā as a result of their schooling. This story also shows how these attitudes are passed on through generations and are still apparent in today's society. The following example is

from a woman, previously a pupil of a Native School, and the barriers she faced in sending her children to a bilingual unit:

It wasn't until my own children started going to school that I got . . . barriers . . . not from teachers, my own family . . . I decided to put [child's name] into the bilingual unit and . . . my husband is Samoan and they went to a Samoan preschool where they only spoke Samoan. And my two girls could only speak Samoan they didn't know how to speak English or Māori. My two oldest sisters said "Why do you do that? They're going to be behind at school." I said "no they're not, they will learn English, everybody's going to speak English to them," and to me that was the same as with Māori, what was the problem with them . . . totally speaking Māori. I asked my older sister... "what if they were just totally immersed in *te reo Māori*" and she said that would be just the same "how could they learn English, they were going to be behind at school, they would not learn; I just couldn't do that to my own children" . . . and then when my second eldest grew up and I decided to send her to the bilingual unit . . . my oldest sister again said it, "what are you doing? She can barely speak English and you're putting her in a bilingual unit." And I said "I want her to, I want my children to start learning *te reo Māori* because I never"...

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 35, Ngāti Kuri, Ngā Puhi)

Many Māori children never spoke *te reo Māori* at home, some were taught the Māori language at an early age however early barriers and attitudes put a stop to their continuing to learn the Māori language. Many children were never taught the Māori language at all even though their parents were able to speak it:

My father . . . lived with his grandmother and his mother . . . They spoke Māori at home with him, he was brought up in a Māori forum so he knew the language at home but he never spoke it. So whether he spoke it with them or not, I don't know because he was just a little boy but both of his mother and grandmother spoke Māori in the home. When he became a married man with mum and had five kids he never spoke Māori to us, he didn't ever say 'no', we didn't ever learn and he never taught us, although he did understand.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

In terms of language at home, we didn't really have any, my dad could speak it and still can, he's lost a lot I think but that's through not using it, he's never put in a situation where he has to use it and so I think, he just lost it.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 26, Ngāti Porou)

Some parents had been punished for speaking the language in school so they did not want their children to be punished for speaking the language as they once were. Consequently, this is why their children were never taught the language:

Both my parents were . . . fluent speakers . . . I never heard them speak Māori at all . . . but as an adult I heard my father tell us that he would be beaten at primary school . . . he just never taught any of his children Māori although I know that like in the last probably five to ten years of his life he did regret it but he never knew why he regretted it. He never knew that . . . it was because he was beaten at school, and he just had these memories of that and he just never knew that that is why he didn't teach it to us.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 35, Ngāti Kuri, Ngā Puhi)

For some children the concept of race was foreign to them. This also stems from the cultural rupture caused by Pākehā dominated, state education:

I guess for us . . . we didn't see ourselves as any different from anyone else in our class . . . and we went to a school . . . there was a good proportion of Māori students in there and all of us never thought of ourselves as being Māori. I guess, I didn't even know who I was, that I was Māori and that I had a tribe until I was eleven, when I reached intermediate.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 26, Ngāti Porou)

I was seven years old and knew no Māori but I suppose I really didn't know that at that stage, that I was Māori because living and going to school and living in Auckland I was just part of everybody else . . . my parents never made a big deal that I was Māori, so I didn't really have any concept of race or ethnicity until I moved home to [place] and went to [school], it was just a primary school at that stage and there the school was predominantly Māori . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 35, Ngāti Kuri, Ngā Puhi)

Teaching in mainstream schools continued to be very Eurocentric and any Māori content was very tokenistic. The Māori language was an endangered species. Up to 10% of the world's mammals and 5% of the world's birds are threatened or extinct. There are numerous protection agencies for these species but there is little concern for the protection of the world's languages. "...surely, just as the extinction of any animal species diminishes our world, so does the extinction of any language" (Krauss, 1992: 8). This is an attitude

carried throughout the 1986 Te Reo Māori claim, as stated by Sir James Henare:

... The language is the core of our Māori culture and mana. *Ko te reo te mauri o te mana* (authority, power, influence, prestige, status) *Māori* (The language is the life force of the *mana Māori*). If the language dies, as some predict, what do we have left to us? ...our Māori language, as far as our people are concerned, is the very soul of the Māori people. What does it profit a man to gain the whole world but suffer the loss of his own soul? What profit to the Maori if we lose our language and lose our soul?

(Waikerepuru & Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Incorporated Society, 1986: 40-41)

The 1986 Te Reo Māori claim records submissions on the Māori language including a history of *te reo Māori* and stories from *kaumātua* (elder, adult) who were physically punished in school for speaking *te reo Māori*.

The Māori language is a *taonga* as guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi and the Crown had failed to protect this *taonga*, “educational policy over many years and the effect of the media in using almost nothing but English has swamped the Māori language and done it great harm” (Waikerepuru & Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Incorporated Society, 1986: 5)

There had been disagreements of the issues raised in the claim. Many people in education circles disagreed with and denied the stories of corporal punishment and many New Zealanders saw the loss of the Māori language as unimportant. However, the claim was a huge step forward for the Māori language because not only were these stories recorded, they were also believed.

In 1987 the Māori Language Act was passed in parliament. This was largely a result of the Māori language claim to the Waitangi Tribunal. *Te reo Māori* was now declared to be an official language of New Zealand (Ka'ai, 2004: 186). It had taken 147 years for the Māori language to be recognised as an official language.

Chapter 4

The New Zealand Curriculum: foundation for learning or tokenistic tool?

Overview of chapter: This chapter will look at education policy and initiatives of the early eighties. It looks at the development of the current New Zealand curriculum. This chapter will also critically analyse the New Zealand Curriculum Framework in relation to the inclusion of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori in New Zealand schools.

During the early 1980s the Department of Education was being put under pressure by Māori to promote a philosophy of biculturalism in schools. The Department of Education responded with Taha Māori (Bishop & Glynn, 1999: 41). Taha Māori was defined as:

. . . the Maori [sic] dimension or literally the Maori [sic] side. In the education process, Taha Maori [sic] is the inclusion of aspects of Maori [sic] language and culture in the philosophy, the organisation and the content of the school. In the curriculum it is not a separated out compulsory element. Pupils should not go to a classroom to 'do' taha Maori [sic]. Aspects of Maori [sic] language and culture should be incorporated into the total life of the school – into its curriculum, buildings, grounds, attitudes, organisations. It should be a normal part of the school climate with which all pupils and staff should feel comfortable and at ease.
(Smith, 1990: 186)

However, Taha Māori was “a Pākehā defined, initiated and controlled policy” (Smith, 1990: 183). It provided Māori with more of the same tokenism and “sticking plaster” solutions they had been experiencing throughout the history of education. The solution was to change Māori students to fit the Pākehā schooling system; it continued to blame Māori underachievement on Māori and not upon the system of education (Smith, 1990: 183).

The 1980s saw a number of changes to New Zealand’s education system and to New Zealand society in general. These changes began in 1984 with the election of a new Labour government under the leadership of a new Prime Minister, David Lange. During this time concerns were expressed by

educators that the current New Zealand school curriculum “did not reflect the current and future social, cultural and economic needs of New Zealand society” (Phillips, 1993: 156) and that it was disadvantageous to girls, Māori, Pacific Islanders and students with learning disabilities. This resulted in the 1987 Curriculum Review by Minister of Education, Russell Marshall and the Department of Education. However, later in 1987 David Lange took over the role of Minister of Education from Russell Marshall. Lange set up a taskforce (headed by economist, Brian Picot) which would review education administration in New Zealand. The taskforce’s report became known as the 'Picot Report' and was published in 1988. The Picot Report formed the basis of what would become known as 'Tomorrow’s Schools' (Simon & Massey, 1994: 74).

Tomorrow’s Schools saw a radical shift in power for New Zealand schools, moving this power from Regional Education Boards onto “communally administered Boards of Trustees” (Hokowhitu, 2004:199); essentially schools were being run as businesses. Boards of Trustees were responsible for the governance and management of their school along with the Principal. Included in Tomorrow’s Schools was a number of charter objectives which related to gender, ethnic and class equity and all schools were expected to achieve these objectives (Lauder, 1995). This policy however continued to discriminate against Māori and other minority groups. As schools were being run as businesses this meant that schools in affluent urban areas were being run by parents with a wide range of professional and business management skills, whereas parents from poorer urban and rural areas often did not have these same skills which were necessary to run their schools like a business (Hokowhitu, 2004: 199).

It was also implied that under this new system, schools would have more control over the education of their children and that “a devolution of power from the state to the community level would benefit Māori because *whānau* who became elected members of a board, would be given the power to effect change in the education of their children” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 1999). However,

this simply took the responsibility off the government, placing it onto the general public. In a society where Māori are the minority, Māori “struggled to find a voice on School Boards” (Hokowhitu, 2004: 199). This meant little change for the status of *te reo Māori* in New Zealand’s schools. Tomorrows Schools was very similar to the previous Māori language programmes of the 1970s (Grace, 2005: 24), as language programmes remained tokenistic and ineffectual:

This reshuffle spelled more of the same in terms of Māori Studies under the new system. Māori content is expected to be seamlessly integrated throughout the ‘Seven Essential Learning Areas’ (Ministry of Education 1993, pp. 8-16), without making too much of a big deal out of it at all.

(Grace, 2005: 24)

Students who were enrolled in primary schools around the country at this time can testify to the amount of Māori content in classrooms. Often this content is very basic, such as greetings, colours, counting and songs but nothing substantial. Māori was often taught by a separate teacher and perhaps only once a week:

. . . we used to have the whole Taha Māori thing where we would have Mrs [name] come in once or twice a week . . . at the beginning of my school . . . I can probably remember stuff being taught to us maybe up to standard one where we had that Mrs [name] come in once a week or twice a week and teach us songs and stuff like that . . . at primary school not a hell of a lot of language learnt just the basics I suppose, counting and colours but even then I wasn’t really conscious of those things . . . when I got to intermediate I joined the *kapa haka* (Māori performing group) group . . . so I learnt bits of language then, nothing formal.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 26, Ngāti Porou)

. . . and then went to primary school in what was supposed to be a bilingual unit which never really was. I had a vague memory of us doing more religious studies than actual Māori studies or stuff in *te reo*. Things that were in *te reo* were mainly songs; we had *kapa haka* with the whole school. And all the Māori kids would be thrown to the front, we had *kuias* (old lady) [sic] and stuff coming in and helping us every now and then, they would be part of the school but other than that I can’t actually remember learning any Māori in the school. It was just real token stuff...

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 22, Ngāti Tūwharetoa)

This lack of *te reo Māori* continues to be an issue in our education system today.

Following Tomorrow's Schools the Department of Education was renamed the Ministry of Education. The new Ministry of Education was a scaled-down version of the Department of Education, they had no responsibility for the everyday running of educational institutions, curriculum support, qualifications or examinations, and the essential purpose of the Ministry of Education was in policy making. Hence, the Ministry of Education became the authors of the current New Zealand Curriculum.

However, it was the newly elected National government of 1990 which saw the initiation of major curriculum reforms beginning with the Achievement Initiative policy (which aimed to establish clear achievement standards in all areas and levels of New Zealand schools) and the National Qualifications Authority (Phillips, 1993: 157). The National Curriculum of New Zealand was released in 1991 but perhaps the most extensive document relating to New Zealand's education was the New Zealand Curriculum Framework which was released in 1993. This framework is based upon previous policy documents and applies to all New Zealand schools, irrespective of gender, race, beliefs or disability. The New Zealand Curriculum Framework is used in Kura Kaupapa Māori, and special education schools (Phillips, 1993: 158). The New Zealand Curriculum Framework is supposed to be "the foundation for learning programmes in New Zealand schools for the 1990s and beyond" (Ministry of Education, 1993: 1). While the New Zealand Curriculum Framework states the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Māori language for the education of young New Zealanders, the reality is that education in *te reo Māori* is not given this importance in many New Zealand classrooms. This is to the detriment of New Zealand society, both Māori and Pākehā alike.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework has seven essential learning areas. These essential learning areas contain "the knowledge and understanding which all students need to acquire... essential for a broad and balanced

education” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 8) These essential learning areas are covered in the curriculum statements Language and Languages, Mathematics, Science, Technology Social Sciences, The Arts and Health and Physical Well-being. It would seem obvious that *te reo Māori* should be included within Language and Languages, however, within this curriculum area, the Ministry of Education lists the following languages: English, Cook Island Māori, Pacific Island languages, Samoan, Niuean, Spanish, Tokelauan, Tongan, French and German. *Te reo Māori* is not included amongst these essential learning areas and there is no *te reo Māori* document currently available in all mainstream schools (see chapter 6, p73). The document, Te Reo Maori [sic] i Roto i te Marautanga [sic] o Aotearoa is for use predominately in *kaupapa Māori* education and bilingual units. This document serves in *kaupapa Māori* education in the same way as the English document does in mainstream schools. This document is written entirely in Māori. The Ministry of Education Curriculum Stocktake survey in 2003 asked if teachers had used any of the Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic]⁴ curriculum statements. 91.9% of those teachers surveyed stated that they had not used these documents (Ministry of Education, 2003). How could they? The majority of those teachers surveyed were probably unable to read them. Even a survey of Kura Kaupapa Māori and bilingual teachers found that many of these teachers used the English documents rather than the Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic] documents as they found the vocabulary and language used in Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic] as being too difficult and inconsistent. Many teachers also commented that these documents do not reflect Māori philosophical approaches to education. Some teachers felt that some of these documents were simply direct translations of the English documents (Ministry of Education, 2003).

Te reo Māori is not compulsory in New Zealand schools although teachers are encouraged to include *te reo Māori* in their daily planning. However, with no

⁴ Including Te Reo Maori [sic] i Roto i te Marautanga [sic] o Aotearoa, the Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic] documents are the curriculum documents to be used in Kura Kaupapa Māori and bilingual units. These documents aim for the adaptation of the Pākehā curriculum into a Māori context. These documents are Pangarau (Mathematics), Putaiao (Science), Hangarau (Technology), Tikanga a Iwi (Social Sciences), Hauora (Health and Physical Well-being), Te Korero [sic] me Nga [sic] Reo (Language and Languages) and Nga [sic] Toi (The Arts).

official curriculum document, *te reo Māori* is not given as much emphasis as the other essential learning areas. Often aspects of Māori language and culture become an add-on, to be fitted into the curriculum amongst everything else, thus remaining tokenistic:

Māori is fitting in with, it's not that fitting in with Māori and that's all coming round forever . . . There's still a lot out there [teachers] . . . they've got big excuses, it's just too hard, it's [Māori language] not given any importance still.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

One factor, according to Grace (2005: 48) which prevented many teachers from including *te reo Māori* into their classrooms was time. With the seven essential learning areas being given much more attention and importance often *te reo Māori* may be added in to the daily, classroom routine if there is time:

. . . our curriculum is so full on now, I mean we just have to teach . . . there's technology now and all those added things we just don't have room in our curriculum. Like I've got a little block on Friday where I try to fit something [Māori], and nine times out of ten I don't do it because there's not time (Teacher aged 45).

(Cited in Grace, 2005: 48)

In regards to the English curriculum statement (1994), the New Zealand Curriculum Framework states the importance of language development for intellectual growth as well as its importance for transmitting values and culture and that “confidence and proficiency in one’s first language contribute to self-esteem, a sense of identity, and achievement through life” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 10). This document states the importance of the Māori language as a *taonga* and that “students will have the opportunity to become proficient in Maori [sic]” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 10). However this document has little to do with other languages such as Māori. In the year 2001 there were 136, 700 fluent speakers of *te reo Māori* (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2005). This number does not suggest that students are leaving mainstream education proficient in the Māori language. If they were, then it could be expected that the numbers would be higher.

The main area where aspects of Māori culture are included within the curriculum is Social Sciences under Culture and Heritage. However, these aspects of Māori culture are predominately traditional aspects of Māori culture rather than contemporary aspects:

. . . when I thought back to my high school days, we studied Māori in a social studies thing . . . it was the Māori *pā* (fortified village) with it's fortifications around it and inside was this *whare* . . . and then there was a *pātaka* (storehouse) . . . This was all we learnt that I recall and I took French and Latin in the third and fourth form at [name of school] High School and sat School Cert French . . . my Latin went down the gurgler but I thought 'Goodness, why do I know more French than Māori?'

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

Research by Grace established that for many teachers (particularly Pākehā) it is easier to teach traditional aspects of Māori culture as opposed to language and contemporary Māori culture because it is safe and well documented in books and other resources:

. . . we do legends, Māori legends and stuff like that . . . because that's part of our heritage . . . and I find I can teach that kind of thing with the legends all written down and the art work kind of flows on from that (Teacher aged 45)

(Sited in Grace, 2005: 38)

Having said this, however, Māori history is often glossed over, painting a happy history of New Zealand's colonial past:

I remember in history and social studies that sort of thing, really glazing over aspects of New Zealand history. History was one of my favourite subjects so I remember we spent a lot of time on the world wars and a lot of time on international politics and that sort of thing but when it came to New Zealand's past it was all sort of, just rosy.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

Māori culture is alive and thriving in New Zealand society today, however many teachers do not know how to incorporate contemporary Māori culture into their classroom:

. . . the resources I have access to are about traditional Māori things, they're about *pas* [sic] and the signing of the Treaty, past stuff and I don't know . . . to take recent Treaty negotiations . . . the foreshore, or whatever into a classroom of eight year olds is not an easy thing to do and there's not the resources to do it . . . I don't know how you would go about teaching about... urban Māori in the city . . . (Teacher aged 25)

(Sited in Grace, 2005: 39)

This presents an imbalance in the curriculum which continues to sideline Māori as a simple, primitive culture, “commodifying New Zealand history for consumption by those for whom it was designed in the first place” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999: 29). In turn the teaching of Māori language is also being sidelined in favour of this simplified, safe portrayal of Māori culture.

Fear is another barrier to teachers incorporating *te reo Māori* into their class, which is fear of mispronouncing words and making mistakes. Unfortunately this often means that *te reo Māori* is not being taught or it is being taught incorrectly. Grace discovered in her research that even though many teachers were teaching *te reo Māori* incorrectly, they viewed it that so long as they were making an effort to teach the language to their class that was acceptable:

I used to know damn well that when I was saying it that I didn't have it right, and I used to think 'oh God, I hope no-one ever hears me' . . . and then I would send those poor little devils off you know, after a year of saying it with me and they probably had all the pronunciation wrong. But I just tell myself 'look, my heart is in the right place' (Teacher aged 59).

(Grace, 2005: 37-38)

Although trainee teachers are receiving more education in Māori Studies in teacher education institutions these days than in the past it is still not enough. Professional development programmes for *te reo Māori* should be made mandatory for those teachers currently in schools as the Māori language continues to be mispronounced, passing this on to students, undermining “the value of Māori culture, Māori language and ultimately the place of Māori people in New Zealand” (Grace, 2005: 38).

There are a number of principles which underpin the ‘New Zealand Curriculum Framework’. These principles are aimed to “give direction to the curriculum in New Zealand schools. They are based on the premises that the individual student is at the centre of all teaching and learning, and that the curriculum for all students will be of the highest quality” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 6). However, these principles show a number of discrepancies in relation to *te reo me Māori* in New Zealand classrooms.

The second principle states, “The New Zealand Curriculum fosters achievement and success for all students. At each level, it clearly defines the achievement objectives against which students’ progress can be measured” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 6). The third principle states, “The New Zealand Curriculum provides for flexibility, enabling schools and teachers to design programmes which are appropriate to learning needs of their students” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 6). The history of education in New Zealand shows that the New Zealand Curriculum is not fostering achievement and success for all students and it is not meeting the learning needs of Māori students as they generally are not achieving to the same levels as their Pākehā peers. In 2003 only 40% of Māori year eleven candidates achieved a level one qualification in National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) compared to 64% of non-Māori students, while 21% of year twelve Māori students achieved a level one qualification and only 9% of Māori students gained a qualification which allowed them to attend university (Ministry of Education, 2004: 15). “Māori aspire for their children to succeed at school in all areas of the curriculum, but also to learn about their own culture, history, and contemporary society” (Glynn, 1998: 5), many are not finding this in mainstream education. The 2003 Curriculum Stocktake discovered that 53.8% of teachers surveyed stated that the New Zealand Curriculum Framework was sometimes useful or not useful at all in meeting the needs of Māori students, while 21.6% stated that they did not know whether it met the needs of Māori students or not (Ministry of Education, 2003).

Each essential learning area is divided into strands, under each strand are a number of achievement objectives which students are expected to attain. With no curriculum document for *te reo Māori*, there are no achievement objectives on which to measure students' progress in the area of Māori studies:

I can pick up a maths book, my maths curriculum and know that . . . I am supposed, in year five to be teaching decimal place . . . three decimal places... But I don't have that in Māori [Studies] . . . you know? ... There is no progression, there are no learning steps, there is no learning progression that says 'in the first two years they will learn these concepts' and then 'in year three they will learn these' . . . it is not a developmental process (Teacher aged 25)

(Sited in Grace, 2005: 27)

The fourth principle is very similar. It states that "The New Zealand Curriculum ensures that learning progresses coherently throughout schooling" (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7). This principle goes on to say how "The school curriculum will link all learning experiences within the total school programme in a coherent and balanced way" (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7). The lack of *te reo Māori* in New Zealand's schools has caused an imbalanced curriculum and with no official curriculum document for *te reo Māori*, there is also no way to ensure a progression of learning from one classroom to the next:

I could be teaching them colours because that is something that I am good at, but the previous three teachers might have covered that because that is what they were good at too. You know? There is no progression... (Teacher aged 25)

(Sited in Grace, 2005: 27)

The sixth principle states that "The New Zealand Curriculum provides all students with equal educational opportunities" (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7). It continues on to state that:

The school curriculum will recognise, respect, and respond to the educational needs, experiences, interests, and values of all students: both female and male students; students of all ethnic groups . . . All programmes will be gender-inclusive, non-racist, and non-discriminatory, to help ensure that learning opportunities are not restricted.

(Ministry of Education, 1993: 7)

However, in its attempts to be non-discriminatory, the curriculum is in fact restrictive to Māori students as they do not learn the same as Pākehā students. New Zealand's curriculum is designed for a dominant Pākehā society and so Māori are clearly disadvantaged. "A middle class Pākehā child acquires a code with which to decipher the messages of the dominant society which are reproduced in mainstream education. It follows then, that any group other than that whose culture is embodied in the school is disadvantaged" (Ka'ai, 2004: 212). Mainstream education is age-specific whereas *kaupapa Māori* education is culture specific. Within mainstream education Māori children are often moved on to the next level of the curriculum regardless of their ability or their readiness to do so (Ka'ai, 2004: 201).

Language is the key, "*Te reo Māori* is the link between knowledge and meaning, and teacher and student" (Ka'ai & Higgins, 2004: 13). The New Zealand Curriculum Framework states the importance of confidence and proficiency in one's first language for self-esteem, identity and achievement (Ministry of Education, 1993: 10). Pākehā children are immersed in their first language in school. However, Māori children do not have this same opportunity in mainstream education therefore furthering the gap between them and the dominant Pākehā culture.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework also contains a number of contradictions. The following is the seventh principle of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework:

The New Zealand Curriculum recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The school curriculum will recognise and value the unique position of Maori [sic] in New Zealand society. All students will have the opportunity to acquire some knowledge of Maori [sic] language and culture. Students will also have the opportunity to learn through te reo and nga [sic] tikanga Maori [sic]...

(Ministry of Education, 1993: 7)

“The school curriculum will recognise and value the unique position of Maori [sic] in New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7). How can the New Zealand curriculum recognise the unique position of Māori in society and (according to the sixth principle) provide equal opportunities for all learners when Māori and Pākehā learners learn in fundamentally different ways? The curriculum effectively homogenises all learners and does not cater for cultural diversity or difference. This is a contradiction (Grace, 2005: 29).

This principle also states that “students will have the opportunity to acquire some knowledge of Maori [sic] language and culture” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7) The selection of “some knowledge” is up to the discretion of each individual teacher and therefore it is their decision what Māori language or Māori culture is taught in their classroom and how much. “Some” Māori language and culture is not enough in a curriculum which is preparing students to “participate effectively and productively in New Zealand’s democratic society and in a competitive world economy” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 3). In a society where both Māori and English are the official languages and in a country where Māori and Pākehā are supposed to be equal partners under the Treaty of Waitangi. In my view, this is not good enough as it does not go far enough in providing equitably for Māori and non-Māori children alike.

The eighth principle states that “The New Zealand Curriculum reflects the multicultural nature of New Zealand society... It will ensure that the experiences, cultural traditions, histories, and languages of all New Zealanders are recognised and valued” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7).

There is much dissention over the meaning of the words bicultural and multicultural. At the simplest level, multicultural means “comprising several ethnic groups or, especially their cultures” (Orsman, 2001: 747). Since the arrival of Europeans and the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand has been described as a bicultural country reflecting the covenant and Treaty relationship between Māori and Pākehā. In today’s society there are many different cultures living in New Zealand including a high number of Pacific

Islanders and Asians. However, the term biculturalism is still relevant in contemporary society as defined by Durie (1994). Durie discusses a bicultural continuum:

At one end of the continuum the goals of biculturalism are about the acquisition of cultural skills and knowledge – an understanding of some Māori words, familiarity with marae protocol, awareness of tribal history and tradition. At the other end, bicultural goals reflect aspirations for greater Māori independence.

(Durie, 1994: 7)

Furthermore, Pacific and Asian people have come to realise the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā in terms of their resettlement in New Zealand. This is evident in the meetings, held particularly at a local community level. For example, the Samoan Council of Chiefs recognise Ngāi Tahu as *mana whenua* (trusteeship of land) in Dunedin (Personal communication – *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu).

The former end of the continuum sounds very similar to the seventh principle of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, “students will have the opportunity to acquire some knowledge of Maori [sic] language and culture” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7) and in relation to the latter end of the continuum, Māori are still struggling to find greater independence and an equal partnership with Pākehā in mainstream education. Biculturalism is a term which is often used to paint a rosy picture of race relations in New Zealand. However, continuing imbalance between Māori and Pākehā would suggest that New Zealand is hardly bicultural, in Mason Durie's sense of the word. Not until New Zealand comes to terms with biculturalism, and that there is balance between the two Treaty partners, only then can New Zealand society begin to address multiculturalism.

Te reo me ngā tikanga Māori do not appear to be valued in an education system which is predominately based on Pākehā culture and therefore continue to be neglected within New Zealand classrooms. There is a perpetuating cycle

of ignorance among many Pākehā New Zealanders. This cycle holds its genesis in the history of New Zealand's education from the outright denial of *te reo Māori* in the classroom, and has continued over the years through numerous education acts, policies of assimilation and integration. It is perpetuated within the national curriculum in New Zealand schools.

Most New Zealander's have not received adequate teaching in either Māori language or Māori culture in their own education and therefore they do not see the importance of the culture and the language for the wider society, nor in the development of our nation. Many of New Zealand's teachers do not have the knowledge or the skills to include *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* into their classrooms as they have not received adequate education in their own schooling or teacher education. This further instils attitudes and perceptions that *te reo Māori* is archaic in that it is not useful for everyday life. This perception is further characterised by people holding the view that *te reo Māori* is a dying language. For many Pākehā they do not feel obliged to learn *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* because they are not Māori nor do they know any Māori people or there are few Māori people living close by. These perceptions have been created out of ignorance. New Zealand's young people are going through mainstream primary and secondary schools, receiving only a very basic knowledge of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. Yet many of these young people are growing up to be the politicians, leaders and decision makers of this country. If *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* are not valued by these types of people it is not likely that it will be given any more place of importance within New Zealand schools, therefore continuing the cycle of ignorance. *Te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* should benefit all New Zealander's, not just Māori but Pākehā as well. It is suggested that only when all Māori and Pākehā New Zealanders are bilingual in *te reo Māori* and English, can we truly say that in part, an attempt has been made to honour the Treaty of Waitangi.

Chapter 5

Mainstream education versus *kaupapa Māori* education

Overview of chapter: This chapter will look at how Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori have contributed to language revitalization in New Zealand. This chapter will also look at kaupapa Māori education in contrast to mainstream education, outlining the effect that the transition from kaupapa Māori education into mainstream has upon the use of te reo Māori. Case studies of a number of people (and parents of children) who have experienced both kaupapa Māori education and mainstream education will provide insight into the effect of the transition from kaupapa Māori education to mainstream education in terms of retention of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori.

At a time when “attempts to address the challenge of cultural diversity [in New Zealand’s education system] continued to be defined by members of the majority culture” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999:61) Māori people were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with mainstream models of education which were described by Māori as instruments of colonisation and assimilation (Ka'ai, 1996: 77) and it was feared that the Māori language would be lost if something was not done. This saw the advent of *kaupapa Māori* education. *Kaupapa Māori* education is an educative initiative which incorporates Māori philosophies and Māori principles, which was created by Māori, for Māori.

The first *kaupapa Māori* initiative, the Kōhanga Reo (which literally means language nest) movement developed from the 1981 Hui Whakatauirā held in Wellington.

The first Kōhanga Reo opened in Wainuiomata in the Hutt Valley in 1982. Kohanga Reo are early childhood language immersion centres. The aim of Kōhanga Reo was to make every Māori child bilingual by the age of five (Walker, 2004: 238) by placing them in an environment where they would only hear Māori for a significant portion of the day. Kōhanga Reo were run by *koro* (old man) and *kuia* who were fluent speakers of *te reo Māori* with the aim of transmitting the Māori language from this older generation onto children. Teachers at Kōhanga Reo come from differing academic backgrounds,

however fluency in *te reo Māori* is the one skill they have in common (Television New Zealand, 1987).

However, parents with children in Kōhanga Reo were becoming concerned that their children, who were fluent speakers of *te reo Māori*, were leaving Kōhanga Reo and entering mainstream primary schools. Parents were worried about the difficulty of this transition for their children and that mainstream education did not validate the experiences these children were bringing with them from Kōhanga Reo (King, 2001: 122). Māori parents were also concerned with the effect this transition would have upon their children's use of *te reo Māori*. Many parents claimed that within three weeks of entering mainstream education their children were exhibiting negative attitudes towards the Māori language and either suppressed their Māori language or lost it all together (Walker, 2004: 239-40). My interviewees described similar experiences in their transition from *kaupapa Māori* education to mainstream education:

. . . even though I tried to keep the language alive at home . . . she was not speaking the language . . . she would answer me in English . . . after a while, she lost her confidence to speak the language because it wasn't valued at school . . . she understood it but she would stop speaking it at home which saddened me. So the impact of trying to fit in, to being one of the girls, meant that she should not speak the language because it wasn't valued in the school context...

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

Each interviewee noted that after entering mainstream schools they or their children began speaking *te reo Māori* less and less; this decline in their use of *te reo Māori* brought with it feelings of *whakamā*. “. . . when I got to high school I used Māori less and less and less until I started to feel embarrassed about my level of *reo* (language) and so that would make me use it even less” (Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu). One interviewee lost their language completely after entering mainstream:

I lost it completely unfortunately, which makes me really sad . . . I moved into mainstream, didn't have to use it. What was the point of using it? Nobody understood what I was saying . . . I just lost being able to speak it, I could still understand everything but I just couldn't actually speak, it was terrible.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

Kura Kaupapa Māori (Maori language immersion primary schools) were set up by a number of committed parents in order to address these concerns and to further the growth of the Māori language. The first Kura Kaupapa Māori was established at Hoani Waititi Marae in West Auckland in 1985. *Kaupapa Māori* schooling is seen, by many parents, as their child's cultural right as Māori:

My decision to send my child to immersion schooling, Kura Kaupapa was basically because I was committed to this type of schooling, not just because of my job in education but because of my understanding of how mainstream education actually fails Māori kids. Theoretically speaking that one could say that because of my occupation, my child is advantaged and so would be likely to achieve. However, I believe that this type of schooling was her right; her right to have access to the language, her right to be taught in a style that is pedagogically appropriate to her ethnic group I suppose and because of her heritage . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

The *kaupapa Māori* ideology informs Māori “about the way in which they best develop physically, spiritually, emotionally, socially, and intellectually as a people” (Ka’ai, 2004: 207). *Kaupapa Māori* education is based around a *whānau*, *hapū* (subtribe) and *iwi* context, where:

Children are lovingly ensconced... and nurtured in learning, so there is every reason for them to succeed as opposed to standard state classrooms, [where] the numbers are greater and the methodology is one that is based on a Western type of methodology which doesn't allow our children to develop in the way that they are learning from our *whānau* method.

(Television New Zealand, 1987)

This is in contrast to mainstream education where the agenda is that of the dominant Pākehā society. The following table shows the conflict between Māori aspirations and State agenda:

Pakeha [sic] Interests

Pakeha [sic] culture,
language,
knowledge

Acculturation,
Assimilation

‘we are one people’

domination

maintain

State schooling

Maori [sic] Interests

Maori [sic] culture,
language,
knowledge

Validity and legitimacy
of Maori [sic]

‘we are Maori’ [sic]

survival

‘status quo’ work for change

Kura Kaupapa Maori [sic]

(Smith, 1990: 194)

One of the differences between immersion schooling and mainstream schooling that each of the interviewees mentioned was that the *whānau* context was missing from mainstream schools:

I mean when you’re in the Kura Kaupapa environment it’s more a *whānau* type environment . . . we found that the teachers were more involved in how you were learning and the progress you were making and as far as when we went over to the mainstream they didn’t really care . . . if you failed that, well you failed.

(Personal communication - *Tāne*, 19, Ngā Puhi)

The absence of *whanaungatanga* (kinship) in mainstream schools leaves students feeling as if they are just a number:

I mean the Whare Kura that I was at, there were about seventy students . . . and we got a lot of attention, a lot of one on one from the teachers and it had more of a *whānau* element . . . then moving to the school that I went to down here there were about 1,000 students . . . it was a huge difference, and then I guess at mainstream high schools like that, having experienced both, I can say you feel like you’re just a number or just another student unless one of your teachers takes a special interest or something. There’s not a lot of support, so it was really difficult . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

Whanaungatanga is very important to the way Māori children develop. *Whanaungatanga* is based on ancestral, historical and spiritual ties and is

associated with the practises which bond and strengthen these ties (Hohepa, 1993: 3). The concept of *whanaungatanga* links with pre-contact forms of education where key people in the *whānau*, *hapū* and *iwi* were responsible for a child's education. Within Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori there are a high ratio of teachers in order to create this *whānau* context therefore children are receiving more one on one support that they may not necessarily receive in a mainstream classroom.

Most mainstream schools do not have the resources to cater for high levels of *te reo Māori* reported by the interviewees. In fact, the students' levels of *te reo Māori* were often better than the teachers':

. . . Māori teachers can have a primary degree and not have any knowledge of *te reo*. If they have brown skin it makes it better for them to be able to teach but my teacher had done Te Kākano [beginner level Māori] when I was at high school . . . and that was all the Māori knowledge she had and she was trying to teach me who had come out of Kura Kaupapa. I found it really frustrating because it made my *reo* get worse.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

This issue was emphasised in an interview with a mother and her daughter:

(*Kōtiro*, 15, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui):

It was hard trying to learn Māori [in mainstream] because Māori language wasn't as high up as the bilingual [unit] was . . . Some of the teachers weren't up to the level that I was at.

(*Wahine*, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui):

And what level was that?

(*Kōtiro*, 15, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui):

Level 2.

(*Wahine*, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui):

Of NCEA?

(*Kōtiro*, 15, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui):

Yup.

Many of the interviewees had to go onto correspondence to maintain their Māori language. Correspondence is such an unnatural environment for Māori children to learn in, particularly for these students who had come from

kaupapa Māori education which has a strong feeling of *whanaungatanga* for these students to suddenly have to work alone is quite different: "...in my fourth form year I did fifth form Māori by correspondence... the correspondence was really isolating and lonely and really not a very nice sort of way to learn, but it was necessary" (Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu).

There are several key areas of *kaupapa Māori* education which differ from mainstream education. The first of these relates to doctrine and pedagogy⁵.

Kaupapa Māori education incorporates *te aho matua* which is a philosophical doctrine "incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society that have emanated from a Māori metaphysical base" (Ka'ai, 1996: 88). Mainstream education stems from Pākehā culture and Pākehā ways of learning whereas "at the Kura Kaupapa the teaching styles [pedagogy] specifically catered to Māori ways of learning. Things were taught to us from and in a Māori world view" (Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu).

Unlike mainstream education which is age specific, *kaupapa Māori* education is culture specific:

. . . she went into mainstream education at age eleven . . . I made her repeat her third form year on purpose because she was only eleven at the time going into a high school situation.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

. . . they separate you out a lot but whereas at the bilingual unit we would have the *tuakana* (senior, older brother of a male, older sister of a female) class and the *teina* (junior, younger brother of a male, younger sister of a female) class and we'd always come together for big things . . . but they were always so ready to separate you by your age, form one had to be separated from form twos . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

⁵ Māori pedagogy is embodied in the practice of Kaupapa [sic] Māori education and encapsulates the principles of *tino rangatiratanga* (ownership), *taonga tuku iho* (aspirations), *ako Māori* (pedagogy), *kia*

Te ara poutama (symbolic representation of developmental learning) is a weaving pattern based upon the twelve levels of thought. *Te ara poutama* supports the notion that learning is developmental (Ka'ai, 2004: 209) and it allows for individual developmental and learning progression. This is opposed to mainstream education where students are placed in levels based upon their age, moving on to the next level regardless of the students' readiness, motivation or interest (Ka'ai, 1996: 87). Within *te ara poutama* the knowledge being transmitted to the learner by the teacher is bound and intercepted by the *tikanga* which is associated with this knowledge. Only once the learner has grasped this knowledge and *tikanga* can they progress to the next level. "It is contended that the transmission of knowledge and the *tikanga* implicit must occur in the Māori language to ensure accurate transmission is sustained through succeeding generations" (Ka'ai, 2004: 209).

There is a link between theory and practise defined by Ka'ai (1996) as *te tātari i te kaupapa* (theory and praxis), which will be demonstrated by the learner. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate knowledge acquisition in culturally specific contexts and often are assessed in these contexts. *Te tātari i te kaupapa* also relates to the twelve levels of thought of *te ara poutama* as which are captured in the *tauparapara* (incantation, often used in formal speechmaking) capturing the journey of Tāne-nui-a-rangi to obtain *ngā kete mātauranga*. Assessment procedures are based on "specific cultural imperatives which could translate into performance criteria... performance and achievement are measured against a clear set of standards" (Ka'ai, 1996: 89).

Other key concepts of *kaupapa Māori* education include *ako* which means to learn but also to teach, the role of teacher and learner are linked within this concept where the child can be the learner, and they can also be the teacher. Connected to this concept is the relationship of *tuakana-teina* where the older children take on a leadership role, in that they assume a responsibility towards the younger children (King, 2001: 123). This *tuakana-teina* relationship also reflects the shifting role between teacher and learner (Ka'ai, 2004: 206).

piki ake i ngā raruru o te kāinga (mediation), *whānau* and *Kaupapa* [sic] (vision) (Smith, Fitzsimons &

“Children, rather than the teacher, frequently control the teaching sequences. This is strongly encouraged” (Ka'ai, 2004: 208). The teacher is a facilitator of learning and it is recognised that the learner controls their own pace of learning (Ka'ai, 2004: 208).

Non-verbal communication is another important feature of *kaupapa Māori* education. These non-verbal forms of communication are often misinterpreted by teachers in mainstream schools and are often interpreted as acting out or playing up (Television New Zealand, 1987). Māori children communicate differently from Pākehā children, therefore the way a Māori child employs language at home usually differs from the way language is used in the classroom, “illustrating miscommunications in cross-cultural classroom settings” (Ka'ai, 1996: 86). Mainstream teachers need to become more aware of these “non-standard forms of English” (Smith, 1998: 197) as well as culture and language in order to understand the background of their Māori students.

The relationship between school and the home and community is very important to a child's development. Māori students are disadvantaged in mainstream education because the culture of the school is often different from the culture within students' homes and communities. *Kaupapa Māori* education contains a “culturally responsive pedagogy” which “reflects a close match between the settings of home and school” (Ka'ai, 1990 cited in Ka'ai, 1996: 86).

One of the parents interviewed eventually withdrew her child from Kura Kaupapa Māori because she was concerned that her child was not learning English and would be disadvantaged in the “real world”:

They weren't teaching him any English whatsoever so he couldn't read a simple book which made it really hard at home . . . for wanting to read . . . what's going on, on the TV, can't read anything, can't understand the language and I just felt that he needed to learn the English language before he got into intermediate because once they get into high schooling and they

Roderick, 1998: 31-2)

don't know it properly they get called dunces and things when they're not. They're just really clever at something else.
(Personal communication – *Wahine*, 44, Ngāi Tahu)

This view is not surprising as it is not uncommon within the South Island where Kura Kaupapa Māori are few and far between and have little support from the community.

Māori children often find the transition between Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Whare Kura or bilingual units and mainstream units difficult. This is due to the difference in discipline regimes between the *kaupapa Māori* education context and mainstream education:

I lost a lot of discipline because [at the] bilingual units [sic] you honestly couldn't step one foot out of line because you knew you'd get in heaps of trouble but in mainstream schooling you could get away with so much and I just went off the rails. So I had to get my discipline back; which didn't really come till third form because honestly I just lost it and went mental, kept getting kicked out of classes, got kicked out of social studies for a whole term. I went really quite bad and things at home went really bad too because I just lost all my discipline, I think that is one of the big things I lost moving, as well as my language just my discipline, I just had no respect for anybody.

(Personal communication – *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

Both Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori incorporate *te taha wairua* (the spiritual component) which is fundamental to Māori culture and an essential part of *kaupapa Māori* education (Television New Zealand, 1987). Within *kaupapa Māori* education it is believed “that education is not viewed as complete if it does not nurture the spirit along with the mind and body” (Ka'ai, 1996: 79).

All of these cultural concepts are manifested within the medium of the Māori language and so the Māori language is the key driver of *kaupapa Māori* education. In a Māori world view culture and language are intertwined as “language is central to the way Māori view the world; it is the life-blood of Māori culture” (Ka'ai & Higgins, 2004: 13). Historically, mainstream education had failed Māori where their language and culture was suppressed

and neglected. Mainstream schools which are based on Pākehā culture, “Staff are mainly Pakeha [sic] and the values and language presented derive from Pakeha [sic] culture” (Smith, 1998: 196). Many Māori parents opted out of mainstream education where their own cultural values were not incorporated.

The dominance of Pākehā culture and the lack of status and value of the Māori language was noted by interviewees:

I noticed her [her child] really pining . . . for the Kura... for the type of teaching style and the curriculum and the quality of the teachers, that were all Māori except for one Pākehā woman (who was wonderful) and who taught English. The reverse could be said of these teachers in the high school that were very focussed on a Pākehā curriculum. Māori language was very much on the periphery and even the Māori teacher was a disaster. She might have been ethnically Māori, but she did not show that she was culturally attuned to working with Māori children in the same way that the teachers are in Te Kura Kaupapa. In fact she was a classic example of the colonised Māori who actively oppresses Māori children who are clearly more enculturated, meaning that they have a greater knowledge and ability in *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* than her peers and many adults.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

I tried to get back in to things Māori in . . . my fifth form and went and did *Manu Kōrero*⁶...and did my *kapa haka* hard out but I just found that in mainstream schools you just didn't get rewarded for things like that . . . My mates were doing these big New Zealand science tests and they were in the top 5% in the region and they'd get heaps and heaps of praise then I would go to the regional of *Manu Kōrero* and get second and get nothing. That was another thing to have to overcome, just actually learning that that's not the way the world works, that there is a huge gap between Māori and Pākehā...

(Personal communication – *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

'Culture shock' is perhaps the term that best sums up the transition that Māori children experience moving from *kaupapa Māori* education into mainstream education; from an environment where the Māori language and culture is the norm into an environment where Māori students are suddenly a minority:

It was in mainstream education that she had her first big 'hit' and was made to feel 'Oh my God, I feel that I am a nothing'. . . Kura

⁶Ngā Manu Kōrero refers to the Māori Secondary School Speech Competitions held annually at a regional and national level.

kids live a pretty sheltered life as they do almost everything together you know and mostly function in Māori contexts: Māori friends, Māori family, Māori speakers including grandparents, aunties, uncles . . . that was her [her child] whole world so the rest of the world spoke English around her but this had little bearing or influence on making her feel they were inferior at all . . . that sort of thing happened only when she went into mainstream education.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

It was real different because we did everything in Māori and it was normal, I never thought about doing it any other way . . . I remember going to mainstream and on my first day . . . someone asked me if I was a Māori and I said 'yes' and I got told to go somewhere at lunch time and we had this meeting and it was for . . . *kapa haka* and it was real weird because I was different from everyone else instead of being like everyone else . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

Interviewees described a number of barriers which they experienced in their transition into mainstream high school. Students found that there was less respect and understanding of Māori culture in mainstream schools:

. . . we had a *pōwhiri* (welcome) . . . and there was a *paepae* (orator's bench) and all us *kapa haka* kids were sitting on the floor behind it . . . there was only one male teacher . . . he did a *whaikōrero* (oratory, speech) and he sat on that and our female Principal sat on the *paepae* as well and I said to her 'Miss, you're not allowed to sit on there' and she goes 'I'll talk to you about it afterwards' and so I thought 'OK, sweet, she was a Pākehā, maybe she just didn't know'. And I went and had a talk to her and she says 'I'm not having this argument with you' and I said, 'No I just want to tell you because being the Principal of the school you can't do things like that, it's only for the men and it's not for women' and she goes 'I'm not having this argument with you'. I was really quite disgusted because all I thought about was the fact that I was trying to protect my culture and I'm not going to let people say that I shouldn't . . . I didn't know . . . was that she was actually told to sit there by the Māori teacher but either way I was going to challenge it because it wasn't right and I felt that, if she'd actually explained to me, maybe I would have had a different reaction but I felt that just saying 'I'm not going to have this argument with you' is just leaving me with that feeling that she was disrespecting me . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19 Ngāti Kahungunu)

. . . one of the teachers was really strong on the fact that she didn't believe Maori should be able to wear *taonga* or *whakakai* (earring) because she just thought that it was inappropriate that we were allowed to wear "necklaces", as she called them, when other students weren't . . . she would tell students if she saw them in the corridors to put it [the *taonga*] inside, underneath the uniform.

Not openly blatant racism but you could tell in the way that they treated you . . . just less tolerance in general for Māori culture.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

The devaluation and lack of respect and understanding of Māori culture and language has fostered racist attitudes and stereotypes, both of which are a major barrier for Māori students:

I found when I went to mainstream school, especially high school . . . that there was a lot more things that are centred at Māori kids, like preventative sort of programmes like sexual health and stuff like that, which kind of made me feel like, as a Māori, it was expected that I would have sex early and do those sort of things. I felt quite different and if I got in trouble it would be because I'm Māori not because I might be a naughty kid. It's always put down to the fact that you're Māori so you're going to get in trouble.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

Some teachers I think couldn't see past the fact that I was Māori and they just expect you to fail and expect you to be a little shit, which I was. In fact you know they expected it from you so I was like 'well, if they expect it then I'll be like that what difference is it going to make, I'm still treated like I'm naughty so I may as well be naughty, even when I'm being good I still get treated like that'.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

Racial stereotypes are tools of the coloniser, holding deep roots in the colonial past which still hold effect in today's society as "the use of the stereotype in the (re)formation of Maori [sic] identity further demarcates and constrains Maori [sic] within the perennial position of the Black Other" (Wall, 1997: 40). Stereotypes create barriers which leave many Māori wondering who they are. These stereotypes serve to strip them of their own cultural identity:

. . . the main barriers were just social ones, trying to work out who I was friends with, who I was. Am I Māori? Am I Pākehā? I didn't really know . . .

. . . I was figuring out why I was being treated the way I was and I realised it was because I was Māori and I didn't like that so I tried not to be Māori and I didn't, I wasn't at all.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri)

Racist attitudes were displayed by some Pākehā:

. . . at Kura everyone was Māori . . . it was normal and there was no racism about it but as soon as I got to mainstream . . . a lot of people have an opinion about Māori and a lot of it was very uninformed, completely what their parents said, maybe what they saw on TV. There was one guy who used to say really racist things to me to wind me up, he actually had no interest in Māori stuff at all . . . he only said things like that because he knew it would annoy me and it would upset me. It's quite awful.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

However, some students also experienced reverse racism from Māori teachers and students as well:

I noticed a change in her. She was alienated from other Māori children, from other Māori kids because they didn't have the *reo* like her. It was a classic case of 'tall poppy syndrome' and *puahaehae* (jealousy) and so they alienated her including the teacher. In the end she felt totally harassed so it wasn't long before my decision was for her to withdraw from the class and enrol in Māori correspondence. This was when I realised that Kura Kaupapa educated children are far more mature and even worldly compared to other Māori children and some adults who are educated in mainstream education and perpetuate racism, marginalisation and other colonial acts which are a legacy of our past history.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

. . . because [child's name] had done level 2 NCEA when she was in form 2, there was a sense of jealousy between other students that were in her class, who were older students that were doing level 3, level 2 NCEA, same as [child's name].

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui)

Reverse racism reflects the continuing hegemonic influence of New Zealand's education system.

Kaupapa Māori education has been an inspiration to language revitalisation efforts both nationally and internationally (King, 2001: 126) Many people, students, parents and teachers alike embraced the *kaupapa* of Kōhanga Reo as their own personal rediscovery and recovery of the Māori language. Many parents enrolled their children into *kaupapa Māori* education because of language loss in their own families and most of parents began learning *te reo Māori* along side their children (King, 2001: 124):

Because I know nothing about my background, that's why I sent [child's name] along to Kōhanga, try and get some of it back. Kōhanga was great, [I] loved that.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 44, Ngāi Tahu)

With the birth of my daughter in 1990 and with her attendance at Kōhanga she brought my father back into speaking Māori and so forth made myself start speaking or learning to speak Māori.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui)

Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, instil in Māori children a pride in their culture and because they are learning in their culture and their language, education becomes something which they enjoy.

The transition (as shown by the interviewees) from *kaupapa Māori* education into mainstream education has a noticeable effect upon a Māori child's use of *te reo Māori* in that some children speak the language less and some lose their language altogether. This is a result of an education system where the Māori language is undervalued and under supported, where students become lost in the dominant Pākehā culture of the system.

Despite all of the barriers which the interviewees experienced in their transition into mainstream education, it is important to note that all of these students are currently achieving well at school or university. This is testament to the teaching they received at Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, which is education which encourages life long learning rather than education which progresses from level to level (Brennan, 1987 cited in Ka'ai, 1996: 81).

Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori have been successful as Māori have left mainstream education for an education which validates the Māori language and culture. Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori are "strong statements of Māori people in New Zealand reclaiming power and autonomy in terms of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and *tino rangatiratanga* (independence, self-determination" (Ka'ai, 1996: 90) which have proven successful in increasing the status of the Māori language.

By 1997 there were a total of 675 Kōhanga Reo in New Zealand as well as fifty four Kura Kaupapa Māori with over 32,000 students receiving *kaupapa*

Māori education. By the year 2000 these numbers had increased, there were now fifty nine Kura Kaupapa Māori around the country and approximately 35% of all Māori pre-schoolers attended Kōhanga Reo, the highest percentage then any other type of early education. *Kaupapa Māori* schooling is a viable option for Māori children as it provides a learning environment where they are immersed in their own culture and language. By 2001 the Health of the Māori Language Survey showed that the number of Māori fluent in *te reo Māori* had risen to approximately 136,700, an increase of over 170% since 1986 (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2005). This figure owes a lot to the efforts of Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori and all those *whānau* involved. However, the fact remains that the majority of Māori children are enrolled in mainstream education⁷ and the Ministry of Education needs to take action to ensure that these children are nurtured in their language and culture as well.

⁷ In 2004 14% of Māori students were enrolled in some form of Māori medium school education (Ministry of Education, 2004: 15) which means that 86% of Māori students are in mainstream education.

Chapter 6

Further initiatives or further Domination

Overview of Chapter: This chapter will consider the more recent developments by the Ministry of Education to be responsive to Māori educational needs and aspirations as articulated in the 2004 Ngā Haeata Mātauranga Annual Report on Māori Education. It will demonstrate how a wide range of initiatives attempt to increase Māori participation and achievement educationally but with little attention to increasing the status of Māori language within mainstream education. There is also a lack of changes to Teacher education in that the majority of graduates continue to enter schools ill equipped to teach Māori language and culture.

Since 1960 the Department of Education (known currently as the Ministry of Education) has produced a number of documents, reports, policies and initiatives which on the surface reflect a willingness to address the status of the Māori language (and culture) within State education. However, the reality is that initiatives such as Taha Māori, Whakapiki i te Reo Māori, professional development programmes and bilingual teaching qualifications indicate merely a thaw at least in theory in the official position of the Crown. However, real transformative change is still to be achieved in that the majority of these initiatives often only target a particular area of education, usually *kaupapa Māori*, bilingual education or Māori classes in secondary schools. Initiatives need to be farther reaching than this; these initiatives need to extend to all levels of our education system and all types of school as *te reo Māori* should benefit all teachers, students and the wider society.

Ngā Haeata Mātauranga is published annually by the Ministry of Education. This report provides an overview of Māori education across all levels of education (from early childhood to tertiary) and includes educational initiatives which are specifically directed at Māori. The most recent report was published in 2004.

Ngā Haeata Mātauranga 2004 lists several key areas as being the focus of Māori education. These are:

- supporting the high-quality of provision of *kaupapa mātauranga* [education] *Māori* across all sectors
- building strong early learning foundations for Māori children
- supporting high levels of achievement by all Māori school leavers
- encouraging Māori participation in lifelong learning
- improving the engagement of whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori communities in education

(Ministry of Education, 2005: 8)

While these goals are important they are also broad sweeping and offer little attention to advancing the Māori language, particularly within mainstream education.

This report states that “ensuring Māori achieve greater success in education is a high priority for the Ministry of Education” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 20) and furthermore states that they aim to achieve this by “finding ways to better support those providing and receiving an education in *te reo Māori*” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 20). This is not enough as education in *te reo Māori* should be provided in all schools, in all classrooms, by all teachers and above all it should be for all students.

While it is important to see the Ministry of Education supporting Kura Kaupapa Māori, immersion and bilingual education, there still needs to be more focus on the development of *te reo Māori* within mainstream education as well.

There are several initiatives aimed at teachers within *kaupapa Māori*/bilingual education. An overview of these will follow:

He Pūnaha Aromatawai Mō Te Whakaako Me Te Ako is a project which “involves the development of literacy and numeracy tools for students in years 5 to 10” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 33). This project provides teachers with a CD ROM which enables them to create pen and paper tests for assessing *te reo Māori* numeracy and literacy skills while diagnosing student’s progress in

relation to curriculum, class, school and national standards (Ministry of Education, 2005: 33)

Whakapiki i te Reo is “an intensive professional development programme for primary and secondary school teachers working in Māori medium settings” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 33). This programme aims to increase teachers’ knowledge of the Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic] [o Aotearoa] documents and teaching *te reo Māori*. Six of these programmes operated in 2004 and were attended by approximately fifty teachers.

Te Poutama Tau is a:

professional development programme aimed at improving the teaching and learning of numeracy in Māori medium contexts... This programme encourages teachers to examine their pedagogical approach to teaching mathematics and to improve their use of *te reo Māori* to convey mathematical concepts.

(Ministry of Education, 2005: 33)

Ngā Taumatua is:

a one year Māori medium literature training programme for Resource Teachers of Māori (in 2003) and *kaiako* (in 2004). Trainees undertake research and fieldwork within Māori medium teaching contexts, as well as residential study, and graduate or post-graduate study. Ngā Taumatua graduates return to schools with specialist literacy skills and knowledge that they practice and share with other teachers in their school or cluster group.

(Ministry of Education, 2005: 33-34)

Other initiatives included reports such as the Bilingual/Immersion Education: Indicators of Good Practice, the release of assessment tools and Māori exemplars for *te reo Māori* and *pāngarau* and a review of Māori medium teacher support.

To date, any improvements to the status of *te reo Māori* have been initiated by Māori themselves such as the advent of *kaupapa Māori* education, the Te

Reo Māori claim to the Waitangi Tribunal and Te Puni Kōkiri's Māori Language Strategy. While it is good to see the Ministry of Education making provisions for teachers in *kaupapa Māori* and bilingual education, it is still a case of the Ministry of Education sweeping the problem of Māori language decline under the rug, and leaving the responsibility for the survival of the Māori language to Māori themselves. However, the stark reality is that the majority of Māori students are in fact in mainstream education where the problem of language decline first began.

Within mainstream education, the report shows a high focus on Māori attendance rates and achievement rates. In response to these results, the report asks a number of questions, “is what is being taught at school relevant? And how is it being taught?” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 62). In relation to the status of *te reo Māori* in mainstream education, the second question is very relevant. Other relevant questions are ‘why are Māori students not achieving to the same levels as non-Māori students?’ ‘Why are Māori students in *kaupapa Māori* education achieving better than Māori students in mainstream education?’ In 2002, results showed that Māori students in Māori immersion schools achieved significantly better in School Certificate and sixth form level English, science, mathematics and *te reo Māori* than Māori in English-medium or bilingual settings or than Māori students participating in mainstream schools’ immersion programmes (Ministry of Education, 2005: 24). The Māori language is the key (Ka'ai & Higgins, 2004: 13) and Ngā Haeata Mātauranga has done little to address the relationship between *te reo Māori* and achievement for Māori students in education.

The report aims to support Māori learners through:

- raising teacher expectations of Māori learners
- supporting professional capability of educators working with Māori learners
- supporting professional leadership
- increasing the supply of high-quality teachers

(Ministry of Education, 2005: 64)

There are a number of initiatives in place to support these aims, including Te Kauhua, Te Kōtahitanga and Te Hiringa i te Mahara.

Te Kauhua is:

A programme designed to support schools, in partnership with their Māori community, to pilot new and innovative approaches to professional development. Their professional development approaches must enhance the effectiveness of teachers working with Māori students in mainstream educational settings.

(Ministry of Education, 2004: 68)

In its initial stages, Te Kauhua has shown some promise in that within participating schools, there has been an increase in Māori participation in schools amongst staff, trustees and *whānau*. This project also highlights the importance of “constructive learning partnerships” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 69) between school staff and parents and *whānau* as well as amongst Māori and non-Māori staff. Te Kauhua enters its second phase in 2006. At this stage, however, there are only a small number of schools involved in the programme (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Te Kōtahitanga is a study of year nine and ten Māori students. This study identified that “the most important influence on their [Māori students] achievement was the quantity of the relationships and interactions between themselves and their teachers” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 72). Te Kōtahitanga also showed that deficit thinking on the part of teachers was “a key impediment to improving classroom pedagogy” (Ministry of Education, 2005: 72). This point simply highlights major problems in our education system if it is still trying to combat outdated ideas such as deficit thinking⁸. The project proved that the performance of the teacher has the greatest impact on student

⁸**Deficit Theory** – an attempt at explanation of difference by identifying and locating psychological or sociological deficits in individuals or groups – for example, low IQ, or poor preschool preparedness for reading. It is then easy to move to victim blaming (Coxon, Jenkins, Marshall & Massey, 1994: 273-274)

learning and a Māori student's educational achievement can be improved by improving classroom interaction (Ministry of Education, 2005: 72).

Te Hiringa i te Mahara is a project aimed at reducing the stress experienced by Māori secondary teachers with excessive workloads (Ministry of Education, 2005: 72). It focussed on:

- increasing Māori secondary teacher knowledge of assessment pedagogy to support the quality of their assessment practice
- trialling a *te reo Māori* programme in school clusters as part of an approach to improve teaching practice of *te reo* teachers and increase their understanding of second language acquisition and pedagogy
- supporting Māori managers to be effective professional leaders
- strengthening online professional learning communities and resources

(Ministry of Education, 2005: 72)

There are also a number of scholarships offered to teachers wishing to undertake study to become Māori medium teachers and secondary school teachers of *te reo Māori*. However, often these scholarships have high eligibility criteria in terms of academic achievement and proficiency in *te reo Māori*.

While these programmes seem promising, their focus is still on a small part of the education system as the particular focus of work in *te reo Māori* in mainstream education is for teachers of years seven to ten (Ministry of Education, 2005). For example, Te Kōtahitanga, Te Hiringa i te Mahara are specifically designed for upper primary and secondary school students. Support and development in the education of *te reo Māori* needs to be extended across all levels of education, particularly in early and primary education as “the most effective way of increasing the numbers of Māori language speakers is to focus on young learners” (Ka'ai, 2004: 205). This is summed up in the phrase “*Te tīmatanga o te reo, kei ngā ū o te whāea* – The very beginning of language is learnt at the breast” (Ka'ai, 2004: 205).

Of significance, potentially the most promising development within mainstream education is the government's draft, Te Reo Māori Strategy for English-medium Schools. This strategy has three parts:

- the production of a curriculum document for teaching *te reo Māori* in mainstream schools
- the production of materials linked to the curriculum to support the curriculum document (Ministry of Education, 2006)
- professional development for teachers who wish to improve their competence in *te reo Māori*.

This document has been on trial in five regions across the country. These trials were completed in April 2005 and the second draft should be in schools by mid-2006. The final document will be published and made available to schools in June 2008 (Ministry of Education, 2006).

It is early days yet and only time will tell how effective this document is in increasing the status of *te reo Māori* in all New Zealand schools, but it is certainly a big step for mainstream education.

However what is missing from the draft Te Reo Māori Strategy for English-medium Schools is a focus upon teacher education. Professional development is important, however, there would be less of a need for professional development programmes if teachers were leaving teacher education institutions with a well developed skill base and of working knowledge of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. Those who do enter mainstream schools with a deeper knowledge and understanding of *te reo Māori* often find themselves bearing the sole responsibility for *te reo Māori* within the school placing them under immense pressure and often causing 'burnout', hence initiatives such as Te Kōtahitanga. Burnout should not happen at all as all teachers should be sharing an equal responsibility towards *te reo Māori* and the achievement of Māori students as

this is an Article Two⁹ responsibility for all teachers not simply Māori or those Pākehā committed to *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*.

Ngā Haeata Mātauranga (2004) is the annual report on Māori education. The latest report (published in 2005) while showing an increase in Māori achievement also shows that Māori achievement is still much lower than that of non-Māori students. While this report outlines many initiatives aimed at Māori education, the majority are offered to particular sections of education such as immersion or bilingual education and a particular focus on secondary school *te reo Māori* teachers. Learning and teaching in *te reo Māori* should be for every teacher and every student, particularly in the lower levels of education, if real change is to be made. This is because the majority of Māori students are in mainstream education and students are more likely to learn and maintain the language if it is taught to them early and then continues throughout their education. The development of a curriculum document for *te reo Māori* is promising, however, implementation is still very much dependant upon effective teacher education and professional development courses for it to succeed. Time will tell if this initiative will show real change for increasing the status of *te reo Māori* in mainstream education and thereafter New Zealand society.

⁹This refers to Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Chapter 7

The outlook for the future

Overview of chapter: This concluding chapter will sum up the findings of the entire report. This chapter will also make some recommendations to the possible future of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori in New Zealand schools.

On 6 February 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi was signed. This document became New Zealand's first official policy document. The Treaty of Waitangi is an agreement of partnership between the British Crown and the Māori people as the Indigenous people of New Zealand. The Crown promised the Māori people that this Treaty would provide Māori with the same rights as British subjects in the third article – “the Queen of England will protect all the ordinary people of New Zealand and will give them the same rights and duties of citizenship as the people of England” (Orange, 2004: 282). The second article of the Treaty promised to “protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftanship over their lands, villages and all their treasures.” (Orange, 2004: 282). However, this document (which is portrayed as the founding document of New Zealand) was not honoured by the Crown in that the promises which had been made to the Māori people in the Treaty of Waitangi have all been broken. The Māori language is a *taonga* and therefore should have been protected as such under Article Two of the Treaty. History tells a different story. The fact is the Māori language has not been protected.

Māori people have not been afforded the same rights as Europeans as stated in Article Two of the Treaty. It has been proven by historians that the quality of education provided for Māori up until the 1960s was not of equal value to that provided to Pākehā children as Māori children were provided with a curriculum which focussed largely on physical labour rather than academic pursuits (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190). These inequalities have continued throughout the history of New Zealand's education system, an education system which is based largely on Pākehā culture and a western world-view.

Māori children continue to fall through the cracks, not achieving to the same standards of their Pākehā peers. Furthermore, the education system has been designed clearly to benefit Pākehā thus denying Māori the same rights and duties of citizenship as expressed in Article Three of the Treaty.

Before the arrival of Europeans, Māori were a people with their own living culture and living language. Literacy and numeracy was not relevant as Māori had their own forms of communication and representation in oral narratives, *whakairo* and *raranga*. Knowledge was passed down from generation to generation through Māori language thus establishing a strong oral tradition.

The education system established by the European missionaries was used as a means of control and a way of civilising a so-called “barbaric” race of people (Hokowhitu, 2004: 190). Education was used to encourage the Māori people to abandon their own values, culture, traditions and language in favour of those of the Europeans because it was feared that if the natives were not educated they would revolt against the colonial practises of the European settlers (Hokowhitu, 2004: 191).

The New Zealand education system has led to the perpetuation of Māori language loss by providing education for Māori which only recognises western values, histories, language and world-view and failed to recognise the status of the Māori language appropo of the Treaty of Waitangi to the point of near extinction. Beginning with the first missionary school in 1816, the New Zealand education system is guilty of the devaluation of a culture and the imposition upon the Māori people of an education system which was alien and foreign to them. Furthermore, the establishment of the New Zealand education system and its hegemonic framework has eroded the status of the Māori language as a living language within Māori society. Māori withdrew from using their own language in favour of speaking English.

Education acts, bills and legislation from 1816 only served to aid and abet the perpetuation of language loss, with the intent of the destruction and the

eradication of the Māori language and the continued devaluation and suppression of the Māori culture. The 1847 Education Ordinance Act, the 1867 Native Schools Act and the Native Schools Code of 1880 are examples of state intervention.

During the 1900s corporal punishment was administered to Māori children who even accidentally spoke their own language. For this the New Zealand education system is guilty of the physical pain administered to small children for speaking a language which was all they knew and for forcing the English language upon them. The New Zealand education system is also guilty of inflicting emotional pain and feelings of fear and *whakamā* upon generations of Māori who carried this with them into adulthood. For many of those children who were beaten in school for speaking Māori the emotional pain was so much that many of them never spoke Māori again for fear of further punishment:

My grandfather had seen the demise of his people. He had experienced first hand the devastation of assimilation. Like many Māori of the time, he was convinced that his children needed the Pākehā world to survive. He sent my father to school to learn these ways. My father's schooling did provide these to him; however, this was at a cost of his own identity. Like all Māori children of the time, my father had remnants of Māori-ness beaten from him. To this day he will not speak his tongue, although he was fluent in it, because the pain of his childhood does not allow it.

(*Kaikōrero - Wahine*, 22 Ngāti Porou)

To this day, Māori still feel the pain and loss of a culture, language and identity which was stolen from them by the state education system:

The majority of Māori speakers are the ones which grew up with it, they are quickly aging plus, this is in 1996, most of them have passed away now and only 20% of Māori can speak their language, a language which is rightfully theirs. I fall outside this 20%. Although I still dream in Māori, I can't speak it during the day.

(*Kaikōrero - Wahine*, 22 Ngāti Porou)

I attended Kura Kaupapa Māori and Kōhanga Reo and yet the language I am most fluent in is not that which I was brought up in. It is not my first or chosen language. It is the language of the coloniser and I speak it because I have no choice. For too long, the Crown has dodged responsibility, has bribed our people with

settlements, that's not come near the full extent of the *mamae* (pain) that has hurt so deep, my generation still cries for what our grandmothers and grandfathers had to endure.

(*Kaikōrero - Wahine*, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu)

We have kids like me . . . grown up in the cities, parents have already lost the language and thinking, deep down there's something missing and not being able to fit . . . into groups and only knowing . . . the stereotypes and the little token things that have been introduced into school, so that's what we know Māori is but it's not. I've come here to university to learn my own language before I learn other languages and with learning my own language; I've been gaining back my own identity . . .

(*Kaikōrero - Wahine*, 21, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Porou)

A new policy of cultural adaptation was introduced in the 1930s. The basis of this policy was to include some aspects of Māori culture within the curriculum however Māori people were given no say over what aspects of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* would be included again. This illustrates how Māori have been excluded from participating in the shaping of curriculum in state education in New Zealand.

This attitude of devaluation towards *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* was summed up in the 1961 Hunn Report. The Hunn report sought to integrate all minority groups into the predominate culture. Aspects of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* included in schools at the time were described as “interesting cultural fossils that might keep Māoris [sic] happy but which otherwise had little relevance to modern life” (Butterworth, 1973:15).

Surface accommodation and tokenism has fostered false generosity. The cultural adaptation policy of the 1930s and the Hunn report sought to include aspects of Māori culture into the school curriculum. Aspects of *tikanga Māori* included arts and music, but not the Māori language. False generosity therefore only served to further oppress the Māori people. True generosity would see Māori people themselves having control over their own education and it would be Māori people themselves who would ensure the survival of their language and culture:

True generosity consists precisely in fighting to destroy the causes which nourish false charity. False charity constrains the fearful and subdued . . . to extend their trembling hands. True generosity lies in striving so that these hands . . . need to be extended less and less in supplication . . .

(Freire, 1996: 27)

Surface accommodation from the Taha Māori programmes of the seventies and early eighties to Tomorrow's Schools in the late eighties remained ineffectual in their attempts to include *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in schools.

The early nineties saw a new direction for education in New Zealand with the initiation of major curriculum reforms. The National Curriculum of New Zealand was released in 1991 followed by the New Zealand Curriculum Framework in 1993. This is the document which is supposed to be “the foundation for learning programmes in New Zealand schools” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 1), a document which is supposed to apply to all schools irrespective of gender, race, beliefs or disability. However, this document only serves to continue the perpetuation of language loss in our education system.

The Ministry of Education emphasises the importance of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* for New Zealand society, yet the majority of our country's teachers do not have the skills or knowledge necessary to adequately teach *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in our schools and Māori is not given the importance it needs and deserves. *Te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* are not an essential learning area and more often than not other curriculum areas such as mathematics, science and English are given first priority. This point emphasises the need for a curriculum document for *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* and not simply documents which are translations of the English documents nor a document which most teachers are unable to read such as *Te Reo Maori [sic] i Roto i te Marautanga [sic] o Aotearoa*, as most teachers have not received adequate teaching in *te reo Māori* themselves. It also highlights the need for more resources and up skilled teachers who are confident and comfortable teaching *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*.

Although their language is not as widespread as it once was, Māori people themselves came up with the solution to the loss of the Māori language in the establishment of an education system called *kaupapa Māori* education, which is reflected in Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Kura and a strong statement of Māori *whānau* expressing their assertions of *tinorangatiratanga*. Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Kura have proven successful grass roots Māori initiatives. However, mainstream state education needs to take responsibility for the survival of the Māori language as well. For far too long, the Ministry of Education has dodged their responsibility in providing *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in all New Zealand schools for Māori and non-Māori alike. The Ministry of Education's solution to Māori underachievement in education has been to date cosmetic and not organic, in that there is no strategy to reverse the cycle of Māori underachievement despite even the most recent initiatives by the Ministry of Education as articulated in Ngā Haeata Mātauranga:

. . . the Ministry do not have a plan; they do not have a plan for Māori education. They have all these marvellous writings about where it's at . . . but they don't have a plan. They have extra funding before the end of the . . . financial year that must be spent so they come up with some programme and they spend it on it because the budget is to be spent, we know. There's nothing enduring about what they do, but it's how we live . . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

We don't want just your money, we want your input and we want you to be involved in this because for such a long time you have just done half pie jobs and you haven't had the heart because you are still trying to assimilate us.

(*Kaikōrero – Wahine*, 21, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Porou)

The lack of Māori content in schools cannot be solved by simply making more money available (Watson, 1967: 9) (this is another of the Ministry of Education's sticking plaster solutions) and the Ministry of Education needs to take action.

There are three main areas where the Ministry of Education needs to provide attention in relation to *te reo Māori*:

- The curriculum – particularly in the development of a Māori curriculum document for schools
- A review of teacher education programmes to produce bilingual graduates who are equipped to teach *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*
- The up-skilling and professional development of current teachers in schools

Research by Grace highlighted the need for a national curriculum document in schools for *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*:

Well, I mean we have curriculum documents for every other area of the school, English, maths, science, social studies, health, physical education, art. In some respects having a Māori document would be handy. So that . . . we've got those guidelines of . . . 'level one, this is what we should be looking at, level two, this is what we should be looking at'. I think that would be helpful (Teacher aged 33).

(Grace, 2005: 55)

Currently the amount of Māori content being taught in New Zealand schools is limited because *te reo Māori* is not afforded the same status in schools as English, mathematics, science or the other essential learning areas. Currently a draft document for Māori has been trialled in a number of New Zealand schools and the final document will be available to schools in 2008. The introduction of such a document would give *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* the importance it deserves and needs to help the language survive. It would also provide a clear outline for teachers of what they should be teaching therefore to ensure that learning does in fact progress coherently throughout schooling as stated in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993: 7).

Along with the development of a curriculum document for mainstream schools there also needs to be a review of the Nga [sic] Marautanga [sic] documents as highlighted by the Curriculum Stocktake Report. This will assist teachers of Kura Kaupapa Māori and bilingual units to use these documents more effectively without having to rely upon the English documents (Ministry of Education, 2003).

There is a lack of Māori teaching resources in schools and often the resources available are old, outdated and “biased towards a white, middle-class, nuclear family and an often masculine ‘norm’” (Hessari and Hill, 1989: 15). A lack of Māori resources serves to highlight and reinforce the Ministry of Education’s stance towards Māori in schools:

... we get resources for reading, we get resources for maths . . . Māori is important, especially to our Māori students . . . but there is not the money that goes into Māori resources (Teacher aged 33).

(Grace, 2005: 28)

New Zealand schools need more Māori resources which cater for contemporary New Zealand society and one which contains many different cultures and people.

Lopez discusses the need for “human resources” (Gagliardi, 1995: 26) meaning teachers. New Zealand schools need more teachers who are confident and competent in *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in order to be able to adequately teach the young people of this country. If teachers are not presenting positive attitudes towards *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in their classrooms, *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* will continue to be devalued:

. . . unless more . . . people come out [of teacher education programmes] who are going to teach it, give it an importance. But right now it's still down there where it's not important, it's the last thing to be figured out on, schools still don't want to do it, it's not important. I think it's because there are so many other curriculum things coming in, there are all these contracts . . . they've got other demands on them these teachers.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

Teachers are emerging from Teachers' Colleges and universities with little knowledge of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* but also knowledge in the issues surrounding Māori society such as the Treaty of Waitangi and how it applies in a contemporary context. By educating teachers about these issues teachers can begin to see the value in what they teach and therefore *te reo me ngā*

tikanga Māori becomes something they want to teach not something they have to teach (Grace, 2005: 75):

When teachers have a better understanding of the political climate as well as New Zealand's history they will be able to integrate that awareness into their programmes and classrooms thus producing children who at the end of their own education will be critical thinkers in society.

(Grace, 2005: 72)

Bishop and Glynn discuss the need for metaphors for education. These metaphors “drawn from the experiences of Kura Kaupapa Maori [sic] ... provide us with a clear picture of the sort alternative metaphors that are needed to prevent the further denial of the benefits of education to Maori [sic] children” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999: 172). Teacher education requires an outlet for students to explore their own individual, core beliefs, their underlying attitudes and values and their own culture as this will affect the way in which they view the world and interact with other cultures and the students they teach.

Heshusius (1996) defines such a metaphor as:

By metaphor, I am not referring merely to an analogy, of a likeness between things. I am using the concept of a metaphor here in the sense of a deeply creative act, an act that gives rise to our assumptions about how reality fits together; and how we can know (p.4)

(Bishop & Glynn, 199: 166)

Furthermore, Bishop & Glynn state the importance of examining our own metaphors of educations as:

. . . when seeking to create contexts that will facilitate learning by Maori [sic] children in mainstream classrooms, we need to examine the metaphors that we use to explain and construct meaning about these contexts for they reveal the images we have in our mind about other people and about the whole process of education... the metaphors through which we organise our relationships and our work, our research and pedagogy have a powerful influence on how we, and those with whom we interact, understand or ascribe meaning to particular experiences and what eventually happens in practice.

(Bishop & Glynn, 1999: 167)

Like Taha Māori programmes of the 1980s, our education system continues to be about fitting Māori students to the system, not fitting the system to the students, as in the 'square peg in a round hole' syndrome..

Other professions offer programmes in cultural safety, such as Te Kawa Whakaruruhau¹⁰ in nursing programmes. However, there is not the same provision for this in teacher education.

Ideally, there would be more Māori teachers in mainstream schools who are fluent in *te reo Māori*. However, the fact remains that the majority of teachers in mainstream schools are Pākehā. Although there has been a shift in recent years of the amount of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* within teacher education institutions around the country, there is still a long way to go. The majority of teacher education institutions provide their students with courses in basic conversational Māori, but little more. Often it is the individual responsibility of the teacher to take this further. Grace (2005) points out there are still many teachers who still are not comfortable with teaching *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in their classrooms. This fact was highlighted in a survey carried out by Grey and Renwick which showed that 21% of first year primary teachers surveyed stated that they were not prepared to teach Māori students (Grey and Renwick, 1998 cited in Grace, 2005: 65). This is reflective of the amount of education teachers are receiving in *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. Grace (2005) reports that “a lack of adequate teacher training, both at teachers college and in-service, professional development courses limits what teachers are able to teach” (Grace, 2005: 52). It also limits their confidence in teaching *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*.

Teachers also need to be trained to use a curriculum document for Māori in order to effectively implement teaching in *te reo Māori* in their classrooms.

¹⁰ Te Kawa Whakaruruhau is a cultural safety programme for nurses, developed by the late Dr Irihapeti Ramsden. Te Kawa Whakaruruhau aims to teach nursing students to “recognise that many of the

However, it is also the case that many teachers are leaving teacher education institutions and entering schools with a desire to incorporate *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*, unfortunately they are often meeting barriers within their respective schools:

. . . even though we've got these young students coming out and that's good, some of them are really on top . . . but somewhere along the line they somehow meet the barriers . . . so on top of the game, so innovative, makes it interesting for the kids, it's so neat but somewhere along the line will be somebody that goes (pop) . .

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 59, Ngāi Tahu)

These teachers need to be supported by their whole school, hence the need for professional development and the resourcing of this by the Ministry of Education. However, research carried out by Grace found that many teachers “discussed a lack of accessible professional development to achieve or maintain any level of Māori knowledge suitable for use in their classrooms” (Grace, 2005: 66). Ngā Haeata Mātauranga points out that the majority of these professional development courses are often for teachers of *kaupapa Māori* and secondary teachers of *te reo Māori*. It was also found that many teachers are not recognising professional development in Māori as a need because Māori is not a compulsory subject in schools. Therefore, teachers are choosing to attend professional development courses in the essential learning areas, not Māori:

Oh no, very realistically . . . I probably would think, ‘um God, I need to do something . . . about this particular reading area and that’s probably going to be more value to me in the long run then going to a Māori course’ (Teacher aged 59).

(Grace, 2005: 67)

“When new programmes come out for mathematics or English it is common for the course to be made mandatory for staff to attend. However, in the area of Māori Studies there is no such requirement” (Grace, 2005: 68). However, a greater focus on teacher education would cut out the proverbial middle man in this equation and there would not be such a need for professional development

things they took for granted about their attitudes and practice are determined by culture. Awareness of

if teachers were entering schools with high level skills in *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*.

Hopefully with a curriculum document for Māori being released into schools in the future, there will be a major change to our education system which needs to occur in order to break the cycle of ignorance and cultural arrogance; changes which will serve to break down the prejudices and barriers to *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* being advanced in New Zealand's schools and the wider society. It is these prejudices and barriers, embedded within our past which are effecting our present and if it remains unaddressed, will also affect our future and will lead to the further decline of a living language. These prejudices and barriers need to be broken down so that both Māori and Pākehā can begin to experience what it means to live in a bicultural country. If change is to occur, there must be an equal focus on each of the three areas mentioned previously (curriculum, teacher education and professional development). These areas come hand in hand and change cannot be affected otherwise. What good is a curriculum document for *te reo Māori* without teachers who have a knowledge of *te reo Māori* and have knowledge on how to use the curriculum document? Without professional development for current teachers, the responsibility for *te reo Māori* will inevitably still fall upon specific teachers when it should be taught by every teacher.

Pākehā New Zealanders need to recognise that *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* is important to New Zealand society and if it is to flourish it needs to be embedded in New Zealand's education system. This is what the educational theorist, Paulo Freire describes as:

. . . the greatest humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well. The oppressors, who oppress, exploit and rape by virtue of their power, cannot find in this power the strength to liberate either the oppressed or themselves. Only power that springs from the weakness of the oppressed will be sufficiently strong to free both.

(Freire, 1972: 21)

their own culture empowers nurses to care better for patients from different cultures” (Turia, 2004).

It is only when Pākehā can see that *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* is an important part of this country that change can begin to take effect.

I think we are a strong people, for sure and with a strong language and no matter what's been thrown our way in terms of legislation and racism, colonization, assimilation and all of that stuff, no matter what's been thrown our way, the Maori language has survived and it will continue to survive.

(Personal communication - *Wahine*, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu)

Imagine what a difference it would make if the Ministry of Education as a Crown agent and representative of the State was to face up to its responsibility as a partner to the Treaty of Waitangi and provide education for all New Zealanders which incorporates *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* in a real and authentic way rather than the token, ineffectual ways it has done in the past and continues to do to date.

It is a common complaint by many New Zealanders that they do not want to be forced to speak the Māori language. Because of these attitudes Māori has never been a compulsory subject at any level of the New Zealand education system. Agencies such as Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (the Māori Language Commission) have not advocated for Māori to be compulsory in schools, instead promoting positive attitudes to the language and individual language choice (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2005). However, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori have to take a more moderate view because they have to be seen to echo the moderate political voice of the day. Surely the education system received similar complaints towards girls learning science and pay parity for female teachers. It only takes a few generations to change these attitudes:

My first teaching job in a school was 1953 as a pupil teacher¹¹ in a small country school, teaching new entrants to standard one. At this time women received less pay than men. In all schools, no women were allowed to wear trousers until the 1960s and even then they were only allowed to wear trouser suits (matching pants and jackets). When we were getting less pay than men, senior jobs went to men because they were the 'bread winner' and only men were awarded school houses because they were the 'bread winner'. It didn't matter that some women may be widows with

¹¹ Pupil teacher refers to an untrained teacher.

children to raise. But nowadays teachers regardless of gender receive equal pay.

(Personal communication – *Wahine*, 69, Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Porou)

This demonstrates that just as pay parity between men and women has taken twenty to thirty years to change; so too could the emergence of a nation of predominately monolingual, English speaking people to a nation of bilingual, *te reo Māori* and English speaking people. State education could play a significant role in making this happen. Māori families need the support of state education to ensure the Māori language flourishes. They cannot be expected to take on this task entirely on their own because they continue to be a minority in schools and their voices struggle to be heard. This is simply unjust as it was state education which led to the decline of *te reo Māori* being spoken in the home in the first place.

Nāu i tango, māu e whakahoki mai – huria te tāi

You took it (the language) away, you restore it – change the tide

Glossary of Terms

<i>ako</i>	to learn, to teach
<i>ako Māori</i>	pedagogy
<i>ariki</i>	paramount chief, high born chief
<i>aroha</i>	love
<i>atua</i>	ancestor of on-going influence
<i>haka</i>	posture dances of various types
<i>hangarau</i>	technology
<i>hapū</i>	subtribe
<i>hauora</i>	health and physical well-being
<i>hui</i>	gathering, meeting
<i>hura kōhatu</i>	unveiling of a headstone
<i>iwi</i>	tribe
<i>kai</i>	food
<i>kaikōrero</i>	speaker
<i>kapa haka</i>	Māori performing group
<i>karakia</i>	prayer-chant, religious service, incantation
<i>kaumātua</i>	elder, adult
<i>kaupapa</i>	vision
<i>kaupapa Māori</i>	Māori-based
<i>kawe mate</i>	mourning ceremony at another <i>marae</i> subsequent to the <i>tangihanga</i> and burial
<i>kete</i>	basket, kit, bag
<i>kia piki ake i ngā raruru o te kāinga</i>	mediation
<i>koha</i>	gift
<i>koha aroha</i>	gift of appreciation
<i>koro</i>	old man
<i>kōtiro</i>	girl
<i>kuia</i>	old lady
<i>mana</i>	authority, power, influence, prestige, status
<i>mana whenua</i>	trusteeship of land

<i>manuhiri</i>	visitor, guest
<i>mamae</i>	pain
<i>marae</i>	space in front of a meeting house, the <i>marae</i> and the buildings around it
<i>mātauranga</i>	education
<i>ngā toi</i>	the arts
<i>ngahau</i>	entertainment, dance
<i>ngā kete mātauranga</i>	the baskets of knowledge
<i>pā</i>	fortified village
<i>paepae</i>	orator's bench
<i>pangarau</i>	mathematics
<i>pātaka</i>	storehouse
<i>pōhiri</i>	welcome
<i>poukai</i>	<i>hui</i> held on <i>marae</i> where people who support the Kīngitanga demonstrate their loyalty, contribute to funds and discuss movement affairs
<i>pōwhiri</i>	welcome
<i>puahaehae</i>	jealousy
<i>putaiao</i>	science
<i>raranga</i>	flax weaving
<i>reo</i>	language
<i>tama</i>	boy
<i>tāne</i>	man
<i>taonga</i>	treasure
<i>taonga tuku iho</i>	aspirations
<i>tā moko</i>	tattoo
<i>tangihanga</i>	funeral, rites for the dead
<i>tauparapara</i>	incantation, often used in formal speechmaking
<i>tauutuutu</i>	reciprocity
<i>te aho matua</i>	philosophical doctrine
<i>te ao Māori</i>	the Māori world

<i>te ara poutama</i>	symbolic representation of developmental learning
<i>te kete aronui</i>	basket of knowledge, arts and love making
<i>te kete tūātea</i>	basket of knowledge, evil
<i>te kete tūāuri</i>	baskets of knowledge, ritual
<i>te kōrero me ngā reo</i>	language and languages
<i>te mana o te reo</i>	the status of the language
<i>te rā o te tekau mā rua</i>	the day of prayer for the Ringatū church
<i>te reo Māori</i>	the Māori language
<i>te reo me ngā tikanga Māori</i>	the Māori language and customary lore
<i>te taha wairua</i>	the spiritual component
<i>te tātari i te kaupapa</i>	theory and praxis
<i>te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	the Treaty of Waitangi
<i>te whānau mai i te tamaiti</i>	birth of a child
<i>teina</i>	junior, younger brother of a male, younger sister of a female
<i>tikanga a iwi</i>	social sciences
<i>tikanga Māori</i>	Māori protocol, customs
<i>tino rangatiratanga</i>	independence, self-determination, ownership
<i>tohunga</i>	expert, specialist, priest, artist
<i>tuakana</i>	senior, older brother of a male, older sister of a female
<i>wahine</i>	woman
<i>waiata</i>	chant, song
<i>whaikōrero</i>	oratory, speech
<i>whakairo</i>	carving
<i>whakakai</i>	earring
<i>whakamā</i>	shyness, embarrassment
<i>whakapapa</i>	genealogy
<i>whakataetae</i>	race, competition, contest, match, tournament

<i>whānau</i>	extended family
<i>whanaungatanga</i>	kinship
<i>whare</i>	house, building
<i>wharekura</i>	school, house of mystic learning
<i>wharemata</i>	school for the art of snaring birds
<i>whare wānanga</i>	university, house of learning

Bibliography

Books and chapters within a book

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffins, H. 1998. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. New Zealand: Routledge.

Barrington, J.M. & Beaglehole, T.H. 1974. *Māori Schools in a Changing Society*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Bell, A. "The Politics of English in New Zealand" in McGregor, G. & Williams, M. (eds.) 1991. *Dirty Silence – Aspects of Language and Literature in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Benton, R. 1991. *The Māori Language: Dying or Reviving*. Honolulu: East-West Center.

Benton, R. & Benton, N. "RLS in Aotearoa/New Zealand 1989-1999" in Fishman, J. (ed.) 2001. *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Best, E. 1996. *The Maori School Of Learning – Its Objects, Methods and Ceremonial*. Kiwi Publishers, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. 1999. *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations In Education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press Limited.

Buck, P. 1950. *The Coming Of the Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Māori Purposes Fund Board, Whitcombe & Tombs.

Butterworth, G.V. 1973. "Highpoint and Hiatus" in Bray, D.H. & Clement, G.N.H. (eds.). *Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand Education: Volume 1 The Sharing of Cultures*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Educational Books.

Calman, R. 2004. *The New Zealand Wars*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.

Durie, M.H. 1994. *Beyond 1852: Maori, the State, and New Zealand Constitution*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: New Zealand Sociology Conference.

Fishman, J.A. "How Threatened is 'Threatened'" in Fishman, J.A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

- Freire, P. 1996. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Harris, A. 2004. *Hikoi – Forty Years Of Māori Protest*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Harvard-Williams, P. (ed.) 1961. *Marsden and the New Zealand Missions: Sixteen Letters*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Hayward, J. 2004. “Te Tiriti o Waitangi – The Treaty of Waitangi” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.
- Hessari & Hill. 1989. *Practical Ideas for Multi-cultural Learning and Teaching in the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge.
- Hohepa, M.K. 1993. *Preferred Pedagogies and Language Interactions in Te Kohanga Reo*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Hokowhitu, B. “Te tāminga o te mātauranga Māori – Colonisation in education” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.
- Hollings, M. “The Politics of Education in Māori” in McGregor, G. & Williams, M. (eds.) 1991. *Dirty Silence – Aspects of Language and Literature in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Ka’ai, T. “Kaupapa Māori Education Strategy: Te Kōhanga Reo, Te Kura Kaupapa Māori, Wānanga” in Taylor, N.J. & Smith, A.B. 1996. *Investing In Children – Primary Prevention Strategies*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Children’s Issues Centre.
- Ka’ai, T. “Te mana o te tangata whenua – Indigenous assertions of sovereignty” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.
- Ka’ai, T. “Te mana o te reo me ngā tikanga – Power and politics of the language” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.
- Ka’ai, T. & Higgins, R. “Te ao Māori – Māori world-view” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.

- Ka'ai-Oldman, T.M. "A History of New Zealand Education from a Maori Perspective" in Hirsh, W. & Raymond, S. (eds.) 1980. *Getting It Right*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- King, J. "Te Kōhanga Reo – Māori Language Revitalisation" in Hinton, L. & Hale, K. 2001. *Green Book Of Language Revitalization In Practise*. Sandiego, USA: Academic Press.
- King, M. 1997. *1000 Years of Māori History*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.
- King, M. 2003. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Laenui, P. (Burgess, H.) "Processes of Decolonization" in Battiste, M. 2000. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- López, L.E. "Intercultural bilingual education and the training of human resources: lessons for Bolivia from the Latin American experience" in Gagliardi, R. (ed.) 1995. *Teacher Training and Multiculturalism: National Studies*. Paris, France: International Bureau of Education.
- Manchester, J. & O'Rourke, A. 1993. *Liberating Learning – Women as Facilitators of Learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bryce Francis Graphics.
- Metge, J. 1964. *A New Maori Migration – Rural and Urban Relations in Northern New Zealand*. London: University of London, Athlone Press; Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Ministry of Education. 1993. *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Limited.
- Moorfield, J.C. 2001. *Inaugural Professorial Lecture – Challenging Some Misconceptions about the Māori Language*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago,
- Moorfield, J.C. 2005. *Te Aka: Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.
- Nicholas, J.L. 1817. *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand*. London, United Kingdom: James Black and Son, (Facsimile Edition – Wilson & Horton Ltd., Auckland, New Zealand)
- Olssen, M. "Education Policy In New Zealand 1984-1998" in Olssen, M. & Morris Matthews, K. 1996. *Education, Democracy, Reform*. Auckland, New Zealand: NZARE/RUME.
- Orange, C. 2004. *An Illustrated History Of The Treaty Of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books,

Orsman, H.W. & Wattie, N. (eds.) 2001. *The Reed Dictionary of New Zealand English: Third Revised Edition*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Books.

Paterson, L. “Mana Māori motuhake – Challenges to ‘kāwanatanga’ 1840-1940” in Ka’ai, T.M., Moorfield, J.C., Reilly, M.P.J. & Mosley, S. 2004. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Longman.

Reed, A.W. 2004. *Reed Book Of Māori Mythology*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.

Selby, R. 1999. *Still Being Punished*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Shirres, O.P. 1997. *Te Tangata: The Human Person*. Auckland, New Zealand: Accent Publications.

Simon, J. 1998. *Ngā Kura Māori – The Native Schools System 1867 – 1969*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Simon, J. & Massey, L. “Historical Perspectives on Education in New Zealand” in Coxon, E, Jenkins, K, Marshall, J & Massey, L. 1994. *The Politics of Learning and Teaching in Aotearoa – New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Simon, J. & Tuhiwai Smith, L. 2001. *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the New Zealand Native Schools System*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Smith, A.B. 1998. *Understanding Children's Development (4th edition)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.

Smith, G.H. “Taha Maori: Pakeha Capture” in Codd, J., Harker, R. & Nash, R. 1990. *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Te Tumu – School of Māori, Pacific & Indigenous Studies. 2004. *Otago Postgraduate Prospectus*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago.

Tregear, E. 1973. *The Māori Race*. Wanganui, New Zealand: A.D. Willis Ltd.

Walker, R. 2001. *He Tipua – The Life and Times of Sir Āpirana Ngata*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Walker, R. 2004. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Watson, J.E. 1967. *Horizons of Unknown Power: Some Issues of Maori Schooling*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Yates, W. 1970. *An Account of New Zealand and of the Formation and Progress of the Church Missionary Society's Mission in the Northern Island*. Shannon, Ireland: A.H. & A.W. Reed.

Dissertations and theses

Grace, O. 2005. "Mā is White, Whero is Red..." Pākehā Perceptions of Teaching Māori Studies in Primary Education". MIndS Research Report. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago.

Ka'ai, T. 1990. "Te Hiringa Taketake: Mai I Te Kohanga Reo Ki Te Kura – Maori Pedagogy: Te Kohanga Reo and the Transition to School". Mphil Thesis. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland

Documentaries

Koha: Kōhanga Reo. (Video Recording) Television New Zealand: Wellington, New Zealand. 15 March 1987 & 22 March 1987. 30 minutes.

Internet articles and websites

Archives New Zealand. 2004. *Akonga te Reo: Māori Language in State Education 1840 – 1990*. Online. Available: <http://www.archives.govt.nz> (6 December 2005).

Bradly, R.L. 1996. "Maori Education" in A.H. McLintock (ed.) 1966. *An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*. Online. Available: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/1966/MaoriEducation/en> (5 December 2005).

Ministry of Education. 2003. Curriculum Stocktake: National School Sampling Study. Online. Available: www.minedu.govt.nz (18 May 2006).

Ministry of Education. 2005. Ngā Haeata Mātauranga 2004 – Annual Report on Māori Education. Online. Available: www.minedu.govt.nz (18 May 2006).

Ministry of Education. 2006. Te Kete Ipurangi – The Online Learning Centre. Online. Available: www.tki.org.nz (31 May 2006).

Smith, G., Fitzsimons, P. & Roderick, M. 1998. *A Scoping Report: Kaupapa Maori Frameworks For Labour Market Programmes*. Online. Available:

<http://www.tpk.govt.nz/publications/docs/FinalKaupap9806.doc> (8 December 2005).

Te Puni Kōkiri. 2001. *Ngā Tatauranga mō te Reo me ngā Tikanga Māori – Māori Language and Culture Statistics*. Online. Available: <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/maori/language/education.asp> (16 November 2005).

Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori, 'Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori – The Māori Language Commission. (2005) Online. Available: <http://www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz/english/index.shtml> (12 September 2005)
Turia, T. 2004. *Culture, health and safety*. Speech to open Māori Indigenous Health Institute, Christchurch School of Medicine. 5 March 2004. Online. Available: www.beehive.govt.nz (18 May 2006)

Waitangi Tribunal. 2005. *Wai 718 – The Wānanga Capital Establishment Report*. Online. Available: <http://www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz/reports/generic/wai7182/> (30 August 2005)

Journal articles

Binney, J. 1969. "Christianity and the Maoris to 1840: A Comment", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 3(2), pp 143-165.

Glynn, T. 1998. "Bicultural Challenges For Educational Professionals in Aotearoa", *Waikato Journal of Education*, no. 4, pp 3-8.

Hokowhitu, B. 2003. "Māori masculinity, post-structuralism, and the emerging Self", *New Zealand Sociology*, 18 (2), pp 179-201.

Johnston, P. 1999. "In Through the Out Door": Policy Developments and Processes for Maori", *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 34 (1), pp 77-85

Krauss, M. 1992. "The World's Languages In Crisis", *Language*, volume 68, number 1, pp 4-10.

Philips, D. 1993. "Curriculum Development in New Zealand", *Educational Review*, Volume 45, number 2, pp 155-164.

Reedy, T. 2000. "Te Reo Māori: The Past 20 Years and Looking Forward", *Oceanic Linguistics*, volume 39, no. 1. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, pp 157-169.

Sorrenson, M.P.K. 1975. "How to Civilise Savages: Some 'Answers' from Nineteenth-Century New Zealand", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 9, 2, pp 97-110.

Wall, M. 1997. "Stereotypical Constructions of the Māori 'race' in the Media", *New Zealand Geographer*, 53 (2), pp 40-45.

Wylie, C. 1998. "Fair Enough?", *Set Research Information For Teachers*, number one, item 9, Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, pp 1-4.

Oral Sources

Wahine, 59, Ngāi Tahu. Personal communication. 6 June 2005.

Wahine, 26, Ngāti Porou. Personal communication. 10 June 2005.

Tāne, 51, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāi Tahu, Te Arawa. Personal communication. 14 June 2005.

Wahine, 35, Ngāti Kurī, Ngā Puhī. Personal communication. 19 August 2005.

Wahine, 22, Ngāti Tūwharetoa. Personal communication. 22 August 2005.

Wahine, 20, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu. Personal communication. 2 September 2005.

Wahine, 47, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tahu. Personal communication. 14 September 2005.

Tāne, 19, Ngā Puhī. Personal communication. 16 September 2005.

Wahine, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu. Personal communication. 22 September 2005.

Kōtiro, 15, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui & *Wahine*, 37, Tainui, Ngāti Ranginui. Personal communication. 29 September 2005.

Tama, 11, Ngāi Tahu & *Wahine*, 44, Ngāi Tahu. Personal communication. 30 September 2005.

Wahine, 22, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri. Personal communication. 17 October 2005.

Wahine, 69, Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Porou. Personal communication. 9 February 2006.

Tāne, 25, Whakatōhea, Ngāti Ruanui & *Wahine*, 21, Ngāti Pākehā. Kaikōrero. 8 October 2005.

Wahine, 21, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Porou, Kaikōrero. Kaikōrero. 8 October 2005.

Wahine, 22, Ngāti Porou. Kaikōrero. 8 October 2005.

Wahine, 19, Ngāti Kahungunu. Kaikōrero. 9 October 2005.

Reports

Department of Education. 1987. *The Curriculum Review*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education.

Grey, A. & Renwick, M. 1998. *A Study into the Effectiveness of Teacher Education Programmes, a report prepared for the Ministry of Education and the Teacher Registration Board*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Te Puni Kōkiri. 2001. *The Health of the Māori Language in 2001*. Wellington, New Zealand: Māori Language Monitoring Team, Te Puni Kōkiri.

Waikarepuru, H. & Nga Kaiwhakapumau i Te Reo Incorporated Society. 1986. *Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori and a Claim Lodged (WAI 11)*

Unpublished Works

Ka'ai, T.M. 2005. *Indigenising the Academy*. A paper presented at the World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education. Hamilton, New Zealand. November 2005.

Lauder, H. 1995. "Educational Reform in New Zealand: 1987-1995" in *Education 151: Education and Society – Course Readings – Book 2B*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.