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MIHI

He tangi nui tenei ki to ao Maori o kui ma, o koro ma.

Kia Io Matua kore, nana hoki te tiimatanga me te mutunga o nga mea katoa.

Me mihi ki nga matua tipuna na ratou hoki nga purapura nei i homai he whetumarama kia rite ano ki to te Rangi.

Kia puawai ai tenei whakatupuranga, kia piri tahi ai ki roto i nga mahi me nga takaro, ka nui hoki te aroha me te mamae.

Mo te mutunga, me ata titiro, me ata whakarongo ki nga korero me nga tangi o a tatou rangatahi, tamariki-mokopuna hoki.

Ko ratou hoki nga purapura i ruia mai i Rangiatea hei pupuri, hei kawe, hei tohutohu, hei pumau hoki i nga taonga tapu i whakatakotoria mai a kui ma, a koro ma.

WAIATA KINAKI

A ma wai e hari te kupu o te aroha
Ma Hine-o-te-rangi hei whakamana mai
Hei okioikitanga mo te whanau nei.
Whirinaki! Whirinaki!
Ka eke ki runga
Ko wai enei e tu atu nei
Ko te kupu tenei a o tupuna
E te iwi Maori e.

Te Whakahawea Kupenga-Tipene
Rosemary Parker
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Preface

It is with more than a little humility that I offer this thesis to the academic community of New Zealand. Firstly, I am writing as a Canadian, having lived in this country for only a few years and, therefore, unable to bring to this study a native's experience or familiarity with what is fundamentally a New Zealand topic. However, it may be that an outsider's view, one framed by citizenship in another country struggling to come to terms with its linguistic and cultural heritage, can offer some useful insight into the changes that are currently taking place here. Perhaps there is some truth in the anthropological aphorism that a fish may be the last to discover water.

Secondly, I am writing as a non-Maori, with only a modicum of Maori language proficiency, on a topic which is one of primary importance and great sensitivity within the Maori community. As Toby Curtis, Deputy Principal at Auckland College of Education, points out (1983), researchers who control only one language and are familiar with only one cultural frame of reference, "... can unwittingly tilt a description away from the heart of the problem and unknowingly remain at the periphery." (no pg. number)

However, Jane McRae, writes that although, "Some feel that those who represent the race of the colonizer are too antithetical to be able to interpret usefully or properly for [Maori]", a variety of research perspectives are necessary to validate any definitive statements. McRae further notes that what is required by Maori people, "of their workers, Maori and Pakeha, [is] a commitment in feeling for Maori society . . . and a measure of identification and belief in their cultural goals." (1988, pp. 14-15).

It is only because of the support of dozens of Maori, and most notably of Rose Parker, that I am able to lay claim in any small measure to satisfying these
requirements. Ms. Parker's role has gone far beyond that traditionally played by a thesis supervisor and our relationship has become highly personal as well as academic. Had she been unwilling, throughout the duration of this thesis, to bear with my naivety and to share with me her insight and perspective then this thesis could never have been contemplated, let alone completed.

I am also indebted to my mother and grandmother, non-native speakers of English, whose courage and equanimity have provided the impetus for this study.

Noreira, ki a Koe toku Koka, me toku Tipuna wahine, he tohu aroha tenei naku, ki a korua.

A Note on the Text: Macrons to signify vowel lengthening have not been employed in this study.
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Community Contexts of Maori-English Bilingual Education: A Study of Six South Island Primary School Programmes

Abstract

Community Contexts of Maori-English Bilingual Education is a multi-case study of six primary school bilingual programmes located throughout the South Island. These six programmes comprised the total number of programmes officially designated by the (former) Department of Education as bilingual and which were administered from the Southern Regional Office of the Department. Each of these programmes employed the services of a kaiarahi reo and had been in operation for at least one school year at the beginning of Term I, 1989.

The focus of the study is the interlocking sociocultural and pedagogical contexts which affect, and which, in turn, are affected by the recent inclusion of Maori as a language of instruction within the New Zealand public school system.

The material presented in this report resulted from quantitative and qualitative study over an eighteen month period commencing in February, 1989. Data collection techniques included interviews, classroom observations and questionnaire surveys which were used to compile base-line data on the numbers and backgrounds of pupils enrolled in the programmes, classroom practices, perceptions of parents and school staff and outcomes of the programmes. The research also included a number of interviews with affiliated personnel such as Kohanga Reo parents and staff, local kaumatua, and officials from the Ministry and Department of Education.

A number of issues are covered in the study; including the rationales for establishing programmes, staffing policies and procedures, resource allocation, bilingual teaching methodology, the range and depth of bilingual and bicultural innovation, community involvement and levels of satisfaction and concern with the programmes.

Major Findings -

1. A number of positive outcomes for the six bilingual programmes under study have been identified. These outcomes include the effective promotion of children's esteem and self-confidence, the provision of culturally sensitive and secure classroom environments, and a high level of family involvement with the bilingual programmes. 46% of families surveyed reported that they visited their children's bilingual unit at least once a week and 84% reported that they visited at least once a term. Close to 100% of families at all sites reported that they felt welcomed when they did visit the units. Moreover, as measured by Progressive Achievement Test scores, whanau pupils' English language development showed no evidence of having been impaired, and may even have been enhanced by exposure to Maori language within the classroom setting.

2. However, a number of operational constraints mitigated against the effective promotion of language and cultural maintenance goals within these programmes. Constraints included:
• The dominance of English as a language of classroom instruction - Two-thirds of the associate teachers surveyed reported using 10% or less Maori language during an average school day.

• The inadequacy of pre- and in-service training for associate teachers and kaiaraha reo - 86% of the associate teachers and half of the kaiaraha reo surveyed were, according to self-reports, inadequately trained to undertake teaching responsibilities in a bilingual classroom.

• The lack of material resources to support a Maori language curriculum - even the most basic resources, such as graded Maori language readers, were totally inadequate or non-existent. In addition, the distribution of available materials was reported to be inequitable, with schools outside major urban centres tending to be overlooked.

• The lack of clear rationales - in all but one case rationales had not been clearly articulated or prioritized, and, without exception, there had been no assessment of goal feasibility.

• The lack of a clearly-defined client group for the bilingual programmes - both children with considerable pre-school experience in Maori language and culture, as well as children who had not received this exposure, were enrolled in the same classes. In practice this meant that children who entered bilingual units with high levels of Maori language proficiency either "marked time" or went backwards while other children caught up with them.

• The paucity of effective support services - key educational support services and support personnel, including resource teachers of Maori and relieving teachers; advisory services in Maori language and other curriculum areas; and special education services, such as reading recovery, were either inadequate or totally unavailable to support the programmes under study.

• The absence of provision for continuation of bilingual programming, at least through the intermediate grades. Positive linguistic and cognitive outcomes can be expected to result from bilingual education only when both languages are developed to a high level of age-appropriate proficiency. This may require up to six years of schooling.

• The absence of local Planning/Advisory Groups - as a result, the bilingual programmes were left largely rudderless and leaderless, with no one person or body responsible for co-ordinating and managing the planning or operational stages of development, or for providing follow up evaluation in order to make necessary adaptations and changes.

• The resistance to bilingual bicultural change - in each of the six cases there were strong indications that some community and school staff members were actively hostile toward the schools' bilingual units. Further, there were indications that this hostility had imposed significant constraints on the operations of whanau programmes.

• The engulfment of innovation - there were indications that within mainstream educational structures and practices, there was little likelihood of promoting kaupapa Maori (the educational principles underlying Kohanga Reo), as far-reaching change tended to be engulfed by existing systems and structures.
As a result of the difficulties encountered in promoting Maori language in a truly bicultural learning environment within mainstream schools, 47% of parents surveyed whose children had attended Kohanga Reo indicated that they would prefer a separate Maori language school, rather than a bilingual unit located within an English-language host school.

Although the study concentrated on the six South Island programmes described above, it was also possible to draw wider theoretical and policy-making implications from the descriptive and analytical data and to formulate a series of recommendations which may prove useful in a variety of bilingual situations, both within New Zealand and overseas.
**Introduction.**

*Definitions Of Bilingual Education: Denotations and Connotations*

H. H. Stern included in his introduction to Swain's (1972) *Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States* the following definition of bilingual education:

... schooling provided fully or partly in a second language with the object in view of making students proficient in the second language, while, at the same time, maintaining and developing their proficiency in the first language and fully guaranteeing their educational development.

Fishman (1976) offers a similar, but not identical definition, and has also noted what he considers bilingual education not to be:

Bilingual education ... implies ... the use of two languages of instruction in connection with teaching courses other than the languages per se. Thus, neither the smattering of foreign language instruction that FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary School) programmes have long been providing ... nor the smatterings more normally offered ... in secondary schools qualify as bilingual education. (p. 24).

Closer to home, Dick Grace, in a management paper entitled *Bilingual Education* (undated) prepared for the New Zealand Department of Education’s Maori and Pacific Islands Division, presents the following definition:

Bilingual education in the New Zealand context is the use of two languages, English and Maori as media of instruction for the same pupil population in a carefully planned programme which encompasses part or all of the curriculum. Elements of the programme will include the development and maintenance of children’s self esteem and knowledge of two cultures - Maori and Pakeha, ... . Bilingual education changes the school situation to enable both majority and minority children to realize individual potential within the framework of parental and cultural aspirations. (p. 1).
Grace's definition is an important one, not only because it describes our own situation, but because it suggests that schools, as organizations, have to change in order to accommodate the new programmes in operation within them. Further, his definition signals that bilingual education programmes have broad cultural and social, as well as pedagogical and linguistic implications.

It should be noted at this point that there are many in New Zealand who feel strongly that "bilingual" and "immersion" education are two separate categories and object, for example, to the description of Kura Kaupapa Maori or Kohanga Reo as 'bilingual' programmes.

There are two reasons for this objection. One is that Maori-language immersion programmes offered by grassroots initiated and operated schooling such as Kura Kaupapa Maori and Kohanga Reo offer more exposure to a wider range of curriculum subject matter taught through Maori than would be possible in a dual language educational situation. Kura Kaupapa Maori and Kohanga Reo also provide a learning environment and pedagogy organized according to community preferences and, therefore, they differ qualitatively from state-sponsored bilingual initiatives, as well as quantitatively in the amount of Maori language used.

The second reason for objecting to the interchangeable usage of the terms "bilingual" and "immersion" is that within the Maori community there is a growing dissatisfaction with bilingual programmes in operation within mainstream state schools. These programmes, as the present study will demonstrate, are often seriously under-resourced and frequently bilingual in name only. Therefore, for at least some New Zealanders, the term "bilingual" is associated with educational initiatives which they deem to be distinctly second-rate.
Janet Holmes (1984, p. 33), entering the debate on what constitutes "bilingual" education in the New Zealand context, writes:

A bilingual education programme is one intended to promote bilingualism either by the use of a minority group language or by the use of two languages as mediums of instruction in the school. ... single medium immersion programmes such as those operated by Kaupapa Maori ... schools are clearly still in the mainstream of bilingual education. ... Clearly bilingualism is a goal and both dual and single medium programmes are legitimate ways of achieving it.

As there appears to be no agreed-upon definition of the term "bilingual education", for the purposes of the present study, when overseas programmes are referred to, in keeping with the customary usage of these terms in international literature, "immersion" programmes will be included as a sub-category under the general heading of "bilingual education". When referring to the New Zealand context alone, however, this study will make a distinction between "bilingual" programmes which incorporate some English language as a medium of instruction and "immersion" programmes where Maori is the sole language used.
Aims And Assumptions

An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of Bilingual Schooling

That bilingual education programmes often have their roots in social change and cultural reassessment is the first basic assumption of this study. Joshua Fishman (1976, p. 124) makes the observation that bilingual education, even more than education in general, "... is particularly dependent on forces and factors in the ... communities that surround the school." He also warns (p. xi) that, "... to neglect the contextual dimensions and realities ... is tantamount to being blind to a good half of the phenomena that constitute bilingual education in its entirety." He further stresses that the attitudes of the majority community may be just as or even more important than those of the minority community in determining the development and outcomes of bilingual programmes.

Jim Cummins also acknowledges that sociological, individual and pedagogical variables combine to affect the educational development of bilingual children (1984, pp. 71-72). According to Cummins:

... conceptual/linguistic skills and knowledge develop in particular sociocultural contexts as a function of interpersonal experiences and interact with educational treatments to produce academic outcomes.

and he concludes that:

... the causal primacy of sociopolitical factors is not in question. (See also: Landry, 1987; Sharp, 1973; and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984).
Further, Spolsky, also holding the opinion that educational considerations may be:

relatively insignificant ... both in the decision whether or not to establish a bilingual program and in the evaluation of the program's 'success' in reaching its goals ... (1977, p. 5)

has created a theoretical framework for the description, analysis and evaluation of bilingual education programmes. This multi-tiered, integrative framework takes into account a variety of linguistic and cultural factors not normally considered when looking at classrooms and schools. Spolsky's schema will be fully described below, as it forms the organizational basis for the present study, which collects and analyses data from both the "macro-system" (see Bronfenbrenner, 1979), beyond the level of the local school community, and the "micro-system", the schools themselves and their surrounding local communities.

In addition to drawing on socio-linguistic and socio-cultural, as well as pedagogical perspectives to frame the research questions, methodology and data analysis of this study, a further interdisciplinary perspective, that of organizational management theory, has also been utilized in formulating an explanation of findings. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) write that systematic comparison and the generation of formal analysis may be enhanced significantly when attention is given to literary sources beyond a given substantive field.

**The Socio-linguistic Situation - Links Between Language and Culture**

The second assumption upon which this study is based is that language and culture, like schooling and societal context, are inextricably bound. No less
an authoritative voice than that of Edward Sapir made this point nearly seventy years age when he wrote,

... language does not exist apart from culture, that is, from the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives (1921, p. 205). 2

Along similar lines, but in specific relation to New Zealand society, Smith and Swain (1988, p. 116) quote the whakatauki (proverb), "Ko te reo mauri, o te mana Maori", stressing the intrinsic importance of Maori language to the Maori people. The authors note that:

... language is much more than simply an arbitrary code for interpersonal communication, [rather language shapes our perceptions, allows us to interpret events and processes and gives us a] ... sense of what is appropriate and inappropriate and indeed our sense of what is relevant.

Zelas, (1989) stresses that,

The Maori language is identified as a central feature of Maoritanga ... . The Maori have an oral tradition and regeneration of the language is seen not only as being essential to perpetuation of Maoritanga but also the key to cultural identity and self esteem of the next generation. (p. 7).

Maori people have symbolically represented their feelings regarding the interdependence of language and culture by identifying te reo Maori as the tahuhu (ridge pole) upon which the heke (rafters) of tikanga Maori (Maori culture) rest and which, in turn, is supported by them. As te reo Maori is replete with cultural allusions and historical associations, a failure to appreciate this depth of meaning can lead to serious misinterpretation of even everyday Maori speech and writing. Likewise, " ... the hermeneutic difficulty of expressing the concepts of one culture in the language of

---

2 See also Spolsky, 1977, on language as "the most sensitive image" of culture. p. 2.
another" (Pere, 1982, p. 1) must be considered in any educational programme seeking to impart knowledge of tikanga Maori.

Consequently, the present study of bilingual education in New Zealand will assume that schools offering Maori language should also incorporate within their basic structures (i.e., staffing allocations, decision-making processes, pedagogical practices, physical ambience, learning materials and assessment procedures) the cultural principles of Maoritanga.

**The Global Situation - Advantages and Limitations of International Comparisons**

The third assumption for the present study is that in addition to a multidisciplinary approach, encompassing theory and methodology from a number of fields, an international perspective may be essential, or at least desirable, if present New Zealand initiatives are to be fully understood. Edwards (1984) offers the following advice,

> An historical awareness and a contemporary cross-cultural perspective are useful if one wishes to avoid reinventing the wheel (p. 3).

Joan Rubin (1977, p. 284) has also noted that language planners, in particular,

> ... should have some idea about the value of already functioning related models ...³

Nevertheless, R. Benton (1989) warns that findings based on overseas research may have only limited applicability to the New Zealand situation, as the contexts may be quite different.

---
³ See Spolsky, 1987, for a discussion of French Canadian immersion programmes as useful models for Maori/English bilingual schooling.
Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), like Benton, issues an important warning about the potential dangers of "inadmissible" generalizations from one bilingual situation to another, especially regarding the best methodology to adopt for promoting bilingualism among unequivalent groups of children. She notes that programmes, such as the St. Lambert Project, which was designed for well-off, culturally secure, majority language children, may be totally inappropriate for children who lack these social and linguistic advantages.

Nevertheless, Skutnabb-Kangas does acknowledge the usefulness of a certain amount of generalization to clarify issues pertaining to bilingual education. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), the most fruitful areas for comparison come from generalizations based on degrees of similarity with regard to power relations and status questions of both the languages and the speakers themselves.

Troike and Modiano (1975) offer a succinct summary of the pros and cons of international comparisons of bilingual programmes and conclude that:

While the goals of bilingual instruction may vary from one country to another, the problems encountered in establishing criteria, developing materials, training teachers, and evaluating programmes have much in common. There is a great need to share experience and knowledge among countries to avoid needless duplication of effort, and an equally urgent need for well-planned research as a basis upon which to build education programs. (p. iii).

**The New Zealand Situation - Justification for Research**

Troike and Modiano's final admonition leads to the fifth assumption for this study, which is that there is an urgent need for New Zealand research, and particularly South Island research, on bilingual education. Fishman (1976, p. 145) points to the "American-Canadian provincialism" which dominates the field of bilingual inquiry and which tends to lead to oversimplified and
overgeneralized interpretations of findings. Baker (1988) reaffirms Fishman's position on this issue, "Research on bilingual education needs to be replicated in as many different contexts as possible." (p. 91).

John McCaffery (1989) writes of the lack of basic research which characterizes the Maori bilingual movement of the 1970s and 80s. He attributes this paucity of research to the fact that many Pakeha have looked at this movement as a signal that,

... Maori wish to do things for themselves and hence there has been a huge flood out of the bilingual Maori field into safer other ethnic ESL and community language settings where the cutting edge is not so threatening. (p. 33).

Wagner (1985) noted that his study of a North Island primary school's bilingual programme was constrained by the lack of locatable research evidence on New Zealand bilingual education and particularly stated that there was a lack of data on schools' preparedness to accept children coming on from Kohanga Reo. The present researcher has been unable to locate any research studies of bilingual education programmes operating in the South Island.

**General Aims of the Present Study**

Decisions are being made at the present time which will greatly affect the future direction of bilingual education in New Zealand. It is important that these decisions be based on the planned and systematic collection, analysis and interpretation of data - in other words on research - rather than, for example, on naive, "flat earth" notions of bilingualism and bilingual education which now comprise a great deal of the public, and so-called "academic" debate on these topics. (Thornton, 1986, p. 11).
At present, the entrenchment of Maori language and culture within New Zealand's public schools has, to paraphrase Fishman (1976), been besieged with controversy and bedevilled by prejudice relating to New Zealand's colonial past. It is hoped that the present study will, in some measure, counteract the tendency for ideology alone to inform bilingual education policies and enable us to maintain, in John Edward's words, "... a sense of perspective in a hot climate." (1984, p. 5).

**Summary**

The present study has been conducted within the following framework of aims and assumptions:

1. The research will be interdisciplinary in nature; in particular it will encompass sociological as well as linguistic and pedagogical considerations in an attempt to describe and explain the interactive contexts within which New Zealand bilingual education is taking place. Therefore Spolsky's framework for the description, analysis and evaluation of bilingual education, which takes into account the interlocking complexity of macro- and micro-level factors, will be employed as the basic research paradigm for this study. Additionally, the theoretical perspective of organizational management theory will be drawn on to offer explanatory elucidation for the findings of this study.

2. Te reo and tikanga Maori are also interlocking components and, therefore, the present study will focus on the culture of the classroom as well as on language innovation.

3. Cross-cultural comparisons and international data will be drawn from, recognizing the limitations of their explanatory capacity in the New Zealand situation.

4. The present study will seek to supply a much-needed New Zealand perspective to:
   a) redress the current imbalance of international research on bilingual education
   b) provide local base line data for the benefit of New Zealand's educational planners and practitioners.
To this end, the present study will be concerned with the following aims:

**At the macro-level:**

1. To identify the rationales for and the situations surrounding the recent establishment of Maori/English bilingual education programmes.

2. To identify structures which have been put in place to promote these programmes, particularly structures within the educational system.

**At the micro-level:**

1. To provide base-line data on the children enrolled in South Island primary school bilingual classes.

2. To determine the attitudes of parents and school staff toward the bilingual programmes with which they were involved.

3. To describe the operations of bilingual classrooms, including the availability of material resources, teacher training and teaching practices, the function of the kaiarahi reo and the incorporation of Maori language and culture into the basic curriculum.

4. To assess the outcomes of bilingual programmes to date, including children's affective development and development in English language skills; the retention of Maori language skills acquired at Kohanga Reo and the impact of the programmes on the school and on the wider community.

This study will be directed toward the improvement of bilingual schooling through the identification of its current strengths and weaknesses and will conclude with a set of recommendations to this effect.

**Chapter Outline**

With these aims and assumptions in view, the present study will be organized along the following lines:

**Section 1:** (Chapters 1 and 2) will present a literature review detailing relevant "constructs" (theory and field research findings) which have influenced the direction of this study. Reviews of both overseas and New Zealand publications will be included in these chapters.
Section 2: - (Chapter 3) will outline the questions which the present study seeks to answer and will also justify and describe and the general methodology, including research instruments and procedures, employed to carry out this task.

Section 3: - (Chapters 4 and 5) will present a description and analysis of factors both promoting and restraining the development of bilingual education at the macro-level (New Zealand national and regional levels).

Section 4: - (Chapters 6 - 11) combining Findings and Discussion, will describe and analyze the micro-level findings from the six schools and their local communities which provide the focus for the present study. This section will include a summary chapter, Chapter 10, based on the theories of organizational management, linking the macro- and micro- level findings. Chapter 11 will list the major findings and research implications of this study and present a series of recommendations for future Maori language programming.
Section 1

Literature Review

Chapter 1

Overseas Literature Review

The purpose of this section is to present an overview of publications which have provided the intellectual perspective (i.e., research findings, theories, models and principles) for the present study. The review is divided into two chapters; the first concerned with overseas publications, as it has been established that international research has some relevance within the New Zealand context of bilingual education, and the second chapter dealing with the considerably smaller body of New Zealand theory and research.

Both chapters are organized according to the Spolskian (1978) framework for the description, analysis and evaluation of bilingual education. This framework, which is designed to reflect the interactive complexity of bilingual education, is based on a four tier analysis comprised of "situations", "rationales" "operations" and "outcomes" levels (see Figure 1.1). Each of these tiers is further analysed by considering a variety of variables, such as cultural, sociological, political, economic, linguistic, and historic factors which make up the total context within which bilingual education takes place. Spolsky points out that not all of these factors will be equally relevant, or apparent, in each case. Educational factors are located in the centre of each tier, although, in fact, they may be of secondary importance to other factors in deciding whether to establish a bilingual programme, or in evaluating its impact.

1 See also, Spolsky et al., 1976.
It is only through a theoretical model of such complexity, Spolsky argues, that the difficult task of describing, analysing and evaluating bilingual programmes can be accomplished. This model has proved to be a useful one for the present study, first as the framework upon which the literature review has been based and subsequently as a means of organizing the presentation and analysis of research data.

The literature review will begin by considering Spolsky's "situational" factors, which Spolsky defines as those factors which exist before bilingual programmes are implemented, but which influence and in turn are influenced by these programmes. These factors include, among others, the linguistic, educational, cultural, historic and sociological dimensions of bilingual education.
Secondly, literature considering rationales, the stated and unstated goals of those who plan or are in control of bilingual education programmes, receives attention.

Next, publications dealing with Spolsky's "operational" constructs are examined which deal with the principles and practices of bilingual education at the classroom level. Operational factors under consideration include, for example, the relative merits of immersion education and Krashen's hypotheses for second language acquisition.

Finally, the literature review will offer an overview of studies detailing the "outcomes" of bilingual education. This section will consider studies which seek to determine both positive and negative effects of bilingualism and bilingual education and also discuss some limitations of these studies. As Spolsky's framework considers outcomes in a very broad sense, publications dealing with affective and cultural, as well as cognitive and linguistic outcomes will receive attention.

The material included in these review chapters has served to establish the foundation upon which the present study of Maori/English bilingual schooling has been built. To proceed without this broad foundation, in other words to ignore the invaluable contributions (and also the blunders) of those who have already considered the same questions, would be to impoverish the present research and also to limit its usefulness to other scholars. This study assumes that a thorough grounding in previous theory and research offers both direction for the present investigation and an exploratory data base on which future research may be founded. Such grounding serves to indicate which research questions may prove most fruitful, helps to establish useful methodology and procedure and, finally, provides a framework for analysis and interpretation.
Baker (1988) deplores the fact that so often bilingual education research has been unconnected to previous research and has, instead, proceeded on a more or less random basis, for example by testing a variety of variables in hopes that statistical analysis would throw up interesting relationships. He also deplores the practice of tacking on theoretical concepts after research has been completed in post hoc attempts to explain contradictory findings. According to Baker, "... theory provides a tradition so that research can be systematic, progressive and evolutionary." (p. 107). Proceeding from Baker's contention that established theory and research are indispensable tools in the formulation, design and evaluation of new studies, the literature review chapters which follow are deemed to be of central importance to this study.
The Situational Level

Linguistic Considerations

Nancy Dorian (1981), in a remarkably thorough study of the East Sutherland (a coastal area of the Scottish Highlands) dialect of Gaelic, has made a number of important observations which are relevant to the present discussion of educational programmes established for the purpose of Maori language expansion and revival. Perhaps the most important of these observations, given current views about the (supposed) imminent demise of the Maori language, is that language death does not necessarily follow from the declining fortunes of an endangered language.

Dorian cites several examples of languages once under threat, but which are now fully vital, most notably Finnish, Hungarian, German (which experienced extreme pressure from French in the 17th century) and English (which was at risk for two centuries after the Norman conquest). Dorian also comments that it is very difficult to predict or to generalize about language extinction, as there is only a meagre body of research data available concerning this phenomenon. This research has significance for those in New Zealand who are concerned about the precarious position of the Maori language, for Dorian's study indicates that the demise of the Maori language cannot be written off as a foregone conclusion.

Factors in Language Decline: - Dorian highlights a further linguistic issue which needs to be addressed in light of the present study's concern with Maori/English bilingualism, that is the issue of the relationship between educational institutions and language survival. In many instances of intercultural contact, the language of the dominant group has come to be adopted as the "unmarked" or usual language of academic instruction. The
"marked" language, excluded from educational domains of usage (enforced by means of brutal physical punishment with nauseating frequency throughout the English-speaking world), may eventually become relegated to the family domain alone. In many bilingual situations, the usurpation of all, or most, high status functions, including educational functions, by one language eventually leads to the total demise of the other language which is no longer used even as a strictly intimate medium of communication. This has certainly been the case for the Maori language within almost all areas of New Zealand. (See Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974 and N.B.E. Benton, 1987. Also R. Benton, 1981).

Dorian concluded that as a result of the exclusion of the East Sutherland dialect from many important public purposes, including its exclusion as a medium of communication and as a curriculum subject in schools, the community itself adopted negative attitudes toward their dialect and while parents continued to speak Gaelic among themselves, they neglected to pass it on to their children, who, in turn opted almost exclusively for English - the international high status language.

Dorian views this pattern of neglect as an understandable adaptive or coping strategy and cautions readers against blaming the victim in cases of non-transmission of vernacular languages:

Most commonly ... a group undergoes a long period during which its language is actively devalued, while speakers of that language are penalized socially and economically, before members of the group see fit to withhold that language from their own children. (p. 106).

In terms of language survival, this "exogenic" pattern is an ominous one, for, as Dorian points out, the home domain is crucial to the continuity of a
language, especially to a local-currency language of low prestige and lacking institutional support.

Finally, in a more positive vein, Dorian documents a particular feature of the language situation in East Sutherland which demonstrates the resilience of this region's unique dialect and which has implications for the survival of the Maori language. Dorian notes the increasing number of semi-speakers of East Sutherland Gaelic, whose grammar, and usually also phonology, are markedly aberrant in terms of fluent speaker norms, which have emerged from among younger age groups as a result of strong cross-generational ties outside the nuclear family, usually with grandparents. There is a similar pattern in New Zealand, where, for example, pre-school Kohanga Reo (language nests) were initiated by kuia and koroua, typically in the over-50 age group. N. Benton (1990, Figure 8, pg 45) indicates that while fully fluent speakers of Maori are declining at an alarming rate, many new semi-speakers are emerging. (See also R. Benton, 1981).

Factors Leading to Language Continuity and Revival: - Dorian has painted a rather sombre, although not entirely hopeless, portrait of the fortunes of East Sutherland Gaelic, which has in large measure fallen into desuetude as a result of the perceptions held by both majority and minority speech groups that it is of little value and little use. That the fate of modern-day local currency minority languages is not always so grim, however, is exemplified by communities such as Spain and Wales, where Basque and Welsh are enjoying a rising tide of popularity and promotion and, to a lesser extent, as is also the case with several indigenous languages of Canada and the United States (See Spolsky, 1977; Dodson, 1985; Paulston, 1988; N Benton, 1990).

In contrast to East Sutherland, where there are few rewards and little support for bilingualism, societies in which local vernaculars have both
survived and are experiencing a significant revival, share several common features. Rubin (1977) points out that for a language revival movement to succeed there must be a perceived social need for such change. She makes reference to the failed attempts to institute Portuguese-English bilingual classes in several California communities where people no longer used their ethnic language and lacked any real commitment to it, but who, nevertheless, were encouraged to apply for bilingual education funds. Rubin concludes that:

... there should not be an unrealistic attempt to create ... bilingualism where none exists unless the citizens are prepared to exert a fair amount of effort. (p. 294)

In the New Zealand context, there is clear grass roots (or flax roots) support from the Maori community for Maori language immersion initiatives such as Kohanga Reo, whose enrolment encompasses approximately one-third of all Maori pre-schoolers, aged two and one-half to five years. Data presented in Chapter Eight of the present study indicates that a measure of support is offered to state primary school bilingual programmes by pupils' families and local communities, but also suggests that wholehearted support from community members most likely to have retained the language may be lacking.

Both Fishman (1976) and Landry (1987) point out that majority as well as the minority communities must demonstrate strong support for language maintenance and expansion if minority language educational are to succeed. Fishman further asserts that schools cannot "go it alone" (p. 111) in that they can only offer instruction in the minority language, but "functional power" must be provided by the communities themselves. In other words, pupils must be able to use the target language skills which schools provide in wider social contexts.
Landry (1987) has posited a "counter balance" model of language acquisition and maintenance, in which community and school factors are taken into account. Like Fishman, he argues that the school alone cannot compensate for lack of linguistic vitality in the home and within the larger social milieu. He concludes that, "In minority groups, the home and the school must work closely together for the promotion of L1 [first language] competence, beliefs, and behaviours, all of which are required for bilingualism to be truly additive." (p. 111). Chapter Six of this study details Macro-level support for the bilingual programmes under consideration and also describes pupil contact with Maori language in the home and community.

Landry makes the excellent point that acquiring additive bilingualism is a very different experience for minority and majority children. He notes that unless linguistic assimilation is to take place, minority language children must be educated primarily through their L1; and he cites a number of studies which demonstrate that minority children educated in their home language not only stand a better chance of maintaining this language, but also learn the majority language better than minority children enrolled in schools which largely ignore their L1.

For majority language children, on the other hand, because of the strength of the majority language within their homes and within the larger society, Landry feels that only long term, intensive language programmes, such as total immersion (offered by Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori, but not the school programmes under consideration in this study), will promote a high degree of bilingualism.

Wales may be taken as a good example of a national community which provides the tripartite support which Landry asserts is necessary for
additive bilingualism (and language revival) to occur. In this principality, which has had a tradition of English language domination from the 12th century onwards and where Welsh speakers make up a minority (approximately 20%) of the total population, the vitality of the Welsh language is strongly supported in the three milieux of Landry's model. Homes, schools and the community at large have combined their efforts to rescue the language from extinction and to provide a favourable climate for additive bilingualism. According to Baker (1988) in addition to widespread bilingual and Welsh language primary and secondary education, there are also a large number of adult classes and books, records, cassette tapes, radio and television programmes which are freely available in the Welsh language.

In summary, a review of current literature indicates that:

1. Schools have been active agents in vernacular language demise.
2. However, they may serve to promote the revitalization of endangered languages and additive bilingualism, but only if pupils, families and the larger community are committed to and actively support these goals.

Documentary evidence and interview data presented in Chapters Four and Five of this study indicate that within the New Zealand context for maintenance and expansion of the Maori language, although some official supports, of the type offered in Wales, for example, are in operation, many, many more are needed to support family and school efforts to revive the Maori language. There are many suggestions that, at the Macro-level, rhetoric endorsing Maori language revival frequently outstrips actual commitment to change and that there is also a great deal of resistance to expansion of the role of Maori language in New Zealand's public institutions.
**Linguistic and Cultural Deficit Theories:** - Until quite recently theories seeking to explain the educational underachievement of minority group pupils have tended to centre on the cultural and linguistic "disadvantages" of children's home environments, rather than on the failure of the schools to provide appropriate instruction. As macro- and micro-level data collected in this study indicate that cultural and linguistic deficits of Maori children and Maori families are seen by some educators as the primary causal variables in Maori children's educational "failure", and, further, that bilingual programmes are seen as potential means of improving academic achievement, publications examining deficit theories will be discussed at some length here.

As early as 1910, the linguistic "deficiencies" of London's Cockney children were described in a report issued by the Conference on the Teaching of English in London Elementary Schools, which deplored this dialect and the children's', "... almost universal resort to monosyllabic responses and broken phrases." (Thornton, 1986, p. 8). More than 50 years later, these sentiments found renewed expression in the work of linguistic theorists such as Bereiter et al. (1966):

... culturally deprived children [those who have not mastered the grammar and vocabulary of Standard American] do not just think at an immature level: many of them do not think at all. (p. 107).

Modiano (1974, p. 163) describes the work of these writers as destructive, but still influential "distortion[s] of the Whorfian hypothesis": Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979) has criticized the methodology employed by deficit theorists who most usually undertook laboratory studies of children's language. Bronfenbrenner describes such studies as, "... the science of strange behaviour of children in strange situations with strange adults for the briefest possible periods of time." (p.19).
Hudson (1980) concludes that an extreme deficit theory, which claims that the linguistic tools of some children are just not up to the demands made by the school, is "dangerous nonsense" (p. 215) - especially since it serves to divert criticism from the real shortcomings of many schools by focusing on the supposed inadequacies of the child.

**Alternative Theories:** Increasingly, as the explanatory power of linguistic deficit theories have been called into question alternative explanations have been offered by Freire (1970) and Ogbo (1974), among others, who argue that schools simply reproduce the inequalities inherent in the wider society. Freire, quoted in Hernandez-Chavez (1984, p. 171) stresses that for students to achieve academic success they must have a strong self-image and a strong cultural identity and notes the crucial importance to the oppressed of, "... the development of a keen awareness of the sociological, economic and political processes that condition [their own] subordinate role".

Basil Bernstein, whose linguistic theories focusing on "elaborated" and "restricted" language codes have often been interpreted as explanations for the relative underachievement of minority students, has also offered a powerful analysis of the ways in which schools unfairly reinforce the power of the elite classes. For example, Bernstein has written that, "Middle-class family socialization of the child is a hidden subsidy, in the sense that it provides both a physical and psychological environment which immensely facilitates, in diverse ways, school learning." (1975, Vol. 3, p. 113).

Troike (1984) also argues that social and cultural factors may be much more influential in minority children's failure than linguistic factors. In support of this argument, he notes that in Sweden, where Finnish immigrants,
formerly colonial subjects, are viewed very negatively by many Swedes, Finnish immigrant children do much worse in school than their counterparts whose families have immigrated to Australia where Finns are generally viewed in quite a positive light.

Verma and Bagley (1982), offering a similar socio-cultural explanation for minority children's failure, refer to a 1976 study of 510 teachers in England which concluded that a substantial majority of them displayed what appeared to be intolerant views of minority cultures and that despite innovations designed to broaden the formal curriculum, teachers continued "... to use racially biased models in allocating pupils to streams and to examinations, and [to] interact with pupils in ways which confirm stereotyped predictions." (p. xviii).

The authors also note that an NATFHE (National [English] Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education) report of 1980 stated that although substantial data existed to demonstrate that a "colour blind" approach, (viewed favourably by some New Zealand teachers, see Chapter Two, below) to educating minority children is a discriminatory practice in itself, teachers continued to adopt it. In other words, discriminatory pedagogy, not linguistic inadequacy on the part of minority children, may explain their disproportionately low levels of academic success. Viv Edwards (1984, p. 63) offers as an example of educators' ethnic stereotyping a quote from the 1970 ATEPO ([England's] Association of Teachers of English to Pupils from Overseas) report which described West Indian creole as "babyish", "careless and slovenly" and "very relaxed like the way they walk." (See also Cazden, 1986 and Wells, 1986).

Similarly, MacDonald and Kushner (1982) state that inflexibly monocultural teachers may have difficulty communicating with children who belong to
minority ethnic groups and that these children, in turn, begin to resist schooling and the cultural practices of the teacher as early as the age of four. Even when the first language of the student and the teacher is the same, cultural differences can lead to misinterpretation of children's messages. Gumperz's study, conducted in 1979, is cited in Guthrie and Hall (1983) to demonstrate that "contextualization cues", paralinguistic features excluding lexis and syntax, (p. 66) play a key role in the verbal interaction of pupils and teachers. Communication barriers have also been observed in conversations between Maori children and their teachers (Clay, 1985, reviewed below).

Finally, both Verma and Bagley (1982) and Cummins (1987) have argued that the academic failure of minority group children may be preordained by standardized tests and psychoeducational assessment procedures which discriminate against them. Cummins gives as a particular example of this discrimination the fact that Hispanic students in Texas are overrepresented by 300% in learning disability classes and further notes that IQ tests, such as the WISC-R, are biased against minority children, with the Information sub test being exceptionally "culturally loaded" (p.115). The effects on Maori children of similar procedures and measures are discussed in Chapter Two, below.

Cummins (1986a) has developed a comprehensive model for ways in which schools can promote academic success for language and cultural minorities. His theoretical framework for the empowerment of minority children offers a clear-sighted and detailed model for the far-reaching changes which he feels need to occur in conjunction with bilingual education if sociological or linguistic goals for these programmes are to be realized. Cummins argues that previous intervention strategies which sought to address minority students' scholastic failure have been
unsuccessful because they have not significantly affected the relationships between teachers and students and between schools and minority communities. He stresses that without such systemic changes, programmes only add, "... a new veneer to the outward facade of the structure that disables minority students." (p. 33). This model is of considerable relevance to the present discussion, as recent "reforms" in Maori education, such as bilingual programming, have been seen as palliative, and ineffectual, measures to address the needs of Maori children and their communities.

Cummins' model posits four structural elements which can contribute to the empowerment or disabling of minority students:

1. the incorporation or exclusion of students' language and culture within the school curriculum.
2. the inclusion or exclusion of minority communities in the education of their children.
3. pedagogical assumptions and practices of the classroom.
4. assessment of minority students.
Following from this hypothetical model, and based on recent research, Cummins recommends:

1. Curricula designed to promote additive bilingualism and maintenance of cultural affiliation.
2. Meaningful and active collaboration with students' parents, who are to be viewed as partners with the school in promoting academic achievement.
3. Interactive pedagogical strategies which release minority children from the syndrome of "learned helplessness" exhibited in overly controlled classroom situations and, instead, encourage children to become active generators of their own knowledge. Such strategies should promote real dialogue between students and teachers and encourage students to talk and write in a collaborative learning environment.
4. The delegitimizing of psychometric assessment in favour of closer scrutiny of the social and educational contexts which frequently contribute to children's academic failure.

These recommendations have provided direction for many of the research questions addressed in this study.

**Rationales**

**Types of Bilingual Education**

Communities are motivated to establish and support bilingual education for a wide variety of reasons or rationales (underlying principles and goals) and following from these rationales have emerged a great number and variety of bilingual programmes, some of which satisfy Cummins' recommendations (above) and many of which do not. Mackey (1977) has developed a highly complex typology of bilingual education based on a wide variety of factors including classroom usage of language, behaviour patterns at home and in the community at large, and national goals of language education. Fishman (1975) differentiates between various types of bilingual
programmes on the basis of rationales; "intensity" of classroom usage, including the presence or absence of literacy instruction; whether one of the languages of instruction is the pupils' home languages; the size of the speech population served by the programmes and a number of other factors. (See also Ferguson, Houghton and Wells, 1977, for additional discussion).

**Compensatory Rationales for Bilingual Education:** In order to simplify matters, Wong Fillmore and Valadez (1986) and Fishman (1976) divide bilingual education programmes into three basic categories: compensatory, enrichment and language maintenance programmes. Compensatory programmes have as their basic rationale the elimination of disadvantage faced by minority language students when encountering a majority language school situation. Perhaps the most widely documented programmes of this compensatory type are the transitional bilingual programmes operating in the United States, which, in theory, provide limited English proficiency (LEP) students with English language instruction as well as curriculum instruction in their home language until such time as they are ready to enter a mainstream all-English classroom. In practice, children are often transferred from these programmes into in all-English classrooms before they can cope with this "transition".

Educational planners responsible for establishing short term transitional programmes were apparently unfamiliar with, or chose to ignore, the fact that students may require many years' exposure to a second language in a school setting before they can cope with it as a language of academic instruction. (Cummins, 1981). This led to situations, such as the one described by MacDonald and Kushner (1982) where the Commonwealth of Massachusetts allotted Hispanic LEP students only three years in a transitional bilingual programme before they were placed in English language classrooms. As a result of this policy, teachers at Boston's
Raphael Hernandez bilingual school engaged in frantic and often unsuccessful battles to ensure that their students acquired skills in spoken and written English before their allotted three years had expired. Further, the "Threshold Hypothesis" (Cummins, 1981) suggests that "early exit" programming is unlikely to promote positive outcomes for dual language education.

As the bilingual programmes under study provided continuation of Maori language only on an ad hoc basis, and as provision at intermediate school for children who had been enrolled in primary school bilingual programmes was often lacking, it is important to note the drawbacks of previous short term planning in the American context.

As can be expected, compensatory programmes such as the transitional programmes described above, which seek to promote proficiency in English language only, irrespective of proficiency in non-English languages, often result in a shift from the student's home language to that of the language of the school. This shift is not viewed as a matter of any great concern by those who plan such programmes, as their main aim is to transfer the "disadvantaged" (see discussion of "Linguistic Deficit Theories", above, this chapter) child into an English-language school programme as quickly as possible. Based on the (oversimplified) premise that linguistic "mismatch" between home and school represents an educational "disadvantage", it is small wonder that compensatory programmes make no attempt to foster the minority languages of their students. In fact, many of these programmes compound their students' learning disabilities, by making it difficult to acquire age-appropriate skills in either language. This is an important point, as there is evidence in the present investigation to suggest that compensatory rationales may form the basis for recent initiatives in Maori/English schooling and that those few children who enter these
programmes with strong skills in Maori language are at risk of becoming semi-lingual, rather than bilingual, speakers of the two languages. (See Cummins, 1981; also Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981 and Lambert, 1984).

Serious doubts have been raised about the value of compensatory bilingual education which include that they are based on false assumptions of language learning and simplistic notions about the nature of academic and social failure. J.D. Studstill (1986), for example, writes as follows:

... attrition research that focuses on the student tends to identify failure exclusively as a student problem, and to ignore the systemic aspects ... of schooling which may have generated the failure ... and may help deflect criticism from those groups that control and benefit most from the system ... (p. 114).

Bilingual education in the United States, for the most part based on the rationale of providing short-term compensatory education for an underprivileged minority, has tended to follow a downward and discouraging path. Many of these programmes were half-heartedly adopted by local school districts seeking to comply with national and state legislation imposed upon them. In all too many cases bilingual initiatives were hastily adopted, half-heartedly implemented, under-resourced and eventually abandoned. (Troike, 1978).

Fishman (1976) expresses grave reservations about the ability of compensatory bilingual education to better the academic chances of minority group children: "My own evaluation is that compensatory bilingual education is not a good long-term bet ... . The 'underprivileged' ... cannot be aided in more than an initial palliative sense by so slender a reed ... ." Fishman goes on to predict that, "It will soon be just another educational gimmick gone sour." (p.34).
This last statement is similar to sentiments expressed by a variety of people, including Ministry of Education officials, kaiarahi reo, and parents contacted during the present study, who have claimed that state-sponsored Maori-English bilingual programmes have been "set up to fail". Maori dissatisfaction with bilingual programming is indicated by the establishment of Kura Kaupapa Maori, set up by Maori themselves, which originally operated entirely outside of the state education system.

Moreover, Fishman (1976) argues that there is no hard data to support the contention that educational programmes which seek to promote increased appreciation of ethnic difference and self-confidence among minority pupils will enable them to profit more from schooling. Fishman does go on to say that this assumption (perhaps unresearchable) is, "... primarily an article of faith, [and] a moral and ethical position" ... (p.30) based on essential social rights.

However, Cummins (1986a) writes that there is a considerable body of research validating the claim that the extent to which a minority student's language and culture are supported by the school programme is an important predictor of academic success. (p. 25). (See also Verma and Bagley, 1982, who document research evidence from a variety of studies which indicates that self-concept and academic achievement are closely related for "disadvantaged" as well as for other pupils).

Nevertheless, Cummins (cited in Baker, 1988) cautions that improved general academic performance is not an axiomatic result of bilingual instruction. Many other factors, including positive pupil attitudes, appropriate teaching methodology, a culturally appropriate climate of schooling and parental interest and involvement are also needed if bilingual programmes are to succeed. Cummins (1986b) also discredits the simplistic
notion that change in the language of education alone can eradicate social and educational inequalities:

The crucial element in reversing language minority students' school failure is not the language of instruction but the extent to which educators work to reverse - rather than perpetuate - the subtle, and often not so subtle, institutionalized racism of the society as a whole. In other words, bilingual education becomes effective only when it becomes anti-racist education. (p.53).  

Further criticism of compensatory bilingual programmes comes from Jacobovitz (1974) who has argued that although the compensatory programmes which comprise the bulk of American programmes funded under the (United States) Bilingual Education Act of 1967 may have given some recognition to the aspirations of cultural minorities, they also, "... within the old climate of ethnocentrism [may have] become one more tool in the arsenal of an assimilatory agency." Jacobovitz explains this seeming contradiction by noting that legislative programmes empowering communities to develop bilingual programmes also, "... explicitly affirm[ed] the primary importance of English". (p. 27). Data collected in the present study suggests that at both the macro- and micro-levels, bilingual programming in New Zealand may be of a similar assimilatory or "token" nature.

**Enrichment Rationales:** - The second major category of bilingual education identified by Wong Fillmore and Valadez (1986) and Fishman (1976) is enrichment bilingual education. Programmes of this type seek to extend a child's linguistic repertoire by adding a second language (hence the term "additive" bilingual education), rather than to replace the home language ("subtractive" bilingual education). The basic rationale for this

---

2 According to Brandt (1986) anti-racist education seeks to promote equality of opportunity and outcome and justice in the distribution of resources, as well as active resistance to racist ideology. Moreover, the dismantling of racism in education must involve changes in macro- and micro-level legislation, policy, and practice.
type of programming is enrichment of a majority language student’s educational experience, "... with some notions of the cultural and/or economic advantages of bilingualism in mind" (Fishman, 1975, p. 5). Enrichment programmes include French language immersion programmes, such as the St. Lambert project, designed for anglophone students in Quebec, which are intended to promote a deeper understanding, culturally and linguistically, of the francophone majority among whom they reside. (For a discussion of the St. Lambert project see Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Lambert, 1984; Fishman, 1976 and Genessee, 1988).

**Maintenance Rationales** - The third category of bilingual education is based on the rationale of maintenance or revival of a minority group’s language and culture, with the purpose of strengthening the minority community uppermost in mind. Basque language programmes in Spain, for example, are based on this rationale, as are Canadian programmes promoting "heritage" languages spoken by indigenous and immigrant peoples, or valued by these groups, even if they no longer speak them. What is of especial interest for present purposes, however, in light of the paucity of resources for Maori language education, is that resources for Canadian indigenous language education, including printed materials, planned curriculum, trained teachers and supervisory support are far less adequate than for either French language programmes designed for anglophone students or for immigrant heritage language programmes. As there are few commercially published materials for school language revival initiatives, and as few resources exist for producing and reproducing locally-created instructional materials, most Native-language teachers prepare the majority of class materials themselves. It is also important to note, in view of the present study's findings, that non-Native language teachers working in schools where language revival is promoted may feel indifferent or
helpless because of lack of knowledge of the language or culture involved and that the turnover rate in Native schools is high. (Burnaby, 1988).

**Conflicting Goals:** - Hernandez-Chavez (1984) makes the important observation that the aims of enrichment programmes do not include full native fluency across a wide range of linguistic and social domains:

> The goals of enrichment immersion include the development of relatively high levels of skill in a second language for limited economic and cross-cultural purposes. There is little expectation that students will become dominant users of the second language. (p. 153)

The implication of this observation is that programmes designed to promote "enrichment" goals may actually be incompatible with language "maintenance/revival" rationales. Interview and observational data presented in Chapters Seven and Eight, below, offer strong indications that as the bilingual programmes under study were primarily "enrichment" rather than "language maintenance and revival" programmes, they did not actually promote a high degree of Maori language fluency or literacy.

**Non-linguistic and Non-educational Rationales:** - World-wide there are political and social, as well as educational and linguistic considerations inherent in minority communities' demands for maintenance education. Frequently linguistic and pedagogical aims are secondary to those connected to redressing social and economic inequities. Spolsky (1977) is of the opinion that it is rare for a linguistic outcome to be the basic motivation for a bilingual programme. For most of those concerned, he believes, "... language serves a secondary role either as a symbol or as an instrument ... ." (p. 8). Cummins (1984) in a discussion of the bilingual situation in Canada writes:
During the 1960’s the French-speaking population in Quebec became increasingly conscious of the fact that the English-speaking minority controlled most of the business and industry of the Province. Fluency in English was a prerequisite for social and economic advancement whereas fluency in French was not. (p.84).

The recently established Maori-English immersion and bilingual programmes are linked to the international rise in ethnic awareness and language revival. Irwin (1989) highlights the connection between overseas ethnic revival movements and the "Maori Renaissance" currently occurring within New Zealand when she speaks of, "... the growing [global] concern for equality of educational opportunity and ... the concern for human rights." (p.3). (c.f. Hauraki Greenland's discussion [1984] of the evolution of Maori ethnicity and sovereignty, which denotes clear distinctions between overseas and New Zealand ethnic revival movements. He notes, for example, that by the mid-1970's, Maori radical ideology had begun to move away from the conceptual framework of black power toward an ideology based primarily on neo-traditionalist distinctions of Maori indigeneity and ethnicity).

Similarly, Gilling (1989) emphasizes the political dimension of Maori language revitalization and Maori language education:

To look at te reo Maori in New Zealand means to look at Maori-Pakeha relationships, to look at power relationships .... (p.40).

**Limitations of Categorical Models**

In practice, categories are rarely as neatly delineated as they are in theory. Kohanga Reo pre-school immersion programmes in New Zealand may be viewed as maintenance programmes; as maintenance and expansion of the Maori language is a chief rationale. (See Chapter Two). However, although they are concerned with linguistic and cultural preservation, they also aim, in the long term, to improve the overall educational, social and economic
well-being of Maori through the assertion of Tino Rangatiratanga (the sovereign power and authority of Maori).

There are also multiple rationales underpinning the New Zealand state-sponsored bilingual education programmes, the stated goals of which include language and cultural maintenance as well as educational enrichment. The Department of Education's (1984) *Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools* clearly mentions both of these aims in the section relating to "Bicultural, Multicultural and Maori Education":

The Maori language is not only an important part of Maori culture, but its main vehicle of expression. Learning Maori is related to two issues of concern to New Zealanders ... the development ... of an understanding of themselves as New Zealanders, their history, culture, institutions and ways of life [and] ... the recognition of rights of individuals and groups to be different. In addition, for a number of students, particularly for Maori students, learning Maori is an important element in developing a sense of personal identity and self-worth. (p.32).

This *Review* also specifically mentions the need for primary schools to make special provision for the linguistic and cultural needs for pupils who have been enrolled in Kohanga Reo and suggests that special programmes be provided for them.

In addition to enrichment and expansion goals, however, a third rationale, that of compensation for educational underachievement, has also been put forth as a rationale for Maori/English bilingual education. This rationale will receive considerable attention below. (See Chapters Four and Seven).
Operations Level

Pedagogical Issues

Recent Changes in Second Language Teaching: Throughout the last two decades there has been a shift in many English-speaking countries away from traditional high school and university foreign-language courses which stressed vocabulary memorization, formal grammatical structure and textual translation. Frequently, second language teaching is now being:

1. Introduced earlier
2. Used for a wide variety of instructional purposes
3. Transmitted in classroom contexts which stress oral fluency and literacy skills and which attempt to replicate "natural" conditions for language acquisition.

Indeed, Baker (1988) makes the important point that parental disgruntlement with traditional French classes (see Melikoff, 1972), which involved French being taught as a second language for only a 20-30 minute period once a day often by a teacher who was not fluent in the language and who relied heavily on drill and practice, was the original motivating force behind Canadian immersion programmes. These classes were totally inadequate in preparing students to use French in every day situations and, as Baker notes, "... after twelve years of such school lessons, many pupils could not communicate in French with French Canadians." (p. 93).

For purposes of the present discussion, it is important to note that pressure for change in the Canadian context came from outside, rather than from within the educational system, as similar, external pressure groups in New Zealand were the motivating forces behind inclusion of Maori language in primary school classrooms.
In addition to changes in the structuring of second language teaching, the
target languages which school programmes seek to promote have also
changed. Traditionally in English-speaking countries, a "foreign" language
of international importance, such as French, German or Spanish, or one of
classical interest, such as Latin or Greek, were offered as they were seen to
be culturally enriching or useful in the attainment of professional
qualifications, such as law and medicine. During the last 20 years,
however, there has been a groundswell of interest in the teaching of
minority languages, including those spoken by restricted or diminishing
populations, and in teaching those languages, not as heretofore, to the
academic and social elite, but to students who in many cases were failing
appallingly in mainstream monolingual schools. In fact, the widespread
and well-documented failure of minority pupils frequently served as the
impetus for the development of bilingual education in the United States and
within New Zealand.

**New Pedagogies:** In conjunction with - and probably resulting from-
these changes, a number of new second language theories and teaching
approaches have sprung up during the 1970s and 1980s and several of them
merit detailed consideration. For example, Stephen Krashen, Professor of
Linguistics at the University of Southern California, offers five hypotheses
concerning second language acquisition (1981). Three of these hypotheses
will receive attention at this point, as they have strongly influenced the
evaluation of Maori language used in the classrooms under consideration in
this study.

Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, makes a distinction between
language "acquisition" which is the subconscious process of "picking up a
language" and language "learning", involving explicit presentation of rules
and error correction (which Krashen sees as unhelpful in promoting acquisition).

The Input Hypothesis, which has very powerful implications for second language teaching, states that language is acquired through exposure to structures which are just beyond our present level of comprehension. If the learner receives sufficient "comprehensible input", speech will emerge on its own.

Finally, the Affective Filter Hypothesis deals with the effects of personality, motivation and other "affective" variables on language acquisition. According to Krashen, the following variables seem to be directly related to success in second language acquisition; low anxiety, high motivation, and self-confidence. Although he notes that all of these variables are secondary to the single causative variable of comprehensible input, he feels that if these affective states are less than optimal, then a filter, or mental block, will prevent full utilization of the second language input.

Krashen's theories have spawned a number of teaching programmes, such as Tracy Terrell's (1981) "Natural Approach" to second language acquisition which is characterized by the following features:

1. Specific behavioural objectives defined in terms of communicative contexts.
2. Activities presented in a two-stage format; comprehension and production.
3. A pre-production period that lasts as long as necessary.
4. Language activities which focus on content not form; in other words, sentences are generated because of the need to communicate messages, rather than in order to practice previously learned forms or to teach rules.
5. Opportunities for children to express themselves in low-anxiety situations.
According to Terrell's model for second language acquisition, curriculum content is taught through the target language - therefore, children must be carefully grouped according to their language skills so that they are at the same level. Since Terrell feels that children learn best whilst they are enjoying themselves, language riddles, mystery games, and other high interest activities are used to focus students' attention on language content, rather than on language forms. This approach also calls for a focus on self-awareness and self-esteem, with children interacting effectively with one another and with the instructor.

**Immersion Education - Description and Criticism:** - Krashen's hypotheses may also be used to describe the theoretical underpinnings for immersion education programmes (see Campbell, 1984) such as the French Immersion Programmes in Canada. Lapkin and Cummins (1984) have provided a highly readable and comprehensive summary of administrative arrangements and instructional practices of Canadian programmes which will be reviewed below in an attempt to show their relationship to Krashen's hypotheses and to Terrell's pedagogical principles.

According to Lapkin and Cummins, immersion education is distinguished from other types of bilingual education in the following ways:

1. The programmes are optional.
2. They are targeted at monolingual English-speaking children.
3. Between 50 - 100% of the school day is devoted to curriculum instruction in French. The most common type of French immersion is early total immersion, where children begin their bilingual instruction for the first year.
4. Immersion students study the same curriculum subjects as their monolingually educated peers.
5. Second language acquisition takes place as naturally as possible on the model of home language acquisition. (Krashen's comprehensible input). Although student's use of English is tolerated and their home
language and culture appreciated, the teacher speaks only French to the students, relying on verbal and physical interaction in context-embedded activities to convey her message.

Formal rules are taught through implicit correction at first, but gradually explicit features of grammar and syntax are introduced into the curriculum. The child's experience serves as a basis for introducing oral language patterns which will later be used in reading and writing activities to be incorporated into the first grade level of instruction. Proponents of immersion education believe that skills taught in the second language will transfer to the student's stronger language (Cummins, 1981).

However, C.J. Dodson (1979) has raised serious objections to what he terms "language bath" or total immersion theories of learning a second language where, "... the intention is to throw the pupils immediately into a sea of language in the hope of creating an immediate 'message oriented' communication level. Our experience has shown that in such a situation the majority of pupils drown". (No pg. number). Dodson's view (1968) is that "message-oriented" immersion teaching approaches which withhold "medium-oriented" cues, such as: mother tongue cues, written cues in either language and grammatical instruction, slow down the rate at which a second language is learned. He suggests instead a fifty-fifty split in the school day, where the target language is used to reinforce concepts which have already been introduced in the preferred language.

This view is based on Dodson's study (1968) of the acquisition of German by Welsh school children, which utilized an experimental design involving groups of primary (N=26) and secondary (N=130) school children of mixed ability levels to test the efficiency of various teaching approaches.

Dodson monitored the children's performance in foreign language learning along a variety of parameters, including apprehension and retention of
meaning and the fluency, accuracy and pronunciation of imitation responses. He concluded from this study that for children beyond a certain developmental level, perhaps beyond the age of seven, second language learning is a very different process than for less mature students. For older students, mother tongue speech cues and printed text reduce obstacles to learning a foreign language. In other words, Dodson concludes that while total immersion may be an appropriate pedagogy for the infant level, where children learn a second language in much the same way as they learn their first language, beyond this stage an approach which incorporates some medium-oriented cues is more effective.

Dodson toured New Zealand in 1976 on a McKenzie Visiting Lectureship (sponsored by New Zealand Council for Educational Research). As his work has received some attention here and as his theories have direct implications for Maori language education, a critique of his methodology and conclusions may be in order. Firstly, as Dodson's conclusions rest on test-type experiments and involve only discrete bits of language which do not replicate the ordinary conversation of teaching and learning, there are no guarantees that they are directly relevant to programmes which seek to foster native-like fluency in a wide variety of language situations.

Secondly, the target language for these experiments, German, was a foreign language to the subjects of the experiment, who most likely would have had no group-related emotional attachment to the language, or opportunity to hear or speak it unless they travelled to the Continent. Unlike the New Zealand situation, where Kohanga Reo offer pre-school exposure to Maori language, there is little reason to expect that any of the children Dodson described would have attended German language pre-schools. This lack of comparability is especially problematic, in the light of Dodson's claims that
pre-schoolers learn (and presumably retain) a second language in a very different manner from older children.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Dodson has based his assertions on a study of a very small number of primary school children and, therefore, any conclusions he reaches must be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive. In summary, Dodson's findings are interesting, but inconclusive, and of questionable relevance within the New Zealand context.

Eurwen Price (1968), a student of Dodson's, has conducted a research study of anglophone new entrants (N=21) enrolled in a half-day Welsh/English bilingual programme. This study is probably of greater value than Dodson's to classroom practitioners in New Zealand. Among other findings, Price's study reveals the overwhelming tendency of English to intrude on the pupil's production of Welsh language speech when the "one teacher - one language" rule is broken. A researcher who normally spoke only Welsh in the classroom infringed on this rule several times in order to administer IQ tests in the morning sessions (normally all-English) and reported that the children, from that point on, seemed less willing to speak Welsh to her in the afternoon sessions. As a result of this observation, the researchers concluded that any gains in clarity and time to be made from translating Welsh into English would have been outweighed by the loss of children's motivation to use Welsh. This finding holds important implications for bilingual teaching, in that it seems to justify an immersion approach.

Although Price's study, like Dodson's, is limited by the small numbers of children involved, it did include prolonged participant/observer contact with primary school children in naturalistic classroom settings which attempted
to foster a national heritage language. Therefore, it may be of more direct interest to New Zealanders.

**Literacy in the Target Language:** One of the major decisions to be reached by planners of bilingual education programmes, whether they utilize immersion or other approaches, is whether literacy skills, as well as aural-oral skills in the target language, will be promoted as part of the curriculum. It has been noted that to fail to do so compromises the status of the target language by making it appear to be of secondary importance in comparison with the language which receives the full coverage expected in any modern day school (see Fishman, 1976). Fishman also points out that a monoliterate bilingual programme provides support for the target language in the intimate domains of the home and neighbourhood, but does not facilitate use of the language in conjunction with work, government, religion or book culture in general.

On a different tack, Lambert and Tucker (1972) have also acknowledged that advantages may be gained from adopting a biliterate/bilingual approach, but they view this advantage primarily in terms of effective language teaching. The authors note that in Canadian Immersion programmes, the written form of the French language appears to provide valuable input for oral vocabulary development as well as providing an aid in controlling and developing the children's mental schemata for error-free oral expression. These authors note that appropriate texts in the target language may be used by the teacher as core material for a wide variety of oral and written language development exercises, including oral reading, practising proper intonation and rhythm, correcting errors, and writing dictation sentences. Lambert and Tucker conclude that biliterate instruction is of prime importance in second language acquisition in that the written form of the target language, "... seems to become a dependable frame of reference which
helps to concretize the free-floating sounds and words of the language." (p. 210).

The Necessity for Adequate Resource Provisioning and Proper Language Planning

A further issue which needs to be addressed in relation to biliterate bilingualism is that of the availability and suitability of printed materials in the target language. Lapkin and Cummins (1984) stress the necessity for full resourcing of programmes, including provisions for accessible reading materials. This is especially problematic for bilingual programmes involving local currency target languages, such as Maori, which cannot draw upon an international supply of school literature. Instead, the successful implementation of biliterate Maori/English programmes depends on the creation of a whole range of new teaching materials, a very large undertaking.

In addition to problems of availability, the suitability of reading materials may prove to be a difficulty for planners of biliterate bilingual programmes because of the number of factors involved in their selection. Thonis (1981) stresses that second-language reading materials, like first language materials, should be visually appealing to children and have appropriately-sized print. Additionally, it is especially important that the cultural content of the materials should be interesting and relevant to students, and concepts and values should be free from cultural stereotyping. Above all, Thonis argues, the materials should not be, "... hastily patched together translations of English." (p.176).

A further, and related, area of concern expressed by writers seeking to promote quality bilingual programmes, whether biliterate or monoliterate, is the need for proper planning and adequate resourcing of these
programmes. MacDonald and Kushner (1982) deplore the lack of planning and provision in the establishment and operation of the aforementioned Raphael Hernandez bilingual pilot school near Boston, Massachusetts. The authors described this school as, "... underresourced [and] lacking in materials, advice and support. The curriculum was poorly synchronized, with an uncoordinated variety of textbooks in use, and a chronic shortage of Spanish language materials." (p. 54). Since many of the same criticisms could be applied to the Maori/English programmes under consideration in the present study, I feel that the comments of these authors, and their negative assessment of the Hernandez programme in general, deserve the attention of New Zealand policy planners in order that they can avoid repeating the mistakes of planners in the United States.

Several other researchers have pointed out the complex and manifold factors which require the careful attention of bilingual education planners. Dodson (1979), for example, emphasizes the need, both at the primary and secondary levels, for adequate supplies of a variety of resource materials. He also stresses the need for teachers to become fully aware of ways in which children learn and develop, both in first and second language situations, and ways of presenting and interchanging activities to foster a whole range of concepts and skills. He urges teachers colleges and universities to involve themselves in bilingual teacher training and recommends the appointment of advisors and inspectors to continually offer in-service training.

Lapkin and Cummins (1984) also stress the necessity for qualified teachers and other support personnel as well as provisions for transportation in the case of "magnet" bilingual schools. In addition, these authors indicate the potentially damaging community divisiveness regarding the programmes which must be dealt with as part of the planning process for bilingual education. As will be demonstrated below, community and school
resistance, in all probability exacerbated by lack of adequate information-sharing and consultation, was a key characteristic of the programmes which receive attention in this study.

Similarly, Rubin (1977) presents a well-articulated discussion of the necessity for extensive language planning which she feels should include:

1. fact finding - including, among other factors, a determination of the clients' needs and an investigation of alternative bilingual methods.
2. the establishment of goals and policy.
3. consideration of strategies, resources, and predicted outcomes.
4. implementation and evaluation based on the above criteria.

It is highly doubtful that these steps have received thorough consideration within the context of currently-operating Maori/English bilingual programmes.

Viv Edwards, a British socio-linguist and multi-cultural classroom teacher also offers a comprehensive list of prerequisites (1984) for workable minority language education policies. Firstly, she emphasizes the need for consultation with parents and community members and secondly points to the need for development of new resources and pedagogies. She also comments on the usefulness of coordinating bodies such as the National Committee on Mother-Tongue Teaching in Britain and joint efforts by interested parties, such as the Welsh Books Scheme which ensured a market for new Welsh language materials. Finally, Edwards asserts that it is very important to have a clear understanding of the way in which successful language education policies operate at different levels within governmental and educational systems. Since Edwards' position on the necessity for a multi-level approach to bilingual education is so close to the fundamental thesis for this study - that schools alone cannot successfully
promote bilingualism - her description of the functions of various levels involved in promoting bilingual education will be quoted below:

1. At a national level, a broad commitment to a given course of action is necessary, together with the financial backing which will allow those at the grass roots level to achieve their aims.

2. At a local authority level it is necessary to adapt the general statements of intent in accordance with local conditions and to monitor needs and developments closely.

3. At the school level, in particular, broad policies must be translated into educational programmes. (pp. 75-76).

Edwards concludes that without this multi-tiered level of commitment, chances of a programme's success are unlikely. She compares the impressive achievements resulting from the language policies of Wales, where bilingualism has received a great deal of thought, support and action, to the piecemeal policies of England which have yielded far from impressive results.

The implications for Maori language education if New Zealand planners choose to ignore these recommendations are made obvious by the experiences of other nations which have experimented with half-hearted (the United States) or ill-considered (Irish) implementation of bilingual planning and bilingual education: the programmes can be expected to fail and/or to meet with considerable community resistance.

**Costs:** As Lapkin and Cummins (1984) point out, there is no doubt that the costs of implementing quality bilingual education programmes are as significant as the implementation costs for any major educational innovation. The authors also assert, however, that once the programmes are in operation, the running expenses may be far more cost-effective and the programmes may be far more efficient than traditional second language programmes which usually necessitate the employment of additional teachers and/or the use of additional classrooms.
Measured in broader terms, as the cost of minority children’s unacceptably high failure rates within mainstream educational programmes is incalculable, carefully-considered and well-resourced bilingual programmes, which are acknowledged to have the potential to reverse this trend, may well represent a bargain for the taxpayer. (See Cummins, 1986a, for a discussion of research studies which support this contention).

Summary

Within the last 20 years significant changes, particularly in regard to target languages, rationales and expected outcomes, have taken place within the framework of second language teaching. In order to accommodate these changes, new pedagogical theories and practices have sprung up, typically emphasizing a message-oriented, communicative approach to second language learning, rather than an approach based on textual translations and formal grammatical rules. Typically, these new practices are carried out in classrooms which endeavour to teach core curriculum subjects through the medium of the target language - thus becoming bilingual rather than second language classrooms.

The theorists and practitioners of the new language pedagogies, as may be expected, are not in complete agreement with one another. A particularly contentious issue has been the value of immersion education for school aged children. A less contentious, but still problematical, issue is that of the advantage of biliterate/bilingual instruction. While there seems to be general agreement that this type of instruction offers several benefits, it also requires a firm, and expensive, commitment to the provision of adequate and suitable printed materials.
There is also widespread agreement on the absolute necessity for thorough planning and adequate general resourcing of bilingual programmes, which must include wider language policies on regional and national levels. That these provisions will represent an extensive financial outlay, especially in the initial stages, is not in dispute; however, once in operation, bilingual education programmes may prove to be cost effective.

**Outcomes**

**Effects of Bilingual Education**

In addition to the controversy regarding the most favourable pedagogical methods for bilingual classrooms, there has also been an immense amount of contention over the cognitive effects of bilingualism and the outcomes of bilingual education. Mackey (1977) reports that this debate began as early as 1911 when the effects of bilingual schooling were discussed at the international Imperial Education Conference in Whitehall. He goes on to note that although this controversy has given rise to a number of research evaluations over the years, until about 1940 the studies were procedurally unsound.

Mackey is of the opinion that to attempt a general evaluation of the effects of bilingual education would be meaningless, as, "... bilingual schooling can be judged only for a specific population in a particular place and at a given time." (1977, p.227). For example, he states that if a bilingual programme is to be deemed "successful" in its outcomes, then it must achieve its own stated objectives with optimum results taking into consideration the particular limitations and unique situations within which it operates. Further, he stresses that a full evaluation of bilingual education programmes must include a discussion of the available alternatives. The
present study has endeavoured to take Mackey's pragmatic recommendations into account.

Very few of the broad evaluations of the effects of bilingual education have considered exactly which programmes work best for which students and why or considered community values and objectives. In the present study an effort has been made to assess community satisfaction with the bilingual programmes under consideration and to recognize that families whose children participate in the six programmes do not comprise a homogeneous grouping, but may have quite different opinions regarding their children's education.

In addition to the overly generalized nature of most bilingual education evaluations, Mackey further (1977) notes that studies almost always focus on the easily quantified cognitive effects of bilingual education rather than, for example, on political, sociological or economic effects, as these are much more difficult to measure. Additionally, there is a lamentable paucity of longitudinal data which could indicate the long term effects of bilingual education on children.

Nevertheless, despite these limitations and gaps, a considerable body of research (usually focusing on measurable linguistic and other academic skills) on the demonstrated effects of bilingualism and bilingual education does exist and will be summarized below. As there is concern in New Zealand at present that education in a minority language acquisition may jeopardize English language development, and many overseas studies concentrate on this issue, the summary will highlight studies which address this point. (cf. Wong Fillmore and Valadez, 1986, for a discussion of evaluators' obsession with testing English language skills).
**Early Evaluations Showing Negative Effects:** - In the United States, early evaluations of bilingualism flourished in tandem with the proliferation of psychometric intelligence testing and, perhaps not incidentally, coincided with the "melting pot" period of U.S. social history. Diaz (1983) noted that in general these studies (1920s - 1960s) gave bilingualism poor reviews. For example, according to Diaz, they typically concluded that bilingualism was a learning handicap leading to poor vocabulary development (Grabo, 1931; Saer, 1923); deficient articulation (Carrow, 1957); lower standards of written composition and grammatical errors (Harris, 1948; Saer, 1923). Bilingual children, as compared with monolingual children were also shown to perform poorly on standardized intelligence tests. Diaz cites a number of methodological flaws of these early studies, including the fact that they failed to control a number of important variables, such as socio-economic status, and utilized small samples of children for whom they failed to assess the actual degree of bilingualism. For example, one study used the parent's birthplace (Brunner, 1929) to indicate the children's level of bilingualism, while several other studies used only family names or addresses. These methodological flaws were additionally compounded by a tendency to overgeneralize the conclusions (see Lambert and Tucker's, 1972 comparison of early and later studies of the effects of bilingual education in the Phillipines).

**More Recent Studies Showing Positive Effects:** - In contrast to these negative findings, during the 1960s studies began to emerge which adhered more rigidly to the rules for testing validity and employed more controlled samples. Frequently, these studies arrive at more positive conclusions regarding the effects of bilingualism. A fair number of cautiously-mounted recent studies indicate that bilingual fluency can be promoted in schools with no detrimental effects on children's acquisition of majority language
skills or attainment in other curriculum areas. A few studies also posit, somewhat less conclusively, a number of distinct cognitive advantages to be gained from the acquisition of more than one language:

- Cummins and Mulcahy (1978), reported in Cummins (1984), revealed that English-speaking Canadian students who were relatively fluent in Ukrainian were better able than predominantly English-speaking children to detect ambiguities in English sentence structure.

- Tucker and d'Anglejan (1972) report that children enrolled in pilot and follow up French immersion classes (St. Lambert, below) could, "... read, write and understand French in a way that English pupils who follow a traditional programme of French as a second language never do." (p. 19). Genesee, (1988) however, cites evidence to show that even after a number of years of French immersion, Ontario pupils' oral competence fell far short of native-like speech. Moorfield (1987), referring to research carried out by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Toronto, Canada) of early partial, early total and late immersion programmes, notes that the early total immersion variation has proved the most successful in developing the French language skills of the pupils. Moorfield concludes that there are no detrimental effects on pupils' academic progress as a result of being taught in an immersion situation, while immersion students' skills in the second language are superior to those of pupils learning a second language in the conventional manner.

- Diaz (1983), who is especially detailed and informative, describes studies carried out over the last two decades which present evidence of the

---

3 There are, however, a number of studies which show negative emotional, linguistic, and scholastic consequences resulting from the "semi-lingualism" which may occur when a child's insufficiently developed first language is replaced by a second language. A child in this situation frequently fails to develop adequate skills in either language. (See Skuttnabb-Kangas, 1981, Cummins, 1981, Cummins, 1976).
positive influence of bilingualism on children's cognitive and linguistic abilities, such as increased metalinguistic awareness, and enhanced concept formation, field independence and divergent thinking skills. Cummins (cited in Diaz) explains this positive influence in terms of the "objectification hypothesis" which states that bilingualism accelerates cognitive development by fostering an early awareness of the objective and structural properties of language. However, Diaz argues that this hypothesis has not been supported by enough research data to warrant its unquestioned acceptance.

There are also flaws in the methodology of some of these studies. Diaz points out, for example, that some of the concepts tested, such as "mental flexibility", which was measured by Peal and Lambert, Ben-Zeev, Balkan and Landry, were poorly defined and difficult to measure reliably.

Cummins and Swain (1986), on the other hand, criticize the construct validity of certain instruments used to measure differences in metalinguistic awareness of monolingual and bilingual children. They give as an example of inadequate construct validity Ianco-Worrall's study which set out to measure children's awareness of the arbitrary nature of word-referent relationships. In this study, children were required to give only an unjustified "yes" or "no" response to questions such as: "Suppose you were making up names for things, could you then call a cow 'dog' and a dog 'cow'?" (Cummins and Swain, p. 21). As the authors point out, a "yes" response does not adequately demonstrate comprehension of the arbitrary assignment of words to referents.

Cummins and Swain conclude that caution is required, "in investigating the effects of bilingualism on phenomena as little understood as children's metalinguistic awareness and orientation to language ...." (p.21).
Another study which presents valuable, but limited, data concerning the positive effects of bilingual education is Lambert and Tucker's benchmark study (1972) of the St. Lambert Project. This study provides carefully documented evidence to indicate that at the end of five years of schooling students enrolled in an experimental immersion programme performed at the same level as a monolingually educated (English) control group in reading ability, listening comprehension and knowledge of concepts in English. Both this study and the follow up study (Bruck, et. al., 1974) reported affective as well as cognitive and linguistic gains for pupils.

It should be noted, however, that the conclusions drawn from these studies may be of limited generalizability, as the St. Lambert Project enjoyed uniquely favourable conditions. For example, the French immersion experimental class was spearheaded by parent initiative and received a great deal of research attention, which possibly created a halo effect. In addition, the students in this programme came from atypically privileged and atypically pro-French language homes.

Carey (1987) offers comment on the favourable conditions surrounding the St. Lambert Project which, as he notes, may not be replicated in other bilingual school programmes. Firstly, he observes that the experimental class students had had good first language role models at home and had mastered their home language before entering school. Additionally, they lived in a sociocultural milieu which offered a great deal of target language exposure in a wide variety of extracurricular settings. Carey's study of anglophone Western Canadian immersion students (grades 3 through 2nd year post-secondary education) provides a warning that substantial exposure in a variety of contexts is necessary to promote high levels of target language proficiency and literacy. According to Carey, "... it would appear that a rich sociolinguistic history " (p.106) is a precursor to both native-like
oral fluency and high levels of reading comprehension of academic material.

What Lambert and Tucker's findings do show is that privileged bilingual children can do better than privileged monolingual children. There are also indications that their findings may have wider applicability. Bruck's study (1982) of language impaired children's performance in additive bilingual education programmes (cited in Genesee, 1984) resulted in findings that majority English speaking Canadian children with learning disabilities benefited from early total immersion programmes. Genesee's own series of studies (also reported in Genesee, 1984) used IQ tests to identify high and low achieving students, enrolled in both immersion and standard English-language classes, and then compared their English language skills development. His findings show that below average immersion students achieved the same levels of proficiency in English reading, spelling, vocabulary and writing as students of similar ability in the English programme. "In other words, below-average students were not handicapped by the immersion experience as many had expected." (p. 178).

Cummins' study (1984) of the English-Ukrainian primary school bilingual programmes which were introduced by the Edmonton, Alberta, Public School Board in 1973, concluded that there were no significant differences between programme students (only 15% of whom spoke Ukrainian on entering school) and comparison students - including low ability students - in English and mathematics skills. This study may be of particular interest to New Zealanders as very few students entering Maori/English programmes speak Maori as a home language.

"Local Currency" Programmes: A programme which may be of particular interest to New Zealanders, as it has an indigenous "local
currency" language, rather than one of international importance, as the target is the Rock Point bilingual project, which seeks to maintain the Navajo language. Krashen (1981) reports that elementary students attending Rock Point school receive between 50 - 75% of their school instruction in Navajo (their first language) and yet outperformed non-bilingual students on a reading test of English. For Krashen, these findings confirm his "comprehensible input" hypothesis which states that understandable, message-oriented input is of far more use to children than mere exposure alone.

Wayne Holm (1982), in a paper entitled "Bilingual Education at Rock Point Community School, Arizona", offers a different explanation for the encouraging outcomes at Rock Point School, however. Holm, although emphasizing that bilingual education alone is no panacea, ascribes the success of the Rock Point programme to the fact that the community itself has a great deal to say about the management of their children's education. "I am convinced that this 'greater say' is essential." (p. 92). He cites as an example of the actual, rather than token, commitment to community involvement at Rock Point that most of the English language teachers (ELTs) and all of the Navajo language teachers (NLTs) are Navajo. "'NLT' is not a euphemism for teacher-aide. NLTs are autonomous: they plan, teach, and evaluate on their own. And in recent years, as many NLTs have obtained degrees as ELTs." (p. 82). Holm goes on to explain that the Rock Point experience is predicated on the basic beliefs that:

... parents and community people will not knowingly mis-educate their own children; that such people are capable of telling the difference between more effective and less effective education; that such people are capable of learning from experience what, in their community, contributes to more effective education and of making decisions that bring about more effective education." (pp. 89-90).
Holm's work, particularly his views regarding the importance of community control of community language educational programmes, has been of significant explanatory importance in the current study of Maori/English bilingual programmes. (See also Burnaby, 1988, on the inappropriateness of "mainstream" educational methodologies and curriculum content for Canadian Native-speaking children. She also addresses the issue of training Native teachers who are speakers of community languages and whose credentials suit community aspirations and local conditions.

**More Recent Studies Showing Negative Effects:** - Although Fishman (1976) writes that "non patrician" bilingual schools have received insufficient research attention to warrant firm conclusions regarding their effects, he states that such schools in Singapore, the Soviet Union, Wales and those which are part of the Yeshiva movement in the United States have been noted by sophisticated observers to achieve cognitive and non cognitive results as good or better than those of monolingual schools for students of comparable backgrounds. Nevertheless, the frequently-cited study conducted by Macnamara (1966 in Ireland) disclosed negative as well as positive findings. Among the negative findings of this study was that children from English-speaking areas taught arithmetic through the medium of Irish tested about 11 months behind students of comparable backgrounds in problem arithmetic. Macnamara concluded that immersion education in Irish hinders the progress of English-speaking children in problem arithmetic.

This study has received criticism on several grounds (see reference to Cummins' criticism in Baker, 1988), for example:

1. That children from English districts who were taught problem arithmetic in Irish scored low in the Irish version of the test may show only that children tested in a weaker language tend to score lower than children tested through their stronger language.
2. Cummins questions the validity of Macnamara's pre-testing procedure of the Irish and English versions of the problem arithmetic test, which attempted to control for this effect. According to Cummins, the control group of students were of higher socio-economic status than the main research group and their parents were more likely than most to speak Irish and have pro-Irish attitudes.

3. Macnamara's findings that the immersion group performed at the same level in English reading comprehension as did children taught in English contradicts his own explanation of the overall results in terms of a "balance effect".

However, as Fishman (1976) points out, there seems to be no disputing the fact that Irish language-educated elementary school graduates were on average a year behind students of comparable backgrounds with regard to tested achievement in mathematics problem solving and their active grasp of Irish was demonstrated to be marginal at best.

Macnamara explains this difference in terms of a "balance effect" whereby an increase in second language skills means a decrease in first language skills. Baker (1988) offers lack of parental support for Irish language immersion education as an alternative explanation. He notes that in all but four of the 119 schools included in Macnamara's study, parents - who would have tended to hold neutral or negative attitudes toward the Irish language and education through this medium - had no choice but to enrol their children in immersion programmes. Baker concludes from this that parental attitudes are very important factors to consider in the evaluation of the effects of bilingual programmes.

Fishman's explanation (1976) of Macnamara's negative findings is that Irish immersion education programmes operate within a sociological context of, "... widespread disinterest and perceived uselessness of Irish" (p.29) as a present day language. Fishman concludes that:
It is obviously hard to accomplish much in a language that few really want and that fewer yet really use outside of school. This is particularly so if funds are lacking for textbooks and for staff, and if society at large is ambivalent as to whether to be sad or happy at the twilight of its long embattled ethnic tongue. (p. 129).

The implications of Fishman's explanation: that the effects of bilingual education are strongly influenced by mitigating circumstances, should be noted by language planners in New Zealand, where in many cases Maori/English bilingual programmes are operating under similar restraints.

Even less convincing than Macnamara's negative evaluation of the outcomes of bilingual education are the findings of the well-publicised national evaluation of Spanish/English programmes in the United States conducted between 1974 and 1976 by the American Institutes for Research (reviewed in Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). The AIR study showed that bilingual education had had little positive effect on the Hispanic students who formed the sample population for the study. Wong-Fillmore and Valadez note, however, that the study has been strongly criticized on methodological grounds, including criticism of the short interval (five months) between pre- and post-testing; criticism of the tests and testing procedures; and criticism of the undifferentiated inclusion of an entire spectrum of treatments under the umbrella title "bilingual education". (See also Diaz, 1983). It is disturbing to note that the flawed AIR evaluation has received favourable consideration in the "Sexton Report's " (Sexton, 1990) discussion of Maori language education prepared for the New Zealand Business Round Table.
Summary

The effects of bilingual education may be considered from a number of perspectives, including psychological, sociological and pedagogical and any thorough evaluation of bilingual education must, perforce, take this complexity into account. Perhaps because cognitive outcomes are the most amenable to quantitative research study, of all the potential areas for evaluation they have received the most attention.

Contrasted with (usually unsound) studies undertaken earlier in this century, a number of recent studies have shown favourable outcomes for bilingual programmes. Many researchers now conclude that both minority and majority language students of varying ability levels from a variety of home backgrounds can be expected to profit from bilingual education, particularly if they can also use the target language in extracurricular contexts. Nevertheless, there are also strong indications that a variety of supports, including positive family and community attitudes toward bilingual education, have to be in place in order for the full potential of this educational innovation to be realized.

Finally, it is important to understand that each bilingual programme is influenced by a unique combination of linguistic, social, political and other variables. Therefore each community, national, regional and local, must undertake its own evaluation of bilingual programmes taking into account its own unique combination of rationales and circumstances.
Chapter 2

New Zealand Literature Review

Situations

Linguistic Considerations

Maori Language and the Schools; - Richard Benton, Director of Te Wahanga Kaupapa Maori of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER), in a paper entitled "The Maori Language in New Zealand Education" (1988b) presents a concise overview of the history and current status of the Maori language, concentrating particularly on the relationship between this language and the New Zealand school system. Like overseas researchers, Benton stresses that schools alone, cannot resuscitate a dying language. In a similar vein, Agnes and Wayne Holm (1984) from the Rock Point, Arizona, Navajo Community School, who spent six months in New Zealand studying bilingual programmes, write, "Without serious attempts to regenerate Maori as a community child-language, [we are] not sure that truly bilingual education in New Zealand can really succeed over any length of time." (p. 21).

Although there are now (very limited) officially-sanctioned supports aimed at providing Maori language education in early school years (See Chapter Five, below), historically the primary education system has taken a less favourable view of the Maori language and its place in education. R. Benton's survey of the Maori language (1979) indicated that fully 40% of the Maori speaking heads of households contacted indicated that they had been punished for speaking Maori at school. (See also R. Walker, 1985). Benton (1988b) points out that up until the 1960s many teachers believed that
children's adherence to their native tongue would deprive them of the English-language qualifications necessary to get on in the Pakeha world. Benton concludes that a history of harsh assimilationist school policies and practices, coupled with parents' desires to help children avoid the punishments which had been inflicted on them, contributed to the demise of Maori as a language of everyday communication. Barrington and Beaglehole (1974) offer an in-depth coverage of New Zealand's Maori schools from 1816 through the 1970s. This coverage includes some especially interesting documentation of the early views of New Zealand educators on the unsuitability of the Maori language for academic pursuits and the advisability of eradicating Maori children's home language as quickly as possible, as it was considered to be, "... an obstacle in the way of civilization." (p. 100).

The brutally repressive attitude taken by schools toward children's use of Maori language, which continued well into this century, has had significant personal and cultural, as well as linguistic, consequences. Ranginui Walker (1987) writes that:

It is difficult to describe the traumatic effect of being condemned by fellow pupils and being dragged before teachers to be reprimanded for ... speaking in the tongue learned from the bosom of the family. ... To be acceptable to the intolerant majority one had to suppress not only one's language but also one's identity as a Maori and surrender one's birthright. (p. 165).

More recently, however, New Zealand public schools have become potential instruments of language maintenance and revival, rather than implements hastening language shift. Byron Bender, then Professor of Linguistics at the University of Hawaii, prepared a report for the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (1971) to address the difficulties of Maori school children. These included, according to teacher reports, "scholastic
retardation", "inadequate command of English", and "difficulty in learning and thinking." (p. x).

Bender rejected the "linguistic deficit" hypothesis as an adequate explanation for the inequality of school achievement between Maori and non-Maori, by pointing out that, according to Labov (1970):

It is traditional to explain a child's failure in school by his inadequacy; but when the failure reaches such massive proportions, it seems to us necessary to look at the social and cultural obstacles to learning, and the inability of the school to adjust to the social situation. (in Bender, p. 46).

Bender's report contained recommendations that reading and writing in Maori be offered as an optional subject in all primary schools having an appreciable number of Maori students. As justification for this recommendation, he cited his own classroom observations of Maori primary school pupils:

In none of the many classes that I visited did I see Maori children as bright-eyed and eager about the subject at hand as in those classes in which the literature of Maoritanga was being read and discussed. In such classes children ... were able to make, eagerly and proudly, contributions of their own to the discussion, based on what they had learned from parents, grandparents and other elders. It is indeed a shame that such experiences are not officially sanctioned or called for in the primary school ... . (p. 54).

Bender's call, added to increasing pressures exerted by a united Maori community and supported by some Pakeha institutions as well, such as the New Zealand Council for Educational Research, resulted in the establishment in 1977 of the first official Maori/English bilingual primary school of this century. This school is located at Ruatoki, which as R. Benton (1988b) notes is one of the last remaining predominantly Maori speaking communities in the country. Since that time, Benton records that there has been a steady growth rate in the number of children (predominantly from
rural Maori communities) enrolled in official bilingual schools (Official figures given in Chapter Five, below. See also R. Benton, 1981 which details this development).

**The State School Response to Bilingual Education:** Rose Parker, in an Education Department lecture at the University of Canterbury (20th June, 1988), has identified four categories of New Zealand state primary school bilingual programmes in operation and has outlined some of their limitations:

**Category 1** - The teachers are bilingual and bicultural and the children are bilingual and bicultural by the time they finish junior school. This type of school, for example, Ruatoki (mentioned above), is tribally based, well-entrenched within a Maori community and depends heavily on community resources. Matawaia in North Auckland and Hiruharama in Ruatoria are two further examples of the very few schools in this category.

**Category 2** - The children are bicultural, but learn Maori as a second language. Some teachers are bilingual and bicultural. Staff training programmes are offered and there is some input from the Maori community, but much of the instruction is in English. Manutahi in Ruatoria is an example of a bilingual school of this type.

**Category 3** - Children develop bicultural understanding along with teachers by incorporating Taha Maori into the curriculum. Some support from local speakers of Maori is available. Parker notes that there are many schools of this nature in the Gisborne area. They are in close proximity to the Maori community and are assisted by Resource Teachers of Maori whose salaries are supplied by the New Zealand Government. These schools are only partly community-based and rely on the national education system to provide materials to supplement the programmes.
Category 4 - Children and teachers are monocultural - no resource people are available to them and they rely exclusively on School Journals, stories, bulletins, physical education and arts and crafts programmes for their Maori input, sometimes using audio tapes for pronunciation. Parker states that this is, by far, the most typical category of "bilingual" schooling in New Zealand.

Pita Sharples, Director of the Hoani Waititi Marae, in a lecture delivered at the University of Canterbury's Maori Department on June 22, 1988, added a further category to this list of bilingual programmes:

Category 5 - Complete "official" bilingual units within state schools which build up as Kohanga graduates feed into them. Maori language input is sometimes provided by a fluent teacher, but more often by a language assistant employed for this purpose. Sharples noted that the language development in these classes tends to be minimal, a sort of "watered-down Maori" and that attracting staff is also a problem. Sharples concluded that these units enjoyed "limited success."

As can be inferred from the comments of Parker and Sharples, the endeavours of the New Zealand state school system to maintain Maori children's linguistic and cultural heritage and to improve their academic success rate has received less than full acceptance from the Maori community. Nash, Harker & Charters' North Island study (1990), for example, shows that 72% of parents whose children had attended Kohanga Reo felt that educational provisions for these children were, "... either inadequate or non-existent." (p. 36). Edward M.K. Douglas of the Centre for Maori Studies and Research at the University of Waikato writes that Maori are often reluctant to engage with the Pakeha educational institutions which promote unfamiliar objectives and plans for Maori education. He notes that
on the other hand, "Whenever the kaupapa is Maori, the Maori community appears willing to get behind it." (Douglas, 1984, p.3).

In a paper entitled "Taha Maori: A Pakeha Privilege", G. H. Smith (1986) offers some sharp criticism of state school system initiatives to provide a bicultural experience for all New Zealand children. Although this paper is not aimed at bilingual education, per se, many of the conditions which it describes also apply to the bilingual units under discussion in the present study. For example, Smith states that "bicultural" education has come to mean, for many people,"... fifteen percent Maori and eighty-five per cent Pakeha". (p. 14). He notes that adoption of Maori culture into the state school system has not resulted in Maori control over decision making, particularly decisions relating to what constitutes valid knowledge, who is qualified to impart this knowledge, and the manner in which knowledge is transmitted. In effect, although some surface change has occurred, it has not occurred at a deeper, systems-wide level or led to a real questioning of the liability of the system for Maori pupils' failure. Smith concludes that, "... all of this has led to increased disenchantment by Maori people with the system and increased demands by Maori people to have autonomy over their own educational development." (p.19).

Similarly, Judith Simon (1986) writes that multicultural policy in New Zealand education has become a mere "solution in the mind" (p.15). and she goes on to state that, "... any efforts by Maori to overcome their power-deficiency through the education system will be met with a strong counter-challenge by those bent on preserving Pakeha dominance." (p.38).

The same point was made by Sidney Moko Mead (1977), Professor of Maori Studies at Victoria University, who has viewed the support of the Pakeha education system for Maori language and culture as something of a mixed blessing. While acknowledging the much-needed support of Pakeha
institutions without which the Maori language would eventually die, he warns that Maori people, "... reserve the right to play a major role in decisions regarding the teaching of Maori." (p.24). According to Mead, the reasons for this reservation are clear: Maoritanga is a treasure bequeathed to Maori people and a complex linguistic, sociological, political and economic entity. To approach the teaching of it from a simplistic, monocultural viewpoint trivializes the taonga and demeans, rather than enriches, the Maori language and culture.

Ranginui Walker (1985), like Fishman (1976), has raised serious doubts about the value of "compensatory" rationales for inclusion of Maori language and culture within the educational framework of the state school system. Walker points out that "reforms", beginning in the 1970s, resulting from Maori community pressure to abandon assimilationist educational policies, "have made no impression on Maori failure." as the real difficulty is the continuing Pakeha domination of institutional structures. (p. 76).

While the expansion of taha Maori in the curriculum was a welcome validation of tangata whenua (people of the land) status, its previous denial and exclusion was not the cause of Maori under-achievement. (p. 76)

One indication of the failure of bilingual units to promote positive outcomes for Maori children comes from a 1990 survey of primary, intermediate and secondary schools conducted by the Manukau Special Education Service which revealed disturbing patterns of non-attendance of Maori pupils in primary, intermediate and secondary schools in North Auckland.

For purposes of the present study, it is especially important to note the following finding of the North Auckland survey:

The high level of non attendance of Maori children was also found in the bilingual unit of School H, an Intermediate, where in one class over the year 11.5 % were absent one day in
five and 30.7% were absent one day in ten. In the other bilingual class 46% were absent either one day in five or one day in ten during the 1990 school year. (personal communication to Elsbeth Preddy, Equal Education Opportunities Adviser, Ministry of Education, from Christine Hilton-Jones, District Manager, Special Education Service, Manukau, May 6, 1991, p. 3.).

**Change Initiated by Maori:** - The Report of the Review of Te Kohanga Reo (1988) states that the Maori-initiated Kohanga Reo (pre-school language nest movement), established in 1982, was the first major grassroots response of this century to the alarming decline in the number of Maori language speakers. In by-passing the established institutions, it also demonstrates Maori disillusionment with the state education system and concern with the alarming social and economic "failure" of Maori children, young people and adults within the larger New Zealand society. In recent years, Kohanga Reo have received some state financial support for operating expenses, but unlike public kindergartens, not for capital expenditures such as buildings. Kohanga Reo often find that their operations, highly dependent on volunteer support, are constrained by lack of funds. The Report notes that immersion in Maori language and culture, which necessitates kaiako fluent in te reo and nga tikanga, have been difficult in some areas, particularly in the South Island, and urges the implementation of appropriate training schemes.

Te Kohanga Reo, in addition to utilizing a method of education which is acknowledged by Maori to be legitimate and acceptable, also has a political dimension, recognizing that,

> ... control over knowledge systems facilitates the maintenance of political control by dominant group interests. (G. H. Smith, 1987, no page numbers).

Nga Kura Kaupapa Maori (originally, privately-operated Maori language primary schools) were established outside of the education system as a response to the implementation of Te Kohanga Reo and prompted by community perceptions that state schools are unable to adequately cater for
children who have had Kohanga pre-school experience. Elizabeth Rata, Secretary of Te Komiti o Nga Kura Kaupapa Maori o Tamaki Makaurau, reports (1989) that since 1984 the Department of Education has been unsuccessfully petitioned to establish immersion schools to provide a continuation of the linguistic and cultural education of Kohanga Reo children entering state schools. She notes with some exasperation that:

The Department's belief in bilingual units as a suitable schooling for Kohanga children has been unshakeable despite mounting evidence that the children lose all their fluency after only a month in a bilingual unit. The pervasive force of English overwhelms the five year old child. (p. 30).

Rata (1989) states that Kura Kaupapa Maori serve three major functions, which bilingual units have proved themselves incapable of serving: they are serious promoters of the retention and expansion of the Maori language; they provide a solution to the crisis faced by Maori children within the mainstream school system; and they offer a valid option for Kohanga Reo children.

According to Pita Sharples, (quoted in G. H. Smith, 1986), the Kura Kaupapa Maori at Hoani Waititi Marae in Auckland was established as a result of the failure of the state school system to provide for the growing number of Kohanga Reo pupils. In his address to the Maori Department at the University of Canterbury, Sharples described Kura Kaupapa Maori as privately established primary schools offering Maori immersion education in the first several years of schooling and firmly based in marae tradition. According to Sharples the aims of these schools typically include:

- that children become fluently bilingual in Maori and English.
- that they are confident and assured in either Maori or Pakeha situations.
- that they are proficient in basic school subjects.
Sharples (in Smith) gives as particular reasons for the establishment of the Haoni Waititi Marae School:

1. the long wait for the system to provide suitable programming for Kohanga graduates.
2. the realization that the system lacked sufficient resources and qualified personnel to implement a bilingual, bicultural programme.
3. the desire to ensure that the curriculum was "tuturu Maori" and based on the principles already established at Te Kohanga Reo.
4. the necessity of ensuring that decision-making regarding subject matter and teaching approaches would be based on Maori principles.

In summary, overt hostility toward the use of the Maori language within the state primary school system has given way to officially sanctioned measures which have as their stated aim the maintenance of Maori language for the benefit of all New Zealanders. These measures also, ostensibly, seek to enhance the cultural identity and self-esteem of Maori pupils in hopes of enabling them, as a group, to achieve on a comparable basis with their Pakeha peers. There are grave doubts, however, given the monocultural perspective and the personal and material resources of the public school system, whether it is capable of responding to the challenge of providing bilingual, bicultural education, particularly for children who have attended Kohanga Reo. There are also doubts that a school system which perpetuates existing social and political, as well as educational (see Chapters Eight and Ten, below) relationships which clearly operate to the disadvantage of Maori, can, in fact, enhance Maori achievement.

**Underachievement of Maori Pupils**

**Concern for Maori Under-attainment:** - Although the fortunes of the Maori language have undergone vicissitudes within the state education system, the fortunes of Maori pupils have been more consistent: they tend not to fare very well. This situation has attracted considerable attention and concern throughout the second half of this century. For example, Wagner
(1985) notes that following the release of the 1962 Report on Education in New Zealand (the Currie Report) a large body of research emerged focusing on the "problems" of Maori children, especially on their language difficulties and low academic attainment compared with the attainment of Pakeha school children. Zelas (1989) also points out that much of the educational research on Maori children has concentrated on learning failure. As research on Maori children has tended to reinforce negative cultural stereotypes and, further, as scholarly explanations for the differences between Maori and Pakeha school attainment have not been substantiated by empirical research data (Harker, 1978), it is not difficult to understand why so many Maori are wary of "research".

A perusal of educational statistics from the 1960s to the present time will clarify the reason for this preponderance of concern. Maori children, on average have placed and continue to place at the bottom of indices of Pakeha-defined "success" at every level of the New Zealand educational system. The disparity between Maori and non-Maori attainment attracted official attention at least as early as 1955, when the National Commission on Maori Education was set up to secure the Maori community's co-operation in reducing absenteeism and drop out problems among Maori pupils. (Watson, 1967). Ranginui Walker (1984) writes that by 1958, following a period of rural-urban shift, the educational gap between Maori and Pakeha became increasingly apparent as educational failures could no longer be absorbed into rural tribal societies and economies. He notes that the 1960 Hunn Report identified a statistical "blackout" (p.2) of Maori students taking part in tertiary education.

---

1 See Wagner (pp. 40-55) for an excellent overview of policies and practices of the New Zealand education system regarding Maori language, including a review of the effects of Mission schools and state-supported Maori Schools and Board Schools from 1820 onward.
Perhaps a quote from Douglas (1984) best sums up the situation of Maori attainment in New Zealand schools:

Despite more than 20 years of the Maori Education Foundation, countless committees and working parties, royal commissions and strategic reports, there is little evidence to suggest that the gap between Maori and Pakeha educational attainment has narrowed. Official figures do show more Maori completing high school and more Maori in tertiary educational institutes, but their relative position vis-a-vis Pakeha children is no better than 20 years ago. (p. 1).

R. Parker-Taunova (1988) also comments on the consistent inability and ineffectiveness of Pakeha-instituted educational reforms to reverse the process of Maori school failure.

The statistical underachievement of Maori children and theories which have been put forth to explain this underachievement receive considerable attention here for the following reasons:

1. Maori underachievement in the New Zealand school system has been a major official rationale for the establishment of bilingual programming (as will be demonstrated in Chapter Four, below).

2. Data collected in the present study indicate that explanations of Maori underattainment based in "cultural deficit" ideology provide one of the "core metaphors" (see Chapter Ten) which underscores the relationship between the school system and the Maori people. This ideology serves to deflect criticism away from the educational system and, thereby, inhibits systemic change.

**Explanations for Maori Lack of Attainment:** - Until quite recently, it was a widespread assumption that deficiencies, particularly English language deficiencies, of Maori children and Maori practices of child rearing were to blame. Conversations with a number of teachers and principals during the course of the present study indicate that such views are still widely held. Lovegrove (1966) in a large survey study of the scholastic achievement of European and Maori children, expressed the viewpoint, but offered no evidence to support such a stance, that Maori
homes were typically, "... less visually and verbally complex and less consciously organized to provide a variety of experiences which will broaden and enrich the intellectual understandings of their children." (p. 34).

Anne Salmond (1974) comments critically on the stereotypical views of Maori homes and Maori children's language presented in *Maori Children and the Teacher*, a publication which was reissued by the Department of Education in 1972 as a guide toward teachers' understanding of Maori pupils. According to this guide, "Maori homes preserve some elements of the traditional social structure which was based on communal living, and this structure is not conducive to the development of language" and goes on to state (patronizingly, as Salmond points out) that, "Richness and variety may be absent in the home and the community, but there is no reason why they should also be absent in the classroom." (Salmond, 1974, p. 22). Salmond argues, however, that the shy, laconic, monosyllabic verbal strategies so often described by teachers as typical of Maori children's speech at school are tactics for avoiding uncomfortable interchanges, rather than an in-group Maori language. She notes that these tactics are frequently resorted to in unfamiliar test situations (children and strange researchers face to face) where almost all of the data relating to "Maori-English" has been collected. (See also Clay, 1972, on children's reluctance to speak their own non-standard dialect in a classroom environment which favours a standard-English speech code).

Both Pride (1974) and Simon (1986) point out that the linguistic and cultural deficit theories, reflected in official publications such as *Maori Children and the Teacher*, are often used to explain the failure of Maori pupils. Simon (1984) writes that the notion firmly held by many junior class teachers that Maori children's control of oral language, including semantics and syntax, is too limited to be of much use in textual interpretation has no basis in
research. She points out that while Maori children speaking in a non-standard English may omit verb inflexions (for example) this is not to say that these children do not understand the concepts (of past tense, for instance) as well as Pakeha children who appear to be more proficient at reading because the syntax they control happens to be the same as that of the text. Nevertheless, despite a lack of research evidence to support the claim that Maori children are linguistically impoverished, Simon's study, which involved interviews with 44 teachers in schools where Maori pupils make up at least 25% of the rolls, revealed that many teachers feel that Maoriness and language "problems" (which teachers were usually unable to specify) go hand in hand.

McCallum's study (1978) of the speech of four groups of Maori and Pakeha 8-year-old children concludes that there is no convincing evidence to suggest the development of a separate "Maori dialect" of English. She goes on to note that her data contradicts the widespread assumption, "... that the inability to control the structure of Standard English implies some sort of cognitive deficiency on the part of the Maori child." (pp.134-135).

Similarly, Metge and Kinloch's monograph, Talking Past Each Other: Problems of Cross Cultural Communication (1984), offers an excellent short chapter (pp. 37-40) on the assumptions commonly underlying the views which New Zealand educationalists hold regarding Maori children. The authors describe how Pakeha teachers and other educational experts have been struck with the limited extent to which Polynesian parents communicate verbally with their children and their practice of giving considerable responsibility to older siblings for the care of younger ones. Typically these patterns have been negatively interpreted. Metge and Kinloch, however, place quite a different interpretation on the interaction patterns of Maori families which they characterize as replete with, "... independence, affection, conflict and fun." (p.40). The authors conclude
that there is a decided conflict between the communication styles of Maori and Samoan homes and Pakeha social institutions, such as schools.

Mitchell and Mitchell's well-documented, but ultimately unsatisfying, study (1988) of 40 Maori pupils 2 who obtained high scores on the English and Mathematics School Certificate Examination concludes with an explanation of Maori school "failure" which, like other cultural and linguistic deficit explanations, focuses on the Maori student and community, rather than the school system:

One of the greatest risks to Maori success at school is strong peer pressure against achievement exerted by other Maoris in both schools and workplaces. (p.125).

Mitchell and Mitchell's contention that, "Sanctions against achievement appear to be an integral part of Maori culture" (p. 125) is unsupported by their findings, as their study concentrates on high achievers, rather than on those students who do not demonstrate outstanding performance. Further, this contention exhibits a simplistic understanding of contemporary Maori culture. For example, the Mitchells' study fails to take into account that Maori resistance to dominant Pakeha education is often erroneously viewed as a rejection of schooling itself rather than as a rejection of underlying racist assumptions and practices. (See G. H. Smith, 1986. See also Basil and Cook, 1974, who describe the alienation experienced by individuals or groups with common aspirations "who find their efforts to bring about [just] change or advancement consistently blocked." [p. 68]).

In sum, the study reveals a marked lack of sophistication in that it fails to adequately consider alternative explanations for Maori underachievement.

---

2 The study fails to make a distinction between "race" and "ethnicity". However, there was clear evidence to show that very few of the high achieving students described therein participated in marae or other Maori cultural activities.
connected with broader social issues such as the school's functional role in replicating and maintaining the existing social class structure and distribution of resources (Hughes and Lauder, 1990)\(^3\) or the monocultural nature of New Zealand society as a whole. Further, it goes well beyond its data in offering an explanation for the phenomenon of Maori "failure" in the school system.

As Hernandez-Chavez (1984), writing from a North American perspective, notes:

> The few who succumb to assimilatory pressures that the system requires for high achievement cannot be considered models for other members of the minority group. (p. 163).

Ultimately, while Mitchell and Mitchell have provided readers with a compelling portrait of individual young people, they offer very little to those seeking to grapple with the wider issue of Maori underachievement.

What has been well established, however, is that economic deprivation alone does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the underachievement of Maori pupils. Based on his study of 679 Standard 3 children, Harker (1978) writes that, while socio-economic factors have been identified as the primary causal variables in the relative differences between Maori and Pakeha pupils' achievement, ethnicity also plays a significant role:

---

\(^{3}\) See also Bernstein (1977) who argues that educational institutions, through their established power relationships, curriculums, and assumptions about the transmission and assessment of knowledge, serve to replicate the cultural idiom, including the distribution of power and principles of social control, which they represent.
... after the environmental deprivation effects are removed there still remains a significant amount of variance in both the PAT and Raven tests attributable to some dimension of human behaviour which has been captured by the Maori-Pakeha dichotomy used in this study. (p. 121).

In a more recent discussion of the highly significant role of ethnic and socio-economic variables in relation to performance on the Test of Scholastic Abilities (TOSCA), Reid and Gilmore (1983) conclude:

... the mean performance of European children from White-collar, Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled occupational groups consistently surpassed that of Maori children from comparable socio-economic backgrounds. (p. 27).

**The School's Role in Maori "Failure";** - The inadequacies of the educational system's policies and practices in catering for Maori children has been well documented in a variety of papers, some of which are reviewed below. Typically these papers point out that efforts to ignore the cultural differences between Maori and Pakeha pupils and to treat all children alike, have had disastrous effects on Maori children's scholastic careers.

The necessity for substantial change in the delivery of educational services to Maori pupils was acknowledged as far back as 1964 by Watson:

.... until the schools of New Zealand are able to accommodate with more skill and discrimination the relationships and tenor of the present social structure that nurtures the Maori child, until they can resolve the conflict of roles in which he is often involved, and offer accomplishments that have real meaning for him in his search for valid identity, then the legitimation of educational change for the Maori people will subsist on the quicksands of expediency. (p. 35).

In taking this view, Watson has identified two key issues which Mitchell and Mitchell's study failed to address:

1. the education system's persistence in viewing cultural difference as cultural disadvantage, and
2. the conflicts experienced by Maori children in classrooms which favour middle-class Pakeha children with an unseen but all-pervasive network of patronage.

Harker (1980) states that a review of New Zealand research⁴ offers little evidence of overt classroom practices of discrimination against Maori pupils. He does write, however, that more subtle and more fundamental forms of discrimination do exist within the organization of New Zealand schools, in that Maori culture is clearly of little interest to teachers and the Maori system of values of little significance in the typical New Zealand classroom. He concludes that the differences between children's home and community culture and the culture of the curriculum, organization and teaching methods of the school "... is an independent causal factor in the lower achievement of Maori children in New Zealand schools." (p. 49). See also Berwick-Emms (1989) who contends, based on data collected during her study of the interaction between teachers and new entrant pupils, that classrooms are often inflexible in responding to the variety of differences engendered by children's home and community experiences.

Similarly, Simon (1984) places particular emphasis on the assumptions of well-intentioned, but dangerously narrow-minded teachers' and principals' views of Maori children as a factor working against the best interests of Maori pupils. She organizes these views into three major categories:

1. The deficit view - which implies that Maoriness and language difficulties go hand in hand.

2. Denial of cultural differences - which implies that all children's needs are identified according to the norms of Pakeha culture.

3. Trivializing Taha Maori - which implies that Maoritanga is a minor frill to be added to the more important standard curriculum.

⁴ It must be kept in mind that educational researchers in New Zealand are predominantly monocultural.
The findings of Clay's 1985 study of new entrants in six Central and South Auckland schools further highlights home/school mismatch by documenting difficulties experienced by teachers interacting with Maori pupils. Results of this study showed that teachers did not communicate with Maori pupils in the same way as they did with Pacific Island or with European children, and that the lowest rate of teacher attention was accorded to Maori children. Clay's study further demonstrated that Maori children had the lowest response tallies (verbal and non-verbal) of the three groups.

Clay concludes from the results of her study that if children's language does not accelerate appropriately in the first year of schooling, it is probably not due to poor teaching or inattention, but to "... a communication style which somehow deters teachers from continuing conversation". (p.34). She recommends that teachers increase their talk with Maori children and give them more appropriate kinds of attention, "... as they seem to be harder to talk to than the other two groups studied." (p.36, emphasis added). Unfortunately, although elsewhere in this paper the author stresses the need for schools to change in order to accommodate cultural difference, this recommendation seems to place a large part of the blame for Maori children's underachievement on the "harder to talk to" children themselves. Further, Clay does not explain how teachers, who frequently lack in-depth knowledge or understanding of Maori families or cultural practice, can give Maori children "appropriate" kinds of attention.

It is interesting to note that a replication of Clay's study by Adrienne Kerin which involved Maori, as well as Pakeha, teachers yielded quite different results. In Kerin's study, Maori teachers, interacting with young Maori children, more frequently asked children to express and expand on their own ideas than did Clay's cohort. Further, Maori teachers in Kerin's study
tended to establish links between Maori children's discourse and home, community or curriculum and to amplify children's utterances. (Reported by C. B. Cazden, Staff Seminar, University of Canterbury, June 2, 1987).

R. Benton (1981), referring to Watson's 1967 publication, cited above, has confronted the issue of teachers' unpreparedness to accommodate cultural diversity in a rather more forthright manner. According to Benton, New Zealand's teachers' training and backgrounds have "... left them ideologically ill-prepared to accept or even recognize linguistic and cognitive difference." (p. 184). This is hardly surprising in the light of Benton's 1987a figures, which show that Pakeha comprise about 90% of all students in New Zealand's teacher training institutions. Additionally, Benton records that only 6 to 7% of these trainees were from families whose father's occupation placed them in the lowest socio-economic brackets, while most Maori families would fall into this category. (See also O'Regan, 1982, for a discussion of the social and educational backgrounds of New Zealand teachers).

J. Ennis, formerly a senior inspector for the Department of Education, offers a yet more plain-spoken criticism of the social views of New Zealand teachers:

> Quite unwittingly most pakeha teachers tend to be racist ... [and] most hold negative and stereotyped views of Maori, display patronising attitudes and maintain an unquestioning loyalty to pakeha dominance ... (1990, p. II).

**Summary:** There has been well-documented evidence collected over the last 30 years to show that Maori children tend to lack parity in academic accomplishments when compared with their Pakeha peers. This phenomenon has created a great deal of official, as well as community concern, and a number of theories have been advanced to explain the cause of Maori underachievement. The majority of research studies supporting these theories, typically Pakeha-designed and Pakeha-conducted, have
concentrated on the "problems" of Maori children, particularly their linguistic "deficiencies", and the cultural "deprivation" of Maori family life. Additionally, socio-economic status and peer pressure based on community sanctions against high achievement have been put forth as potential explanations for school failure.

These assumptions have been called into question, however. For example, it has been pointed out that the linguistic "deficiencies" of Maori children have never actually been documented, and remain an unsubstantiated, if widespread, notion. Some educational theorists (both Maori and non-Maori) have claimed, instead, that the problem of Maori underachievement resides within the schools themselves, which reflect the monocultural bias and institutional racism of New Zealand society as a whole, and which unfairly discriminate against the Maori child by means of Pakeha-dominated teaching staff, choice of curriculum topics, behavioural expectations and pedagogical practices.

**Operations**

**Pedagogical Issues**

In contrast to the previous section, which included discussion of the relative academic underachievement of Maori pupils and which provided a summary of debate (1960 - 1990) concerning the causality of this phenomenon, the present section seeks to strike a more positive note by considering principles and strategies put forth to promote

---

5 Although the international literature review section of this study deals at some length with bilingual pedagogical techniques, such as Canadian immersion approaches, Dodson's medium and message-oriented bilingualism and Krashen's natural approach, there is little information available on specifically New Zealand instructional approaches to second language teaching. Bilingual programmes here have tended to rely on adaptations of overseas techniques and strategies. Therefore, the New Zealand literature review does not contain a section, comparable to the international review section, on bilingual pedagogy. The investigation of strategies which work best in the New Zealand context merits consideration as a topic for future research.
bilingual/bicultural learning and teaching. This section will form the basis of a comparison of teaching paradigms (presented in Chapter Ten) which seeks to explain the dissatisfaction with current bilingual offerings.

Perhaps one of the best known and most cogent commentators on Maori pedagogy is Rangimarie Rose Pere, whose monograph *Ako: Concepts And Learning in the Maori Tradition* (1982) has become a classic in its field. In this work, Pere spells out several of the basic philosophical concepts underpinning her view of traditional Maori education, one strongly influenced by her Tuhoe-Potiki and Ngati Kahungunu elders, which she distinguishes from the educational principles and practices of other Maori tribal groups.

Pere defines "maatauranga" in its broadest sense, as total life experience. She notes that the term embraces the notions of knowledge, learning, skills acquisition, as well as understanding or certainty and is an activity which continues throughout, and possibly beyond, each person's life-span. Within the Maori context which Pere describes, an intimate and co-operative working relationship is developed between the teacher and pupil, with high expectations on both sides. Traditionally, education is whanau-based and the child's teachers would very likely be members of the third and fourth most senior generations within this group who would have extensive knowledge of the child's background and history as well as strengths and curiosities. Pere points out that the teacher, armed with this intimate knowledge, is enabled to assist the child to learn at her own level of understanding, readiness and interest. This is in contrast, Pere writes, to the public school curriculum which, while carefully designed to add to what is already "known", is targeted for the average pupils in the class, rather than for individuals.
According to Pere, traditional Maori teaching and learning are not distinct enterprises; neither are topics rigidly compartmentalized. The pedagogical style which she describes is one of mastery learning, and when the pupil has demonstrated that she has the skills, knowledge and understanding to perform the task alone, then the next task is undertaken. Pere points out that the term "whakamaatautau", meaning to test and thus evaluate oneself, is an alien concept within the average state classroom where assessment is carried out by adult authority figures and the child attains or fails to attain a certain mandatory level of competence at a given time in a given subject area. Traditionally, in Maori education, assessment is an activity jointly carried out by both teacher and learner and within a time frame acceptable to both.

Finally, Pere emphasizes that a strong belief in spiritual support and influence is a critical factor in the processes described above. In this way, "... the work of one's ancestors from the distant and immediate past are brought to the fore and recognised as an important part of present endeavours." (p. 68).

In a more recent paper, *Te Wheke: Whaia te Maramatanga me te Aroha* (1988), Pere draws an analogy based upon the octopus to describe individual development within the extended family. This model may also be useful in elucidating the interrelated and complex aspects of Maori education in its fullest sense.
Briefly 6, these aspects include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wairuatanga - spirituality</td>
<td>Mana ake - the child's individual uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauri - the characteristic spirit of all life forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha a kore ma a kui ma - the heritage of Maori forebears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taha tinana - the physical dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga - based on the principle of both sexes and all generations working together and supporting one another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whatumanawa - emotional understanding and sustenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinengaro - the mind, source of intellective and emotive activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiora - total well being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a traditional Maori education each of these aspects would receive attention in an integrated programme seeking to develop the unique individuality of each person within the context of social responsibility. (See also Metge, 1984).

Gadd (1976) like Pere, urges us to avoid stereotyped views of how Maori think, feel and act and writes that both Maori and Pakeha currents may flow together within an individual to create an infinite variety of configurations. He acknowledges, however, that there are important Maori values, institutions and behaviours which collectively combine to create a distinct Maori identity:

The massive failure by schools of Maori - as indicated by public examination pass rates, by behaviour problems and so on - is actually evidence that Maori culture is still vigorous and influential on ways of learning and behaving. (p. 20).

---

6 These abbreviated comments hardly do justice to Pere's text.
It is important to note that Gadd's statement counters the "cultural deficit" argument explaining the statistical under-attainment of Maori children:

Gadd goes on to point out that although educational innovations, such as Maori culture clubs, Maori language and Maori studies courses, and trips to marae may be laudable, they are still based on Pakeha perceptions and values and reflective of the false notion that culture is something which can be switched on and off. He argues that for many young Maori, these minor changes do not begin to address "... the deep and urgent desire to identify with Maoriness, to draw upon the communal strengths and support of the Maori people [and] ... to assert Maoris' rights as New Zealanders to be themselves ... ." (p. 40). In other words such "bicultural" programmes do not meet the criteria of "anti-racist" education proposed by Cummins (1986b). (See also Dewes, Principal of Kaumata Kura Kaupapa Maori, quoted in NZEI Routou, July 27, 1990d, p. 3: and Gilling, 1989).

The 1988 Report of the Review of Te Kohanga Reo (The Kaupapa and the Cultural Dimension of Te Kohanga Reo) highlights one central element which is missing from programmes superficially designed to accommodate cultural difference; i.e., the involvement of the whanau at every level of the decision-making, operational, and evaluative processes of education. According to this Report, the whanau operates under a prescribed set of values, including aroha, co-operation, collective responsibility, consensus decision-making and the use of spokespeople to represent the whanau to other groups. Although in urban areas the whanau may not actually be a kinship group, it closely resembles the traditional whanau in that its membership covers a wide age range, from the very young to the elderly, and members take on a variety of roles and responsibilities, including administrative and support duties as well as involvement in teaching and learning.
Additionally, the Report's consideration of oral and written testimony revealed the following basic aims for Kohanga Reo, which may also be taken as a blueprint for whanau-based education catering to other age groups:

- "Children will learn the Maori language and culture, including the spiritual dimension, through immersion.
- Language and cultural learning will be fostered and supported for all members of the kohanga reo whanau.
- Members of the kohanga reo whanau will learn a range of other skills (for example, administration) within the whanau setting.
- Collective responsibility for the administration and operations of the kohanga reo will be fostered through whanau development.
- All involved will be helped to feel the sense of being accepted and belonging which is crucial for their empowerment.
- The content, context and control of learning will be Maori." (pp. 20 - 21).

L. Smith (1989) has articulated one key feature of Kohanga Reo which further illustrates its appeal for Maori:

Te Kohanga Reo ... became a symbol of what Maori people could do on their own without having to put themselves into the often demeaning position of trying to influence local schools, local prejudices and deep seated antagonism to Maori things. (p.7).

In his 1983 paper, "A Management Strategy For Multi-Cultural Classrooms", D. Hunkin, Principal Lecturer in Education, Auckland Teachers College, illustrates his perceptions of , " ... the cultural dissonances generated by the contrast of Maori and Pacific Island ways and common New Zealand classroom practices." (p. 7) and offers recommendations based on these dissonances for the creation of a "culturally relevant management strategy." (p.8).
Hunkin's recommendations are based on a small-scale classroom study of pupil/teacher interactions which involved observations of 8 teachers, including 4 Polynesian teachers, in 2 junior school, 3 middle school and 3 intermediate school classes with enrollments of between 50 - 96% Polynesian pupils. The study is a potentially valuable one in that it considers frequently ignored cultural differences which may create obstacles to the educational advancement of minority children in New Zealand schools, and, better still, offers some concrete advice on how to cater for these differences. Because Hunkin addresses the issue of cultural difference, however, this does not mean that he possesses any significant understanding of New Zealand's minority cultures, and this readily-apparent lack of understanding seriously undermines the credibility of his work.

For example, Hunkin proposes a strategy for an appropriately "Polynesian" style of education, based on his perception of the needs of Maori and various groups of Pacific Island children, without considering that each of these groups may be very different. Hunkin appears to be unaware that there may be marked differences between, for instance, Maori and Samoan preferences in regard to educational strategies and behavioural expectations for both adults and children.

That Hunkin's identification of "successful" teachers is based on nominations by Staff Inspectors and Principals displays a similar lack of cultural awareness. Consultation with the minority students themselves, as well as with their communities, would have provided a less biased selection process. A critical look at some of Hunkin's recommendations suggests that these teachers may have been more effective in controlling their classrooms than in actually educating their students. (Cf. empowerment strategies for minority students recommended by Cummins, 1986a and 1986b, reviewed below).
Curtis (1983) responds to and comments on the cultural elements which Hunkin identifies as significant in preferred "Polynesian" modes of learning. While he acknowledges Hunkin's skill and scholarship, as well as the potentially fruitful nature of the questions which his study addresses, he also presents some trenchant criticism of Hunkin's paper. Essentially, Curtis argues that researchers, like Hunkin, who control only one language and are familiar with only one cultural frame of reference, are at a distinct disadvantage in evaluating school programmes for Maori children. Here, Curtis touches on the problem of hermeneutics encountered by Pere (1982) in translating concepts from Maori into English.

Further, Curtis questions the assumption that meaningful research into culturally appropriate and effective styles of teaching and learning can be carried out in Pakeha social settings, such as classrooms, rather than, for example, on marae.

... researchers appear to have a high level of arrogance. Most study Maori children ... in a contrived situation like the classroom, and then make incredible assertions about Maori society ... e.g. [that] Maori parents do not appear interested in the educational well-being of their children! (1983, no page number).

Curtis also criticises Hunkin's implied assumption that all Maori and Island children are incapable of profiting from classroom instruction geared toward abstract concepts and analytical thinking. Carried to their logical conclusion, Hunkin's recommended direct teaching strategies may, according to Curtis, lead only to more effective teaching of the wrong curriculum.

Wayne Holm (1982) of the Rock Point (Navajo) School expresses similar sentiments regarding the well-intentioned, but necessarily limited,
perceptions of monolingual, monocultural educationalists who attempt to prescribe educational treatments for the children of other cultural groups:

At the risk of being misunderstood ... I would insist that there are real limits to what one group of educators can do for the school children of another group in the devising and giving of an 'appropriate' education. I don't know what the limits are; I'm sure there are limits. (p. 91).

Summary: - A review of publications by writers such as Pere (1982 and 1988), Gadd (1976) and Curtis (1983) reveals that there are a number of factors to be considered in the education of Maori children. On the most general level, these factors include:

1. The Maori community is a heterogeneous one. To view it from any other perspective will lead to false assumptions based on overgeneralization.

2. Nevertheless, there are certain educational concepts and practices which have been identified by Maori writers as preferentially Maori and which are distinct from those typically encountered in New Zealand classrooms. These preferences include:
   
   • An emphasis on a broad spectrum of human development issues, including an integrative approach to cognitive, emotional, physical, social and spiritual development.
   
   • Whanau involvement at all levels of the educational process.
   
   • Education through the language of the tangata whenua.
   
   • Teaching/Learning as a joint enterprise, capitalizing on individual motivation and strength with an emphasis on self-evaluation.
   
   • Education carried out as a life-long process and in a variety of settings, including the marae.

3. Researchers limited by a monolingual and monocultural perspective, however, cannot be expected to grasp the full significance of Maori aspirations or belief systems, and misguided attempts to do so may result in totally inappropriate recommendations for the education of Maori children.
Need for Planning and Resourcing

In addition to the need for establishing culturally appropriate programmes for Maori children, there are two related needs, the planning and resourcing of these programmes, which require attention. A perusal of literature relating to Maori/English education in New Zealand reveals that these programmes are seen to lack comprehensive, systemic planning and adequate resources. For example, Wayne and Agnes Holm’s (1984) study of New Zealand bilingual classrooms and official bilingual schools, based on data collected in 1981, illustrates these inadequacies. Wayne Holm, in this jointly authored 1984 study, writes:

As an outsider, I am struck by the rather limited resources put into bilingual schools [and] although ... I am impressed with the Department’s wisdom in allowing [curriculum, materials and training] to develop and be developed locally ... I must still say that these [resources] seem to be inadequate. (p. 13).

More recent studies indicate that the needs highlighted in the Holms’ study have yet to be addressed. Richard Benton, in The Matawaia Declaration, (1988a), makes a comparison between the favourable conditions for immersion education in Canada and the less propitious situation in New Zealand, where, Benton notes, there is an acute shortage of Maori-speaking teachers as well as a lack of teaching resources even remotely comparable to those which exist for English language instruction in conventional classrooms. In addition, Spolsky (1987) estimates that New Zealand is facing a need for at least 1000 qualified Maori bilingual teachers over the next decade. (Hirsh, 1990, writes that this is a gross underestimate of the actual number of bilingually-trained teachers which will be required to provide continuity of instruction for Kohanga Reo graduates.)
Similarly, the "Report of the Kura Kaupapa Maori Working Group" prepared for the Ministry of Education as part of the "Picot Report" (Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand, 1988, Section 6.4.6) states that:

Even with Maori resource centres and a concentrated fully-funded drive to provide children's literature in the Maori language, it would take 25 years before parity of resource with those written in the English language is reached.

A very interesting comparison can be made between the piecemeal approach to Maori language education and the comprehensively planned, resourced, and researched English-language Reading Recovery programmes, described by Clay (1987) and Robinson (1989), which have been implemented throughout New Zealand and which have been reported as highly successful in achieving their goals. Reading Recovery is an early intervention programme which provides individual reading and writing instruction to primary school children experiencing difficulty.

Clay (1987) attributes the success of this innovation to the systemic changes which it implemented at four different levels within the "host" organization (the education system). Firstly, behavioural change took place on the part of the Reading Recovery teachers; secondly, change in children's behaviour was achieved as a result of altered methods of teaching; additionally, organizational change took place in schools on the part of teachers and administrators; finally, there were social and political changes which assured funding by controlling authorities. (p. 36).

Clay argues that one of the primary causal factors in the successful implementation of Reading Recovery has been its cohesiveness, both internally and with the host system within which it operates. Bilingual programmes, on the other hand, have failed to achieve this cohesiveness at
either level (see Chapter Ten, below). Unlike Reading Recovery programmes, bilingual programmes lack material and personnel resources; lack full commitment on the part of school administrators and staff members; and lack adequate pre-service training of teachers to do their job or to deal with conflicts which might arise within schools and communities regarding their operations. Additionally, bilingual programmes lack a support network which could provide on-going training and evaluation. (See Chapters Six and Eight, below).

Reading Recovery supplements, rather than directly challenges, the existing system and therefore only minimally threatens the system. This is in contrast to bilingual education which calls for far-reaching changes, not only in the language of instruction, but also changes in pedagogical goals, teaching style and decision-making processes. As Robinson (1989) points out, Reading Recovery is not directly contrastive to existing organizational and instructional practices or belief systems which were in operation before the programmes were established. Because of this, Reading Recovery avoids calling attention to the shortcomings of the existing system or a critical examination of ways in which this system may have contributed to the problems which the new programme seeks to address.

According to Robinson, the only radical element introduced by Reading Recovery was its insistence on individual remedial instruction, rather than a group-based instructional approach. In order to resolve this incompatibility, the host system was asked to accommodate the alternative system as a parallel infrastructure, but not to adopt its practices, "... thus allowing quite different practices to occur in the regular classroom and in the Reading Recovery sessions, and as a consequence reducing the threat to the former system." (p. 58). Paradoxically, a separate parallel system, rather than an attempt to reform existing structure from within, has
reduced tension and allowed the innovation to proceed successfully and with little apparent threat to already-established programmes.

The systemic analysis of Reading Recovery and its cohesiveness with mainstream educational programmes, presented above, raises an important question in regard to the establishment of bilingual units within the State School system, i.e., why is there such a disparity between the inadequate planning, development and resourcing of bilingual programmes and the cohesive planning, development and resourcing of Reading Recovery programmes?

Richard Benton (1987a) offers a partial answer to this question when he points out that the structure of the Department of Education, which undertook overall responsibility for bilingual education, reflected a tendency to marginalize Maori interests and to combine them with other special or "problem" areas. Benton notes, for example, that the Division of the Department which had responsibility for Maori education also attended to the interests of Pacific Island New Zealanders and immigrants from South East Asia. Additionally, the Regional Inspectors, Advisors, and Resource Teachers of Maori for this Division were held accountable for the implementation, teacher-training, materials creation, and supervision of "Taha Maori" programmes for all public school children, an enormous undertaking.

The Secondary Schools Bilingual Units report (Ohia, 1988) highlights a related issue which may be taken as a further explanatory factor in the disproportional lack of resources available for Maori language programmes, the issue of "separatism". There continues to be a marked ambivalence, on the part of both the educational system and the community at large, regarding the value of a pluralistic New Zealand society and especially, in
light of the recent economic downturn, the value of committing educational funds to the promotion of bilingualism and biculturalism.

Douglas (1984) has confronted the funding issue directly, by arguing that the present educational system which continues to allow the failure of Maori young people, who comprise 20% of the nation's primary school population, is "... needlessly wasteful and inefficient, and will almost certainly lead to greater alienation, bitterness and strife in the future." (p. 4). Douglas contends that funds which could be used to promote the success of Maori are being applied, instead, in negative ways. He gives as an example of this negative application of funding to Maori "problems" the fact that $8 million (excluding social workers' salaries) is spent yearly to provide Children's Homes services for Maori adolescents - approximately $20,000 per bed per year. Likewise, in excess of $40 million is allotted per year to maintain 2,000 Maori prisoners and even greater sums are expended on Maori through unemployment benefits, Access training for non-existent jobs, law enforcement and policing, and sickness benefits. According to Douglas, taken collectively, "This funding perpetuates Maori dependency and generates helplessness. It also provides employment for Paheha professionals in the management of Maori distress." (p. 5).

In a similar vein, R. Benton (1987a) illustrates the inherent inequality of distribution of educational resources in New Zealand by pointing out that although the Maori community lacks a sufficiently secure economic base to ensure the educational success of its young people, per capita government expenditure on formal education for non-Maori (between the ages of 5 and 25) is at least $4,250 (in 1987 terms) greater than for Maori. This anomaly is a result of lower Maori enrolment at the post-compulsory level of secondary education and at all levels of tertiary education.
The issue of racial "segregation" or "apartheid" resulting from Maori language schools is tackled by Simon (1984) as follows:

To cite the need for unity as the grounds for denying Maori children the same right that is given to Pakeha children - to have their cultural needs catered for within the education system - is, in fact, to promote 'separatism'. (p. 136).

Why there should be such soul-searching regarding the establishment of a parallel Maori system remains an open question, but this response seems illogical in view of

1. the fact that there is ample evidence to demonstrate that Maori have not benefited greatly from the present system,
2. that other groups maintain their own schools and
3. that separate Maori military units and sports clubs have been well-accepted.

The existence of integrated schools, such as religious "special character" schools, for example, indicates an apparent willingness on the part of taxpayers to support a parallel education system catering to the particular needs of certain students. In fact, the "segregation" claim is nonsense, as a parallel system of Maori schooling would be an educational option, rather than a legislatively-enforced mandate. Nevertheless, Dr. C. Knight, Principal of Christchurch College of Education, has been quoted as describing the operations of a Kaupapa Maori school in Christchurch as, "educational apartheid" and has warned that separate schools "could lead to prejudice." (England, 1988, p. 1).

**Summary:** There is widespread documentation of the lack of adequate planning and resourcing for Maori language education, including a lack of adequately trained staff, clearly articulated goals and well-developed curricula, sufficient learning resources and a support network for programme development and evaluation. Perhaps most importantly, Maori language education has been ineffectually promoted, both among the public
at large and within the education system as well. Inadequate planning and resourcing at both macro- and micro-levels, as will be demonstrated below, has undoubtedly contributed to the lack of credibility with which bilingual programming has been received by many members of the general public and to its luke-warm acceptance and partial commitment from the educational system as a whole.

The inadequate provision for Maori educational initiatives becomes especially noticeable when bilingual and immersion programmes are compared with another recent educational innovation, the Reading Recovery programme. Reading Recovery tutors and teachers are empowered to become knowledgeable practitioners and advocates for their programmes; principals receive thorough grounding in the aims and goals of Reading Recovery; there are adequate support networks; and social and political commitment resulting in adequate governmental funding are well-established. The successful outcomes of Reading Recovery have not been left to chance.

Moreover, the Reading Recovery programme, hardly a "radical" initiative, requires only minor modification and adaptation and, therefore, does not challenge existing educational hierarchies, practices or belief systems. Maori language programmes, on the other hand, linked as they are to cultural change and a desire to redress social inequity, pose far greater threats to the host systems which are asked to accommodate them. Accordingly, attempts to establish bilingual programmes within state schools may well meet with resistance; for example, attempts may be made to assimilate the programmes into previously-established ways of doing things. That this was the case in the majority of schools under consideration in the present study will be shown in the micro-level discussion presented below.
A final point which must be stressed is that there are suggestions, based on Reading Recovery experience, that Maori language programmes may prove to be less divisive if they operate outside existing educational frameworks.

**Outcomes**

**Bilingual Education and School Achievement**

*Intuitive Notions and Research Evidence:* In the previous section, an ambivalent public opinion toward bilingual education was mentioned as a possible constraint to the provision of adequate funding for Maori language programmes. This is hardly surprising as the monolingual nature of New Zealand society has created a lack of public familiarity with bilingualism in general, and bilingual education in particular. Many people, including some who may be involved in teacher training or who desire a bilingual education for their children, harbour doubts concerning the effects of dual language education on children's English language skills and academic development in other key curriculum areas. These doubts persist despite New Zealand research by Clay (cited in Thomas, 1986) and McClew (in Lovegrove, 1966) which indicates that bilingualism *per se* is not an educational disadvantage. Similarly, D.R. Thomas' study (1986) of 482 Standard 3 and 4 children attending various primary schools in the Waikato Region, "... indicate[s] that Maori children with some knowledge of Maori language and culture tend to have higher scores on achievement tests than Maori children who have little or no knowledge of Maori culture." (p. 371).

Moorfield (1987) writes that in the past, educators' attitudes toward Maori language education were justified on the basis of the intuitive notion that if Maori students were deficient in English language skills, then what was required was more English language teaching, not Maori language. (See reference in Chapter One, above, to Macnamara's "balance" hypothesis).
He goes on to note that many New Zealanders, including leading educators, are still convinced of the truth of this assumption, although it remains empirically unsubstantiated.

Wagemaker (1988) acknowledges that one of the primary concerns of any evaluation of bilingual programmes has been the argument surrounding the impact that such programmes have on overall academic achievement. Spolsky (1987) recommends that a start be made to collect data on pupil achievement in basic skills, once pupils have been exposed to some English language tuition. He warns, however, that Maori values and aspirations must also be reflected in evaluation processes:

A critical issue that will need to be recognized is that the developing Maori classrooms and schools will be different in significant ways from existing European-based ones as they develop sensitivity to Maori styles of learning. Evaluation of programmes (and teachers) will need to show similar sensitivity. (p. 25).

Up to the present time, no comprehensive evaluation of the effects of Maori language programming on pupil achievement has taken place, largely because such programmes are only just getting off the ground and because appropriate evaluation strategies have yet to be established.7

Nevertheless, several studies have included data concerning the overall academic implications of these programmes. Wagemaker's study (1988) of the bilingual Whanau Unit at Tauranga Boys' College shows no significant differences in School Certificate Examination results of Whanau and non-Whanau pupils. Chapter Six of Wagemaker's study presents a (generally

---

7 A formulation of Maori principles and strategies of assessment would serve two purposes: 1) it would enable programme evaluation to take place and, thus, facilitate programme improvement and 2) it would empower Maori students and, in all likelihood, some other non-Maori students as well. (See Penitito [1988] and Middleton [1983] See also R. Walker [1987] who notes that the School Certificate Examination requires that each successful examinee be matched with another student, "usually of lower-class or ethnic origin", who fails (p. 188). Roberts [1988] recommends several techniques for assessment of Maori school children in the lower grades).
positive) discussion of outcomes resulting from this programme, including School Certificate scores, Maori language use, retention rates and parents' and teachers' perceptions of affective gains.

Dow and Rolfe conducted a Maori/English bilingual education evaluation project (1983) which led them to conclude that, "... while it was impossible to provide definite evidence of improved standards in English or general subjects, it is also important to note that there is no evidence of any declining standards in these subjects." (C-5).

Likewise, R. Benton's study (1985b) of bilingual schools shows, "... no evidence that the bilingual programmes had adversely affected the achievement levels of children in these schools in any aspect of the regular curriculum." (p. 60). Anecdotal reports of the high achievement of some pupils coming through the Hoani Waititi Marae Kura Kaupapa Maori suggests that Maori language primary school immersion does not handicap students going on to mainstream intermediate schools. (Pita Sharples, address to students and faculty, Maori Department, University of Canterbury, June 22, 1988).

**Some Caveats:** R. Benton (1988a), however, issues a warning, based on overseas documentation of the effects of "semi-lingualism", that academic difficulties can be expected for children who have developed greater linguistic strengths in Maori than in English if primary schools, "... cannot build effectively on the work of the kohanga." (p. 18). Further, Benton warns that for children who speak only English, the total exclusion of English from the learning environment, if insensitively applied, could jeopardize their educational achievement and in some cases their English language development as well. One assumes that "sensitive" implementation of immersion education includes the following provisions specified by Benton:
(1) the programmes are voluntary;

(2) the children in any given class have similar degrees of ability in the second (immersion) language;

(3) the home language (and culture) is respected;

(4) teachers are committed to immersion education, but are not speakers of just one language themselves - they have a high degree of bilingual competence, and have a pluralistic outlook;

(5) a flexible and well thought out methodology is implemented; and


Benton goes on to affirm that carefully implemented immersion programmes in Maori will not hamper the linguistic or academic development of children who arrive at school speaking only English.

In addition to Benton's warning about "semi-lingualism", a further cautionary note is struck in Ranby's study (1979) of the self-concept of Maori pupils in New Zealand secondary schools, which involved 62 schools and 5,100 pupils, and revealed that the establishment of Maoritanga courses did not enhance the average self-concept of Maori pupils. Ranby interprets his results as suggesting that merely adding bits and pieces of Maori language and culture to school programmes is of little value. He goes on to state, however, that, "If Maoritanga is something that you live and not something that you teach, then schools at which learning and teaching are done in a Maori way - active Maoritanga - could by-pass the low self-esteem problem." (p. 4). Ranby supports this contention by citing the successful records of secondary pupils attending Maori church schools - St. Joseph's, Hato Paora, St. Stephen's, Hukarere, Queen Victoria, Te Aute, Church College - where the academic achievement of students surpasses that of equivalent Maori students at state schools. Additionally, Ranby notes that, on average, the self-concept of Maori church school pupils is significantly higher than that of their state educated peers. He attributes these successful outcomes to the schools' unique environment, which combines active promotion of Maoritanga with competent academic teaching. (See also He Huarahi,1980),
wherein the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education (NACME) warns that the teaching of Maori language and infusion of Maori cultural values into the schooling process are not, "... panaceas for all the educational ills of Maori pupils." [p. 37].

Ranginui Walker (1987) states that successful outcomes of programmes which teach minority children about their own language and culture heavily depend on attitudes of the school staff, including the attitudes of the principal in establishing school policy. Walker gives as an example of negative outcomes of inappropriate bilingual education the effects of an Auckland school programme which offers Maori to lower-stream students only and thereby reinforces, "... prevailing attitudes that Maoris are second class citizens." (p. 181).

Likewise, Peters and Marshall (1989) illustrate that educational innovations which appear to support Maori language and Maori pupils do not, in fact, do so if they operate according to non-Maori perceptions and serve to support the majority culture's agenda. The authors note that only 2500 candidates out of about 50,000 fifteen-year-olds who sit the School Certificate examinations elect to write the Maori paper. They refer to R. Benton's explanation of this phenomenon, which is that students avoid sitting School Certificate Maori because of a scaling system in operation until 1984 which artificially depressed the proportion of candidates passing Maori to 41%, compared with, for example, the 51% overall pass rate for English and an 89% pass rate for Latin.

Consequently, while the inclusion of Maori as a School Certificate examination subject appears to raise the status of the language and, by extension, its speakers, in fact it actually accomplishes neither of these functions as the examination process engulfs te reo Maori under the
assimilationist umbrella of the state school system, thus precluding Maori "ownership" of their own taonga and reasserting Pakeha dominance. Further, the examination operates in a manner unlikely to exploit the cultural capital of Maori students.... There is no indication that "reforms" of this nature can offer any hope of revitalizing or expanding the Maori language or of redressing educational inequities experienced by Maori students. Benton (1987a) suggests that a fairer system would be to tie the Maori pass rate to those of other non-English languages offered as optional papers in the School Certificate examination.

Peters and Marshall (1989), promoting radical reform, offer a set of recommendations for community-oriented, empowerment-style assessment of oral Maori as a School Certificate subject. They propose several far-reaching changes to the present Examination system; for example, that assessment become a joint responsibility shared between the tribal runanga and State education authorities, that senior secondary examinations not be competitive between candidates, and that local dialects must be given greater status.

The need for active community participation in Maori language programmes is also highlighted in a paper titled Developing Bilingual Schooling in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1984). This paper identified Maori community support as a key factor in the successful establishment of bilingual programmes and emphasized the need for full community consultation and discussion before the programmes were implemented.

Other Outcomes

Ohia's 1988 evaluation of secondary school Maori bilingual units in the North Island indicates a number of positive outcomes, many of which are
unrelated to academic achievement, but which do reflect other aims seen to be important by teachers, parents and students. Ohia's study includes self-evaluation reports of bilingual units which had been established for at least three years. These reports indicate that:

(a) the students' ability to speak Maori, to behave appropriately in Maori contexts, to develop confidence and expertise in the performing arts and powhiri, and their appreciation of Maori values, improves each year.

(b) The teachers generally report better attitudes and achievements of Maori students in their classes.

(c) The parents are thankful that their children are generally enjoying education, staying on at school, and aiming for professional careers.

(d) The students are generally enjoying their learning. (p.12).

**Conceptual Frameworks and Programme Evaluation:** A discussion of non-academic outcomes resulting from Maori language education programmes raises an issue which has cropped up throughout the present section dealing with the effects of bilingual programmes. This issue is the potential conflict, or at least differentiation of emphasis, between the conceptual frameworks which guide the essentially monocultural New Zealand school system and the Maori communities which they serve and the fact that a system which educates Maori children through an unwelcome imposition of inappropriate pedagogy is a racist system. These conflicts and differences may be far-reaching, and are particularly noticeable in relation to educational goals and methods of assessment. In *He Huarahi* (1980), the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education (NACME) states that while society may place emphasis on individual academic attainment and results of school examinations it is nevertheless, "... possible to pursue other goals, and to have other notions of success." (p. 8).
Likewise, Pere (1982) and Irwin (1989) also question the assumption that the validity of a learning experience can be assessed solely, or even primarily, in terms of academic outcomes and test performance. Additionally, Pere emphasizes the importance of joint assessment of individual targets of achievement based on each child's own rate of progress, as does the NACME Report. (He Huarahi, 1980). The Assessment For Better Learning (ABLE) Report (1989) implies that developmental, child-centred primary school programmes do meet the criteria demanded of preferred Maori assessment styles. This assertion, however, is open to debate and Pere, for one, has questioned the notion that standard primary school practices and methods of assessment are appropriate for Maori children.

**Summary:** - There is little comprehensive data upon which to predict academic or linguistic outcomes for Maori language education, as the programmes have only recently been implemented and there is no agreed upon formula for evaluation. Navaho studies show, for example that as many as six years may elapse before the benefits of community language education programmes show up. (Spolsky, 1987). What New Zealand data there is, however, supports overseas findings that 1) bilingualism, per se, is not a learning handicap and 2) properly-implemented instruction through a minority language offers no risk to majority-language children's acquisition of their own mother tongue or achievement in other academic subject areas.

There appears to be clearer evidence, however, that bilingual and immersion education, supported by the minority communities themselves and reflective of their value systems, can be expected to result in a number of non-academic benefits for both primary and secondary pupils, as well as schools and communities at large. Positive personal and social outcomes which have been identified for pupils enrolled in bilingual Maori/English programmes include higher self-esteem and confidence, increased bi-
cultural and bilingual competency, improved attitudes toward school and higher career expectations.

Several warnings, drawn from overseas experience and reported in the preceding chapter, must be kept in mind, however. Firstly, children whose strongest language is Maori may be at risk if they are thrust into classrooms which do not support this language. Secondly, Maori language education for English language children must be based on sound theory and established practice. In other words, bilingual education is not a job for enthusiastic amateurs, let alone unenthusiastic ones.

It must also be noted that merely introducing some aspects of Maori language and culture into school programmes, which quickly become engulfed by mainstream practices and programmes, will not automatically produce academic, linguistic, personal or social benefits. This is especially the case if school staff themselves perceive little need for such changes. In fact, bilingual programmes set up in schools where such assumptions prevail may do more harm than good.

Finally, it must be kept in mind that while Maori expectations for educational outcomes may overlap some of those traditionally set in New Zealand schools, the prioritizing of goals and preferred methods of determining whether goals have been achieved may be quite different. Therefore, active participation and decision-making on the part of Maori communities are logical and necessary conditions to the successful implementation of bilingual initiatives if they are to receive protracted community support and commitment from Maori.
Conclusion

As stated above, the purpose of the Literature Review has been to provide direction for the data collection phase of the present study and to establish an intellectual perspective upon which to base the analysis and interpretation of the study's findings.

The exploration of overseas and New Zealand publications presented above has been a very broad one, covering linguistic, social and cultural, as well as pedagogical, issues. Nevertheless, a broad exploration is entirely appropriate for a study such as the present one, which takes as its theoretical framework Spolsky's multidisciplinary model. Fishman (1976), among others, has warned of the dangers inherent in a narrow approach which may leave researchers in ignorance of many factors which are crucially important to a comprehensive understanding of bilingual education.

In order to assist the reader to come to terms with with the lengthy Literature Review presented above, it should be helpful to pause here to summarise and highlight key points established in the preceding two chapters and to indicate their relevance to the present study. To this end, a list is presented below of 1) the major issues, theories, models and principles drawn from the review of overseas and New Zealand literature and 2) the focal research questions which have been derived from this review and which will be addressed in the following chapters.
### SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For language maintenance and revival to succeed, there must be strong, practical and protracted commitment from both minority and majority speech communities.</td>
<td>What indications are there to show family and community support for the revitalization of the Maori language in general, and the furtherance of bilingual education in particular?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, alone, cannot compensate for lack of linguistic vitality in the home and within the larger social milieu.</td>
<td>What factors appear to inhibit or constrain these activities within the New Zealand context for bilingual education?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RATIONALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUE</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are strong indications that the operations and outcomes of bilingual programmes are closely related to their stated and unstated rationales.</td>
<td>What are the stated and implied rationales of the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amongst the various groups involved with the programmes, is there general agreement regarding basic goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given the limited available resources and constraints under which the programmes operate, are the goals feasible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorough planning and resourcing, as well as follow up support and monitoring are all essential components of successful bilingual programmes.</td>
<td>Do the programmes under study have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a clearly-defined clientele?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear-cut objectives and strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a well-planned curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provisions for continuity of instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are strong indications that previous reform policy in Maori education failed because &quot;new&quot; programmes were merely adaptations of existing programmes, rather than real alternatives offering empowerment to Maori children and to Maori communities.</td>
<td>How adequate are material and personnel resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective are support services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much decision-making authority has devolved to the Maori community in the introduction, operations and evaluation of the bilingual units?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effectively bilingual are the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are their operations bicultural?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both majority and minority students of varying ability levels from a variety of cultural and economic backgrounds can be expected to profit from well-run bilingual programmes.</td>
<td>What are the reported cognitive, linguistic, cultural and social outcomes of the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, international research offers clear evidence that students educated bilingually suffer no handicap in acquiring majority language skills or skills in other important curriculum areas.</td>
<td>How effective are these programmes in maintaining the linguistic gains and cultural identity fostered by Kohanga Reo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, it is important to keep in mind that attitudes of school staff, families and communities are vitally important to successful achievement.</td>
<td>What attitudes do participants hold regarding bilingual education?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is hoped that the summary presented here will serve to clarify the preceding chapters' discussion of conditions seen to lead to successful implementation and positive outcomes for bilingual programmes. The following chapters, beginning with an explication of the research methodology employed in the present study, will attempt to describe and explain the general presence or absence of these conditions in New Zealand as a whole and, more particularly, in six programmes currently operating in the South Island.
Section 2

Methodology

Chapter 3

Methodological Justification and Procedures

Nature of Inquiry

In the present study of primary school bilingual education the researcher has adopted a broad, exploratory approach, using open focal questions (Chapter Two, above), rather than a narrower, hypothesis-testing or confirmatory approach. The reasons for this choice are four-fold. Firstly, the bilingual programmes under investigation, and, indeed, New Zealand bilingual education in its entirety, are still in an early and developmental stage. As programmes are not yet firmly established, it is felt that to make hard and fast pronouncements about their processes, to make firm predictions regarding their outcomes, or to compare them with programmes which have become well-established elsewhere would be premature at this point. (See Chesterfield, 1986).

In fact, the rapidly changing nature of the programmes under study has been apparent throughout the current investigation. For example, the Ministry of Education, following restructuring in October, 1989, absorbed many of the functions of the Department of Education which had held overall management responsibility for bilingual programmes in state schools. Regional Education Boards were abolished and school-based management teams (Boards of Trustees) were elected and appointed at all schools. Maori advisors were redeployed and reassigned and the newly-created Educational Review Office replaced the School Inspectorate,
including the Inspectorate for Maori and Pacific Island languages. There was also a very high teacher turn-over rate in the programmes included in this study and an ongoing transformation of programme operations in response to 1) community pressures, 2) pressure from national and regional educational managers and 3) the availability of resources, particularly personnel resources.

The second reason for mounting a broad, exploratory study is the paucity of existing research of any type on bilingual innovation in New Zealand schools. The very limited number studies of North Island programmes have tended to be single-site studies (Wagemaker, 1988; Wagner, 1985) or have involved only limited contact with the school and its community (Spolsky, 1987) or have focused on bilingual schools, rather than on units within schools (Benton, 1985b; Dow & Rolfe, 1983). There is no locatable research on South Island programmes. It is hoped that the present study will provide much-needed base-line data, where none exists at present, and thereby begin to lay a foundation of research which may assist the development of future programming. **It must be kept in mind that the present evaluation of South Island bilingual units is formative, rather than summative in nature, and intended to provide feedback to facilitate improvement of services.** This study should by no means be construed as an excuse to limit or eliminate current programming.

A third justification for this approach finds its roots in the sensibilities of the Maori people, many of whom have come to view educational research, especially survey-oriented research based on monocultural assumptions and employing monocultural instruments, with a jaundiced eye. "Maori" research has frequently been conducted by non-Maori academics who have neglected to hold themselves accountable to their "subjects" and who have employed norm-referenced tests of academic achievement or personality
surveys of dubious relevance, which have often served to perpetuate negative cultural stereotypes.

Finally, following from this last point, many people within the Maori community have understandably been reluctant to lend their support to the development of pen and pencil "tests" of Maori language proficiency. Therefore, the psychostatistical techniques, including standardized achievement tests in target language skills, adopted by Lambert and Tucker (1972), for example, were both unfeasible and inappropriate in the educational and cultural contexts of the present research.

Although it is not entirely situated in the research tradition established overseas, the present study does draw its focus from the work of previous bilingual theorists and practitioners (see Literature Review chapters). Its research design is based, for example, on the framework developed by Spolsky and on the socio-linguistic theories of Fishman and Cummins. In its analysis and explanation of findings, this study takes into account previous research, both national and international, not only from socio-linguistic and educational sources, but from other disciplines as well. For example, organizational management theory provides the explanatory framework for Chapter Ten.

However, as bilingual education is both extremely wide-spread and takes an amazing variety of forms, local research is vitally important. The questions which the present study seeks to answer are not, "Is what we are doing really bilingual education?" or, "Are we doing it right?". Rather, this study addresses the question, "Are these programmes appropriate to the needs of these children, the aspirations of these parents, the abilities of this staff and the resources of this community/region/nation?" (Holm, 1982, p.90).
The personal perspective of the researcher has been framed by twenty years of experience as an educational practitioner, most recently in a bilingual area of Nova Scotia, Canada. The motivation for this study stemmed from a family background of language assimilation and a resulting interest in language maintenance coupled with pragmatic concerns regarding the implementation of Maori-English programmes. Further motivation was provided by an increasing awareness of the injustice and inequality of educational outcomes for Maori (and other) children in the New Zealand school system.

**Research Methodology**

Because of the exploratory approach deemed most appropriate for the present study, the research draws heavily on flexible and eclectic case study techniques, which appear to offer the most suitable methodology for an investigation of this broad nature. (Stenhouse, 1990; Wolcott, 1975). Case study methodology may be described as the collection, recording, and reporting of data about a case or cases. Wolcott (1980) notes that case study researchers endeavour to understand classes of events through the careful examination of specific cases. Case study "field work" typically includes the ethnographic techniques of participant and non-participant observation and interviews, as well as the collection of documentary and descriptive statistics and the administration of tests and questionnaires.

The chief advantages of case study methodology are that it allows the researcher to reflect on contextual complexity and also provides a means whereby the participants' own perceptions and interpretation of the "meaning" of the bilingual programmes with which they are involved may be recorded. In order to best exemplify their views, participants' verbatim quotations will often be included in the present study (Spradley, 1979). As an
increasing number of writers point out (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982; Sowden & Keeves, 1990), the qualitative data typically included in case studies can offer a rich and personal portrayal that frequently contains a depth of meaning which quantified forms of evidence lack.

While individual cases may themselves be of sufficient interest to warrant investigation, particularly in evaluation research, case study methodology does not preclude cautious generalization. "Generalization and application [of findings] are matters for judgement rather than for calculation, and the task of case study is to produce ordered reports of experience to which judgement can appeal." (Stenhouse, 1990, p. 644).

Case study methodology, because of its attention to contextual detail, may provide a remedy to the questionable relevance of educational research to educational practitioners. (Dodson, 1967; Nuthall, 1989). In particular, ethnological methodology appears to be especially suitable for the investigation of the complex linguistic and sociological interaction which occurs in the bilingual classroom. (Mackey, 1984; Trueba and Wright, cited in Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986; and Wagner, 1985).

Ragin, (1987) offers a summary of distinct advantages to be gained from the employment of case study methodology:

1. Case study methodology affords the advantage of comprehending the relations between parts of a whole within the context of the whole, thereby avoiding oversimplification. (See Skinner, 1985 on the hermeneutic theories of Hans-Georg Gadamer).

2. Case studies, based on concrete data obtained in "naturalistic" settings, allow researchers to maintain a meaningful connection to "the real world" and therefore offer more relevance than do abstract, statistical studies to those engaged in education at the chalk face as well as to planners of educational programmes.

3. While variable-oriented research is an ideal instrument for producing general statements about large bodies of data encompassing diverse cases, "... the simplifying assumptions that make this approach possible often violate commonsense notions of causation and sometimes pose serious obstacles to making interpretive statements about specific cases or even about categories of cases." (Ragin, 1987, p. xiii).
Notwithstanding the enthusiasm expressed for case study methodology, there are a number of drawbacks, or limitations, which accompany this approach (Ragin, 1987; Sowden & Keeves, 1990; Stenhouse, 1990):

1. There is a danger that findings based on unrepresentative cases may be overgeneralized.

2. Data collection is frequently lengthy and labour-intensive.

3. There may be difficulty in the analyzing and reporting of data which have often been collected without a recognized structure.

4. There may be difficulty in assimilating case study evidence, in terms of theory testing and replication, into the corpus of knowledge about education and its processes.

5. Researcher "subjectivity" may colour the interpretation of findings.

**Approaches to Reliability and Validity**

In relation to Point 5 (above) regarding subjective interpretation, it must be noted that all research, and perhaps educational research in particular, is value laden. Bias is introduced by the nature and assumptions of institutions which commission and validate research, by the personal and social histories of the researchers, by the topics which are selected, the manner in which the investigation is mounted, the instruments which it uses to measure whatever phenomena are of interest and the way in which findings are interpreted. There is no way in which research can be completely value free. (Paulston, cited in Baker, 1988; Yeakey, 1983). However, objectivity, that is, "... the simultaneous realization of as much reliability and validity as possible" (Kirk & Miller, 1986, p. 20) is the basis of all good research. These two key features were built into the present study in the following ways:
1. The study was designed to encompass the total number (six) of primary school bilingual programmes administered from the Southern Regional Office of the Department of Education and which had been in operation for at least one year at the commencement of the project (February, 1989), thus avoiding the problem of lack of generalizability which is endemic to case study research.

2. Programmes were monitored by a variety of mechanisms; including observation, interviews, review of documents and questionnaire surveys. Consistent with established case study methodology, both quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques were employed in the belief that the combination of both of these research paradigms taken together would offset the limitations of each taken separately.

3. Data were further "triangulated" by comparing reports obtained from various participants, as well as by cross-checking observed and reported data. (Mitchell, 1988; Stake, 1979).

4. In order to retrieve the sources for any generalization of findings, "data trails", specifying the sources of reported data, were established during the process of analysis. (Mitchell, 1988; Sowden & Keeves, 1990).

5. As the study progressed, the researcher invited participants to report on the validity of her explanations from the point of view of their knowledge and understanding. (Sowden & Keeves, 1990).

6. A longitudinal (February, 1989 - August, 1990) time frame and multiple contacts with each programme under observation were employed as means of establishing diachronic reliability (reliability over time). Follow-up contact was also maintained with half of the cases into the 1991 school year.

7. A great many participants, both professional and non-professional, were interviewed and surveyed, in order to avoid the elitist bias of research which lends greater weight to the opinions of high status, and/or articulate participants than to the responses of lower status, less articulate ones. (Sowden & Keeves, 1990).

8. Following Spolsky's framework, data was collected and analysed both at the macro- (national and regional) and micro- (schools and surrounding communities) levels. This dual-level approach was taken in order (a) to avoid the limitations of a too-narrow "micro ethnography", focused on the individual child and the individual classroom, which would fail to take larger contextual complexity into account and yet (b) to allow the researcher sufficient flexibility to report on local variations. (Chesterfield, 1986; Lutz, 1981; Nuthall, 1989). As Bronfenbrenner (1979) has stated:

... human abilities and their realization depend in significant degree on the larger social or institutional context of individual activity. (p. xv).
Summary of Methodological Justification

The present study was designed both to take advantage of the strengths of quantitative and qualitative case study techniques and to minimize their limitations.

It is felt that the methodology adopted for this study was sufficiently flexible to provide meaningful description and explanation of micro-level classroom interactions as well as to situate these interactions within larger, macro-level, contexts. Because the description and analysis offered by this study are based on concrete classroom and community experience, it is hoped that they will prove to be useful to both educational practitioners and policy makers.

The problem of overgeneralization of findings has been minimized by undertaking a multi-site study, comprising the total number of the most typical type of South Island bilingual programme. Additionally, data was gathered at several North Island sites, so that comparison and contrast of several key factors could be made.

The problem of assimilating the present findings into the established corpus of research has been offset by the study's grounding in established bilingual education theory, and in particular its foundation in Spolsky's well-accepted research model for the description, analysis and evaluation of bilingual programmes. (Benton, 1981; Fishman, 1976; Wagemaker, 1988; Wagner, 1985). The study has been designed so that its findings may be assimilated into the considerably larger body of international research on bilingual education and thereby serve to counterbalance the heavy bias toward North American data. The study's reliance on Spolsky's framework has also provided a structure for the orderly collection and analysis of data.
The problem of researcher subjectivity has been addressed by means of data triangulation, the use of data trails and the avoidance of elitist (or anti-elitist) bias.

The problem of lengthy and labour-intensive data collection, however, did prove to be a drawback, although not an insurmountable one. In retrospect, it is felt that the potential advantages of rich, personal and explanatorily powerful case study research design far outweigh the practical difficulties inherent in such an approach.

**Procedures**

In order to accommodate the aims and assumptions described above, the following research procedures were adopted.

**Macro-level Procedures**

**Documentary Evidence:** A number of documentary sources, both published and unpublished, official and informal, were examined and analysed during the course of this study. Indeed, documentary evidence forms the principal data source for findings at the macro-level. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) point out, the use and production of such documents is an essential part of the operations of many organizational systems and ethnographic studies can gain much from reference to such materials.

These documents were garnered from a number of sources. The Maori and Islands Division of the Ministry of Education were very generous in supplying a great deal of relevant information in the form of proposals and discussion papers, research reports, information pamphlets and learning
materials. The Ministry's Research and Statistics Division made available data relating to Maori educational statistics and to survey results gathered from schools engaged in bilingual education. The Learning Media Centre also supplied information regarding currently available Maori language resources and plans for further resource creation.

Documents were also obtained from Te Wahanga Kaupapa Maori of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research, and collected from individual schools in the form of school Charters, parental surveys, job descriptions for bilingual personnel, pupil progress reports, achievement test scores, enrolment forms, policy statements, and minutes of school whanau and Board of Trustees meetings. Additionally, publications from political parties, teachers' organizations and popular print media have supplied data for this study.

While the documentary evidence described above has provided insights which would not have been obtainable by other methods, the researcher has kept in mind that official sources, alone, cannot be unquestioningly accepted as authoritative.

**Interviews:** Face to face contact was made with a number of participants involved with Maori language education on the national and regional levels, including Ministerial and Departmental officials, school inspectors, college of education and university lecturers and polytechnic tutors. Frequently, these interviews served to "flesh out" the data presented in official documentary sources and, in some cases, actually contradicted these documents.

**Seminars and Hui:** Five seminars, offered at the University of Canterbury by S. Jackson, P. Sharples and R. Benton, were attended to
provide insight into the current theory and practice of Maori language education. Participation in two educational hui at Rehua Marae in Christchurch afforded the researcher further insight into the reaction of the Maori community to local bilingual initiatives and to concerns regarding the education of Maori children.

Micro-level Procedures.

Sites: - During an interview with the South Island Inspector for Maori (January, 1989), five sites were suggested for this study's investigation of the provisions made for bilingual education by the state primary school system. An official bilingual unit, composed of one or two bilingual classes (normally referred to by school participants as "whanau" classes), staffed by a certificated "associate teacher" and a kaiarahi reo (marae-attested speaker of Maori), was in operation at each of these five schools. A further site was included during Term III, 1989, thus bringing the total number of schools involved to six. Classrooms in these schools represented the total number of official programmes administered by the Southern Regional Office of the Department of Education and which had been established for at least one year at the time of the study's commencement. There were two other official programmes (that is, programmes operating with a kaiarahi reo) established in the South Island at this time which were not included in the study. One of these programmes, located in Marlborough, was administered by the Wellington office of the Department and the second had only just begun operations. Thus, the study included the total "population" of Maori/English bilingual units administered by the South Island Regional Office of the Department of Education, which had been established for one year by the beginning of the 1989 school year.
# TABLE 3.1 - SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF SCHOOL CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th># Staff Interviews</th>
<th>Staff Q'aires returned</th>
<th># Parent group or Whanau Interviews</th>
<th>Other Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Principal (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kohanga reo staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (5)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Tchr Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist. Senr. Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Resource Tchr Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist. Senr. Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist. Senr. Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marae Whanau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Tchrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principal (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Tchr (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jnr School Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kairahi Reo (6)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tchrs Coll Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No parent interviews at school's request.

** No identifiable group of whanau parents.

The bilingual, or "whanau", units at each of these selected schools were monitored throughout 18 months, from February, 1989 to August, 1990 and follow-up contact was maintained with personnel at three schools into the 1991 school year. As shown in Table 3.1, the number of contacts with each school varied considerably. At one school as many as 14 visits were made. At another site, because of a fire which necessitated removal of students to temporary classrooms, observations and interviews were terminated after only two visits. Most often, each school contact included three to five hours of classroom observation as well as a limited amount of participant and non-participant observation carried out in school playgrounds, before and after class and during play times. In order to obtain as complete information as
possible about each school and its community, a very wide range of interviews took place with both professional and non-professional participants. As often as possible, non-professional participants were contacted in their own homes or at other locations familiar and comfortable to them.

Three North Island schools were also visited, in order to determine whether there were apparent regional differences between North and South Island programmes. However, North Island sites received only limited research coverage, typically including a half day of classroom observation and interviews with key school personnel. School staff questionnaires were distributed at two of the three North Island sites. There was no intention of including the North Island schools in the main study. Unlike the South Island schools, the North Island sites were selected specifically for their "successful" operations. Results of the North Island portion of the study are reported under "Major Findings" in Chapter II, below.

Access: - In view of the difficulties anticipated in research on politically sensitive Maori language programmes, much care was taken in negotiating access and justifying the project to the participants. Access to South Island schools was initiated with a letter to each of the Regional School Boards responsible for the schools selected for study. Following Board approval, principals of each school were contacted by telephone and letter, and an initial appointment to meet with each of them and with their bilingual staff was arranged. During this initial visit, school personnel were appraised of the nature and purposes of the research and asked whether they would consider participating in the study. Most often, agreement was obtained on the spot; however, access to one classroom of a two-classroom unit was refused on the grounds that the associate teacher was a recent appointee who had had little experience of te reo or tikanga Maori.
Negotiation for access to North Island schools was arranged under the auspices of the Maori and Islands Division of the Department of Education and, after October 1989, the Ministry of Education.

Kaumatua and kuia were also contacted to request permission to carry out research in their districts. Most often, the kaiarahi reo in each district was instrumental in arranging this contact.

**Ethics:** Throughout the study, several ethical principles were observed. (See Spradley, 1979). Participants were assured that their participation would be on a voluntary basis and that every effort would be made to ensure that information about school and personal identities would remain confidential. All participants were informed that the study would be submitted in thesis form to meet the Ph.D. requirement at the University of Canterbury, as well as submitted in report form to the Ministry of Education. Additionally, participants were assured that a draft copy of the research would be sent to each school for their comments or corrections, which would then form part of the complete report. Participants were further assured that each school would have access to a copy of the completed study.

**Data Collection**

**Classroom Observation**

Observation was typically of a non-participant nature, undertaken as unobtrusively as possible. Because of the special situation presented by a bicultural classroom situation, however, the researcher was also included occasionally in classroom and other activities. For example, she joined in karakia and exchanged formal and informal greetings with staff and
students. She also served, at times, as a "teacher's aide", which afforded her a closer inspection of children's oral and written language.

Although the original research design included tape recorded classroom observations, this intention was abandoned because of negative participant reaction. Given the limitations of hand written field notes, as complete a replication as possible of classroom context was recorded, taking into account the physical setting, people involved, the purposes and sequences of actions and events, and the expressed and unexpressed feelings of participants. (Spradley, 1980). Observations were focused by the questions generated in Spolsky's analytical framework. In particular, the observational research was concerned with the place of Maori language in the instructional programme, the role of the kaiarahi reo and the cooperative interaction between the kaiarahi and the associate teacher, the availability and quality of Maori language resources, the organization of multi-age groupings of pupils and community input into the daily operations of the programme.

Ideally, a second researcher would also have been present to allow cross-checking of notes; however, research budget limitations precluded this option. Also, the presence of a second recorder would have been more obtrusive and, perhaps, less acceptable to participants.

**Interviews**

Both formal and informal interviews took place with principals, kaiarahi reo and associate teachers at all schools. Families of children enrolled in bilingual units were also contacted, and interviews, usually guided by the Parent Questionnaire, took place with 24 families, either at school, in their homes, at Kohanga Reo, or, on one occasion, at the local pub's Housie Day. The time span of these interviews varied considerably, but they were most
often completed in about one hour. A number of less-directly involved local participants were also interviewed, including kaumatua and kuia, Kohanga Reo staff, marae whanau, resource teachers of Maori, teacher trainees, regular classroom teachers and deputy principals.

At all sites, the researcher was fortunate enough to locate a key informant or informants, most often kaiarahi reo or associate teachers, but occasionally parents or principals, who proved to be invaluable sources of interview data. It is difficult to express sufficient appreciation to these people, whose insights and self-critical evaluations contributed greatly to "behind the scenes" understanding of the programmes under study.

In all cases, interviews were recorded in short hand, rather than tape recorded, as this was seen to facilitate open communication. Indeed, the researcher was frequently surprised by the frank nature of interview data. As far as possible, participants' actual words were recorded, following the ethnographic methodology advocated by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) who note that verbatim quotes, "can be of significant analytical importance ... ." (p. 153).

**School Staff Questionnaires**

Associate teachers, kaiarahi reo and principals were asked to complete separate questionnaires containing both open and fixed-response type items covering a wide variety of topics, such as their concerns and satisfaction with programmes, classroom language use, parental involvement, role of the kaiarahi reo, responsibilities and training of associate teachers and children's performance and backgrounds. These questionnaires are reproduced in the Appendix.
All response data were hand coded and sorted into the umbrella categories (situations, rationales, operations, and outcomes) suggested by Spolsky's model. In several instances, identical questions were posed to more than one of these participant groups, thereby affording an opportunity to compare responses between groups. Responses between schools were also compared.

Questionnaires were distributed to all participating staff contacted during the first year (1989) of the study, with the exception of one associate teacher who had been appointed only a few weeks before the questionnaires were distributed. The response rate was 100% from principals (6/6); 100% from associate teachers (7/7); and 67% from kaiarahi reo (4/6).

No direct data is available to explain why the rate of response was lower for kaiarahi reo than for the other two groups. In hindsight, however, it is felt that direct personal contact, "te kanohi kitea", rather than an anonymous questionnaire designed to maintain confidentiality may have been a more culturally appropriate and productive way of gathering information from kaiarahi reo. Another possible explanation is that non-responding kaiarahi reo may have refused to participate in the questionnaire survey on the grounds that Maori have received so little benefit from the plethora of existing research data of which they form the "subjects".

**Parent Questionnaires**

**Description of Questionnaire:** The Parent Questionnaire was designed to elicit parents' (or primary care givers') responses to a wide range of issues related to bilingual education in general and to the dual language schooling of their children in particular. Parents were also asked a series of questions regarding their educational and employment backgrounds and the ethnic and language backgrounds of their children. Questionnaires completed by this group of participants yielded a great deal of useful
information and contributed both to an understanding of the programmes under study and to the researcher's understanding of questionnaire design, administration and interpretation.

As J. Edwards (1984) has noted, bilingual education researchers typically give little or no attention to parent attitudes and interests and thereby contribute to the "faddish" nature of ethnic language and cultural revival programmes.

Any programme or policy which is intended to have real social consequences would obviously do well to build upon the firmest possible foundations [including research knowledge of parents' and students' perceptions and opinions] if it wishes to avoid becoming merely a matter of fashion, or the latest band wagon. (p. 291).

With the exception of three items, all 21 questions were of the fixed-response type which requested that parents place a tick or a number beside their choice of response. However, following each question, parents were invited to expand or elucidate their answers with written comments and many (37%) did so. As these comments proved to be insightful and illuminating they are quoted directly throughout the study.

Despite frequent textbook warnings that questionnaires should be kept short and simple, the researcher admits that the Parent Questionnaire was rather long and involved. The reason for this departure from standard survey practice is two-fold. Firstly, it was the researcher's intention to administer the questionnaire to parents personally in a large group interview situation which could have mitigated any difficulties parents experienced in answering the questions. Secondly, to the researcher's knowledge, this questionnaire was the first to be administered in the South Island to parents of children enrolled in bilingual classrooms. Therefore, because little or no base line date exists and theoretical concepts appropriate
to the New Zealand context are not well-formulated, it was envisaged that
the wide ranging questionnaire employed in this study would serve both to
provide initial research data for the benefit of the scholarly community and,
for purposes of the present study, to establish, "sensitizing concepts . . . [to]
suggest directions along which to look." (Blumer, 1954, quoted in

**Selection of Respondents:** - Parent Questionnaires were distributed to
all families whose children were enrolled in six bilingual classrooms in four
of the six schools under study. No Parent Questionnaire data was collected
at two of the schools contacted for two reasons. In the first instance, a great
deal of negative public reaction had resulted from the distribution of a
previous parent questionnaire and the school requested that no parent
survey take place. In the second instance, there was no separately identified
bilingual unit, as the kaiarahi reo worked in several "regular" classrooms.

**Method of Distribution:** - Originally, it was intended that the Parent
Questionnaires would be distributed and collected by the researcher during
a parent meeting to be organized at each school. The researcher intended to
be personally available to parents as they filled in questionnaires in order to
discuss the methodology and rationales of the study, interpret any questions
which required clarification and to note any comments or criticisms of the
questionnaire.

These large-scale meetings did not eventuate in any of the four schools
because of the difficulties arising from the researcher's dependence on
school staff to organize meetings at a time when the majority of parents
could attend. Consequently, the questionnaires were distributed by teachers
who sent them home with their pupils. A covering letter from the
researcher requesting parents' participation was affixed to each
questionnaire and teachers followed this up by sending several notices home requesting that parents complete and return the questionnaires.

Although meetings with large groups of parents proved impracticable, a number of interviews with parents did take place in three of the four school districts, during which time the questionnaires were completed and discussed. These interviews with individual parents or small groups, which typically lasted from a half hour to several hours, took place in various locations, including schools, homes and Kohanga Reo. In total, 24 of the total number of parents surveyed (20%) were contacted in face to face meetings.

As a result of parent interviews, two key items of data emerged. Firstly, although the questionnaire had been trialled and reworded following the suggestions of two Kohanga Reo mothers, it became apparent that the reading level (estimated as appropriate for readers aged between 9.5 - 10.5 years according to the Noun Frequency Method [Elley, 1975] ) was too difficult for many parents. This offers a possible explanation for some of the missing data on the completed questionnaires and may also offer a partial explanation for the low rate of returned questionnaires in the present study, compared with the rate obtained in Wagner's 1985 study, for example, (discussed below, this chapter). Secondly, based on parents' verbal comments during the interviews, the researcher sensed that two quite distinct client groups were being served by the bilingual programmes under study. Although ethnic origin was not a good predictor of parents' responses, as there were wide variations within each major group, a factor which did appear to correlate strongly with patterns of parental response was their children's exposure to Kohanga Reo pre-school experience.
This "hunch" was confirmed by a cross-tabulational analysis of questionnaire responses. For purposes of comparison, parents were assigned to one of two groups: the first group, "Kohanga parents", was made up of parents whose children had attended Kohanga Reo at least once a week for at least six months, and the second group, "non-Kohanga" parents, was composed of parents whose children did not have this experience. T-test analyses showed that there were many significant differences in the response patterns of the two groups (reported in detail in Chapter Nine, below).

If the questionnaires had been distributed and collected by teachers alone, with no personal contact between the researcher and the families of the children enrolled in bilingual classes, then it is unlikely that the two important items of data mentioned above would have come to light. This provides a strong suggestion that researchers employing questionnaire survey methodology may benefit greatly from face to face interviews with the subjects of their studies. It is the researcher's opinion that this is especially the case when the study involves work outside one's own cultural milieu.
**Response Rate:** A total of 122 Parent Questionnaires were distributed during Terms 1 and 2, 1989. The total number of computer analysed responses was 65. Two additional questionnaires were returned after computer analysis of data had been completed and were analysed for comments only. The response rate for each of the four schools was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Return rate</th>
<th>% Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>24/33</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>18/26</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>17/45</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67/122</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No obvious explanation presents itself for the wide variation among the rates of return in the four schools. At School 4, for example, where the rate of return was lowest (38%) the researcher, assisted by a bilingual class parent, spent three days in the district in order to make contact with parents and to work with them in completing the questionnaire. At School 2, where the response rate was second highest (69%), the researcher had had very little personal contact with parents. Moreover, in each of the schools, teachers and principals supported the survey and encouraged parents to respond.

The 55% response rate in the present study does not compare unfavourably with the parent questionnaire response rate of at least one other study undertaken of bilingual education in New Zealand (Wagemaker, 1988) in which 55.6% of parents responded to a questionnaire survey. However, both of these response rates are far lower than the 100% response reported in a study of Otara School's bilingual programme (Wagner, 1985) where all
twenty-one families contacted agreed to participate in a structured interview during which Wagner recorded their responses to a series of questions. The high rate of response in Wagner's study is almost certainly related to his method of data collection whereby he contacted each family personally and arranged to administer the questionnaire to each of them in their own homes, where, as Wagner noted, the researcher, not the participants, had to conform to the requirements of the situation. Further, Wagner's questionnaire was administered and responded to orally, a more appropriate method than the distribution of printed questionnaires which was employed in the present study.

Because of constraints related to budget, time, location, and numbers of parents (21 families in Wagner's study: 122 in this study), the present study could not adopt Wagner's methodology. However, it is likely that a higher response rate would have been achieved if this had been possible, particularly in light of the difficulties that some parents experienced in reading the questionnaire. In hindsight, it appears that personal contact with a sampling of parents and an oral, rather than a written, approach may have been a better method to adopt than a distribution of printed questionnaires to all families. A second change which the researcher would adopt if repeating the study would be to discuss with families of bilingual class pupils their aspirations, concerns and involvement with the bilingual units before formulating the questionnaire, and, in this way, allow participants to shape the data which emerged. This approach may have compensated, in part, for the researcher's lack of in-depth knowledge of Maori language and culture.

Bias Introduced by Self-selection: - Because parents who responded to the questionnaire did so as a matter of free choice, it is impossible to claim with any certainty that their perceptions are representative of the group of whanau parents as a whole. However, there were no indications given in
their responses (or detected in personal interviews) to suggest that they may have been unrepresentative of the total population of whanau parents at each of their schools. Their responses indicated a wide spectrum of viewpoints, educational qualifications, socio-economic status, and ethnic background. Given that so large a percentage of the total population under investigation completed surveys, it is unlikely that their responses would be highly unrepresentative of the group as a whole.

It was not possible to ascertain whether there was a pattern of correlation between parents' education levels and levels of response to the Parent Questionnaire, because data was not available for all whanau parents. However, although it might be expected that parents with higher formal educational qualifications would have been far more likely to respond to the Parent Questionnaire, there were suggestions (based on responses which were received) that this was not the case. For example, a comparison of responses of parents at Schools 1 and 2, with the two highest response rates of 73% and 69% respectively, indicated very different educational backgrounds for the two groups. At School 1, no parents indicated that any male parent or guardian held educational qualifications higher than Trade Certificate and 38% indicated that male parents held no formal qualifications. At School 2, on the other hand, 54% of the parents indicated that the male parent or guardian held a university degree and all male parents held at least a University Entrance or Sixth Form Certificate. Schools 3 and 4 also had similar response rates, (44% and 38% respectively), but different reported levels of male parents' educational qualifications. At School 3, 40% of the male parents were reported to have passed some university papers, with 20% holding no formal qualifications. At School 4, no male parents were reported to have passed university papers and 70% were reported to hold no formal educational qualifications.
Impressions gained from written responses indicated that there was a wide variation between participants' levels of literacy, with no one group predominating. Personal contact with parent respondents sustained this impression. In fact, some of the written responses give the impression of only very basic level literacy skills. As suggested by the variety of ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds indicated, as well as by the broad spectrum of expressed opinions, a cross-section of parents responded to the questionnaire.

**Problems with "Home Background" Data:** - The final section of the Parent Questionnaire (questions 14-21), relating to family socio-economic status and parents' education, received far fewer responses (average number of missing observations for this section was about 25 out of a total of 65 responses) than did the preceding sections, which typically contained about 5 to 10 missing observations. The most probable explanation for this discrepancy, based on teachers' reports of parent attitudes toward the questionnaire, is that parents resented the intrusiveness of these questions, and so, as the cover letter suggested they might, parents simply ignored them. However, some respondents who did not supply data on the male parent's employment and educational background went on to supply some or all of the same data requested of the mother. It is highly likely that this pattern indicates that, as anticipated, some single parent families responded to the survey and that they were headed more frequently by women than by men.

Nonetheless, because of the relatively low response rate to all of the questions in this socio-economic section, the validity of the data is suspect and is used with caution. The socio-economic data does, however, serve the one rather general purpose for which it was intended, that is, to determine that a cross-section of students are represented in the bilingual programmes under study and that they are not attended only by children from "underprivileged"
backgrounds. Whenever possible, other measures, such as teacher and principal reports, were used to confirm any discussion of socio-economic status. Where these confirmations were not available, Parent Questionnaire data alone was not used.

A further "problem", which can actually be viewed as one of the "sensitizing concepts" described by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) was that although several female respondents reported that they were employed in relatively high SES occupations, such as "teacher", "kaiako" and "social worker" (categories one and two [or possibly, three, for "kaiako"] on the Irving /Elley scale, 1977) they held no formal educational qualifications. This anomaly suggests that researchers, especially those engaged in bicultural research, should not base assumptions on these categories alone.

**Summary: Methodological Procedures**

A variety of data collection techniques was employed in order to investigate the focal issues selected for the present study. At the macro-level, information on the situations, rationales and operations of national and regional provisions for Maori language education was collected, largely from documentary sources and, less frequently, from interviews with key participants. Attendance at educational hui and seminars also yielded information on the macro-level operations and outcomes of bilingual units.

Micro-level data has been extrapolated from survey questionnaires completed by school personnel and families of children enrolled in the six bilingual units under consideration and from classroom observations. Interviews with key participants at the micro-level, including participants from the wider community, such as Kohanga Reo whanau, as well as with
those directly involved in school programmes, facilitated a cross-sectional analysis of opinion regarding the bilingual units under study.

Procedural constraints included that:

- Although the researcher attended classes at Christchurch Polytechnic in order to equip herself with sufficient Maori language to comprehend most of what went on in the classrooms under study, she approached the topic from an essentially monolingual and monocultural perspective.

- Research procedures well-established in the New Zealand educational context, such as the use of the Irving/Elley socio-economic index and the distribution of printed questionnaires, proved to be of limited use in accomplishing the aims of the current research project.
Section 3

Macro-level Analysis

Chapter 4

Situations and Rationales

Introduction

The theoretical model adopted for this study makes it clear, "... that there is considerable interpenetration of the school and the wider community. Educational activities affect the life and constitution of the community, while social factors have their influence on the school." (Spolsky, Green & Read, 1976, p. 239). As Spolsky (1978, p. 350) describes "community" as, "any relevant socioeducational entity" ranging from a neighbourhood to a village to a school district to a geographically focused ethnic group to an entire nation, the present study cannot restrict itself to the local school context alone and still meet Spolsky's requirements for an adequate description, analysis or evaluation of bilingual education.

Therefore, in order to:

1. facilitate the orderly presentation of data across this broad contextual spectrum and to

2. elucidate the interrelationships between larger social contexts and local bilingual initiatives

the present study makes a distinction between the macro-level (national and regional) and micro-level (local school community) findings.
Situations

It is beyond the capabilities of the present research to present an extensive description and analysis of all of the macro-level situational factors stipulated in Spolsky's model, as each factor would, in itself, serve as topic material for an entire thesis. This section seeks, rather, to bring into relief particular situational factors identified in the Literature Review as strongly influential in the operations and outcomes of bilingual and immersion programmes. Readers who desire more detailed information concerning factors discussed in this section are advised to refer to the bibliographical sources indicated.

Linguistic Factors

A great deal of scholarly work has been carried out on the current status of the Maori language, chiefly by R. Benton of the New Zealand Council of Educational Research, whose 1973 - 1979 survey of the Maori language has been credited with providing an impetus for the Maori-initiated language revival in pre-school education. (R. Walker, 1987). Nevertheless, a great deal of work remains to be done; for example, although the North Island study has been updated with small-scale, follow-up studies, no South Island survey of Maori language usage has yet been mounted.

According to R. Benton (1981; 1988b) the Maori language forms a branch of the Eastern Austronesian or "Oceanic" subgroup of the Malayo-Polynesian family of languages which are spoken by the indigenous peoples of Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia. Although there is a separate Cook
Island Maori language, New Zealand Maori is spoken in this nation alone, by a rapidly diminishing number of speakers, perhaps 75,000 according to data collected in the mid-1970s. There are very few fluent speakers in the school age cohort.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of Maori population by age group.]

**Figure 4.1: Fluent Maori Speakers within Age Groups. (North Island)**


In 1913, 90% of Maori children had Maori as a first language; in 1953 this figure had fallen to 26% and presently stands at about 5-10%. (Peters and Marshall in Hastings, 1988, p. 10, note 23). As can be seen, less than 180 years of English-language contact has resulted in "a massive depletion" of Maori speakers and "profound changes in the language's structures, domains and functions." (Peters and Marshall, 1989, p. 141. See also Pool, 1991). Although a number of factors contributed to this decline, Waitangi Tribunal findings, "... pinpoint responsibility on 'a monolingual and monocultural education system'." (Peters and Marshall, 1989, p. 143. See also N. Benton, 1987).
This system, as could be expected, reflects the linguistic and cultural situation of New Zealand as a whole, which:

... remains one of the world’s most linguistically homogeneous countries - at least nine out of ten of its 3.3 million inhabitants speak English as their first language, and even among the 400,000 people of Maori ancestry only one in eight is a native speaker of Maori. (N. Benton, 1989, p. 65).

Although most of the fluent speakers of Maori are adults, since the establishment of Kohanga Reo in 1982 there has been an increasing population of young speakers with some proficiency in the language. Further, although it is impossible to state with certainty the number of non-Maori speakers, significant numbers of them, probably to be counted in thousands, have at least a passive knowledge of the language. (R. Benton, 1987b).

Holm and Holm (1984), visiting educators from the United States, have written that although, "Those involved in Maori bilingual education on a day-to-day basis are probably only too aware of the discouraging signs around them, ... more positive signs should be noted." Among these positive indications they include:

1. The vitality of the Maori language on the marae and in song and dance.

2. The relatively long Maori literacy tradition. "Given the relative age and prestige of Maori lexicography, difficulties with word-boundaries and dialectical spelling, which beset some "adolescent" bilingual programmes elsewhere, are not a problem ... " in the New Zealand context.

3. The "academic respectability" of Maori (which was taught first as a university subject, then as a college subject) compared with other indigenous languages.

4. The number of certificated Maori-speaking teachers. While there may not be "enough", the situation in New Zealand is more promising for indigenous language programmes than in the United States, Canada or Australia.
5. The number of Maori professionals who say they have learned, or relearned, Maori as adults. "We know of no parallels in the States, despite a marked increase in the number of people who identify themselves as Indians."

6. The "quiet shift" in pakeha perceptions of things Maori in the last decade; which has generated a climate for Maori bilingual education which seems much more favourable than that for indigenous language education in other English-dominant countries. (pp. 10-11).

Demographics: - According to 1986 national census figures, reported in the New Zealand Official Yearbook 1990, (1991) about 12.4% (403,185) of New Zealand's total population of 3,307,084 are of "Maori descent.". Following World War Two, the Maori population very rapidly shifted from rural to urban locations and Maori now tend to cluster in various North Island population centres. (Only about 10% of New Zealanders of Maori descent live in the South Island.) Fifty-one per cent of the total Maori population is under 20 years of age, while only 4% are over the age of 60. The convergence of these statistical patterns is that Maori children make up approximately 20% of the total New Zealand primary school population. (Ministry of Education, 1989, p. 1).

These population figures cited above have several important implications for the survival of the Maori language and for Maori language education:

1. The paucity of numbers of older Maori (those who are most likely to be fluent speakers) means that urgent efforts will need to be made within the next few years if Maori is to remain a living language.

2. That Maori children make up a significant proportion of the primary school population, coupled with the facts that:

   a) many of them are receiving Maori-language pre-school experience (see Chapter Five, below) and

   b) there is growing dissatisfaction with the shortcomings of the system in terms of Maori achievement

indicates that primary schools may need to make significant changes to cater to their needs.
3. That Maori tend to live in widely-separated, urban communities means that they lack a solid territorial base, such as the Province of Quebec in Canada, or the Gaeltacht in Ireland. This has created, "...very great problems in the revival of Maori language." (R. Benton, 1987b, p. 16).

4. As only eight South Island local authorities have 1,000 or more people of Maori descent, compared with 71 local authorities in the North Island (Unpublished Table 51, 1986 Census of Population and Dwellings, Series C. Report 9.), in the South Island, problems associated with language revival are even greater than in the North Island. There is little possibility, for example, that primary schools might make provision for the bilingual education of three or four children. According to one South Island school inspector, magnet schools, which would draw children from several areas for bilingual education at one site, are felt to be unacceptable because of community objection ("too radical") and because of transportation difficulties. "They would create a great deal of fuss." (interview data).

**Dialect:** - There are a number of dialect differences amongst the various tribal groups (such as the soft velar of the Kai Tahu), but Maori was, and continues to be, a language spoken throughout the whole of New Zealand. The Maori language has a standardized orthography, originally transcribed by missionary-scholars, as well as established dictionaries, grammars, and pronunciation guides. The Tuhoe and Taranaki groups, from opposite coasts of the North Island have retained the most distinctive dialects, probably due to a history of geographic isolation and resistance to assimilation. School texts in Maori are largely written in the Ngati Porou or Tuhoe dialects. (Douglas & Douglas, 1983).

The choice of dialects for Maori language education has not been greatly problematical (See Hirsh, 1990). An attitude expressed by kaumatua from several tribes (Sinclair, 1988) indicates a fair amount of flexibility on this issue:

At one whanau meeting I attended the subject of changing the words in ... publications that did not correspond to the dialect of Ngati Porou was raised. A kaumatua eventually spoke to the teachers: 'You teach them,' she said, 'we'll correct them.' (p. 141).
Although similar flexibility was expressed at a South Island school whanau meeting attended by the researcher as well as at a Kohanga Reo whanau meeting, it should be recorded that at the Hui Whakamatautau held at Rapaki Marae in Oct, 1984, a comment was made that the draft syllabus of Maori should include alternative dialect expressions, for example, alternative terms for kinship relations. (Hui Whakamatautau, 1984).

**Family Support for Maori Language:** Although there is little danger of the Maori language disappearing from formal or ceremonial domains, or from formal academic study, there is a very real possibility that it will disappear from use in the more intimate domain of the home (R. Benton, 1981). It is not the case, however, that Maori parents are indifferent to the potential extinction of their ancestral language, and an enormous grassroots response, chiefly in the establishment of Kohanga Reo, indicates popular concern within the Maori community for the future of the Maori language.

Since intergenerational transmission is the most critical feature of language survival and since Kohanga have proven themselves to be a popular vehicle for this transmission, it is imperative that their work be continued and expanded. An endangered-language planning policy which does not accord a very large proportion of its resources to agencies involving the entire family at an intimate level (such as Kohanga Reo) is seriously misdirected. (see Fishman, 1989).

There are several other important functional language domains within the Maori community which have kept the language (and culture) alive in modern times, albeit in forms which have altered considerably from traditional patterns. Among these domains, in addition to Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori, are marae-based ceremonial functions, especially the
tangi; the activities of some church groups, musical celebrations and competitions; Maori boarding schools; and community organizations, such as the Maori Women's Welfare League. In 1981, Te Wananga O Raukawa, a tribal level initiative at the tertiary level of education, was established. Te Ataarangi adult Maori language programmes, using the "rakau method", are available through a national network of courses offered on marae, in school halls and at work places.

**Majority Community Support for Maori Language**

While it is clear that, "... the task of revitalizing and perpetuating the Maori language belongs in the first place with the Maori people, they can and should expect the help of the country's social, political, legal and educational institutions in carrying out the task." (R. Benton, 1984, p. 18). To a certain extent, this support has been forthcoming in a number of educational, legal, political and governmental policy provisions, which are summarized below. What must not be lost sight of, however, is that this support has been offered very late in the day and, often, in token measure only.

**Adult Language Learning:** - Douglas & Douglas (1983) have written extensively on community resources for Maori Language learning, which include limited input of the language at all levels of the formal education system, including university, polytechnic and community college course offerings. All colleges of education require trainees to take introductory Maori language courses and distance Maori language education is offered to teachers currently in service. Language courses for adults are available in the South Island, as well as in the North. Christchurch Polytechnic, for example, enrolled 49 full time and 235 part time students in Maori language courses in 1990 (figures supplied by M. Pierson, Head of the Department of Languages). The University of Canterbury has experienced increasing
numbers of students enrolling in Maori language courses. (Course enrolment figures, Registry, University of Canterbury). Whether such courses actually promote functional competency, however, remains a consideration for future research.

**Legal Provisions:** - In addition to the limited educational provisions for the maintenance and expansion of the Maori language mentioned above, the language receives support from a number of other official sources which include several national and international legal supports.

According to Claudia Orange (1987, p. 250), Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840, guarantees protection of the Maori language as a "taonga" (valued custom or possession). Orange mentions that in 1986, the Waitangi Tribunal recommended that Maori be made an official language in New Zealand. Additionally, the Tribunal recommended that "all children who wish to learn through Maori should be able to do so from an early stage." (cited in R. Benton, 1988b, p. 82).

Hastings (1988, pp.35-39), Lecturer in Law at Victoria University, offers an in-depth discussion of more recent legal and policy supports for bilingualism and bilingual education. He notes, for example, that the Maori Language Act of 1987, which stems from Article Two of the Treaty, permits anyone who wishes to do so to use the Maori language orally in courts and that the Act also established a Maori Language Commission. Although this Act could commit the government to providing Maori language education, repeated attempts to broaden and strengthen it have been unsuccessful. (R. Benton, 1988b, p. 5).

- Additionally, Section 77A of the Maori Affairs Act (1953); the Maori Trust Boards Act (1955); Section 26(1)(c)&(d) of the Human Rights
Commission Act (1977); the Education Act (1964) and the Maori Education Foundation Act (1961) provide a legal foundation for Maori language protection and provisions for Maori language education.

- The New Zealand Educational Institute (the national primary teachers association) has pointed out that the legal responsibilities of schools toward Maori people and Maori education are specified in the State Sector Act (1988); the State Sector Amendment Act (1989); and the Education Act (1989), section 63 of which requires schools to significantly increase their commitment to providing education in Maori and for Maori pupils. (*NZEI Rourou*, 1990e, Vol 1, No 4, p.11)

- *Administering For Excellence* (1988), the "Picot Report" [in paragraphs 7.2.5 (p.66); 7.2.6 (pp.66-67); and 7.7.5 (pp. 77-78)], the report of a task force set up by the Minister of Education to review the administration of the education system, calls for more scope for Maori people to influence their children's education and mentions options for children to be instructed in tikanga Maori (Maori culture) and te reo Maori (Maori language), but the report contains significant provisions whereby schools may choose to "opt out" of responsibilities in these areas. (Hastings, 1988.). Moreover, bureaucratic entanglements and the "absolute discretion" which the Minister of Education retains in implementing alternative Maori programming within the state education system (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1988), create huge obstacles for Maori communities seeking to establish change within these legislated provisions. (G. Smith, 1989).

- Further support for Maori language education is provided by New Zealand's ratification in 1963 of the UNESCO Convention Against
Discrimination in Education which upholds the rights of national minorities to educate their children in their own language.

It must be kept in mind, however, that far-reaching domestic legislation, of the nature of the Canadian Official Languages Act or the United States Civil Rights Act, which provide firm support for bilingual education, have no parallels in New Zealand. The Treaty of Waitangi has never been directly enshrined in law and although in 14 years the Waitangi Tribunal has completed eight full reports, none of these reports has been fully implemented. (M. M. Jackson, 1989, p.II).

**Political Responses:** - Both major political parties have voiced concern regarding the education of Maori children and support for Maori language education. The former Minister of Maori Affairs, Winston Peters, stated his intention, "... to implement an urgent inquiry into the scandal of Maori underachievement" and to develop a comprehensive and cohesive set of policies specifically addressing Maori education. (NZEI Rourou, December, 1990a, p. 7). The Chairman of the National Party's Maori Advisory Committee (Canterbury-Westland division), Cliff Bedwell, has stated that, "Maori language and culture should be part of every child's standard education." (Dunbar, 1990).

Although the National Party has expressed recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of New Zealand and also recognizes the unique place of the Maori language in New Zealand society, the educational policy of the Party states that the focus of early school education should be, "... on the core subjects of English, mathematics and science/technology." The Party executive has not specifically acknowledged that children may develop these competencies, "... through te reo Maori and in the context of their own tikanga." (NZEI Rourou, Sept. 1990c, p. 5).
Labour Party statements regarding Maori language education specifically accorded recognition to the role of Maoritanga, "... in all schools, particularly through the promotion of Maori language teaching." (NZEI Rourou, Sept. 1990c, p. 5).

**The Politics of Ethnicity:** - Despite official pronouncements giving at least some political recognition to the role of Maori language in education, Maori people, who hold less political power than their numerical representation in the New Zealand population would warrant (Shafer, 1988), have expressed concern that Maori priorities are frequently "marginalized" in the "majority rule" political and policy processes which affect Maori language education. (interview, District Manager, Ministry of Education). Maori in significant and increasing numbers have registered dissatisfaction with their de facto exclusion from political decision-making processes by boycotting national elections. (S. Jackson, lecture, Sociology Department, University of Canterbury, August, 1991). Mead (1983) has commented on the lack of Maori political cohesiveness, exacerbated by the demographic factors described above. "The tangata whenua (people of the land) ethnic group does not exist as an entity or clearly identifiable enclave within New Zealand society." (p. 336). (See Hauraki Greenland, 1984, for a discussion of Maori politics).

**Official Policy:** ¹ - A number of governmental policies have been set in place to foster the development of Maori language education:

- Officially, for example, all government departments may release people for Maori language courses. In practice, however, some departments may neglect to inform employees of this policy or may be reluctant to

¹ A comprehensive review of the policies and practices of the Fourth Labour Government in regard to bilingual education is presented in R. Benton, 1989b)
release employees. The Justice Department, however, appears to have strongly promoted Maori language learning for its staff. (Interview with Departments of Education, Health and Justice employees attending Christchurch Polytechnic immersion courses.)

- A few government documents are fully or partially printed in Maori, these include, for example, election enrolment instructions, public health information pamphlets and newspaper advertisements for government employment vacancies. Additionally, the names of all major government agencies have been translated into Maori and these translations frequently appear in print. New Zealand Post has accepted 12 Maori alternative names for cities (traditional Maori names and some transliterations).

- The Maori Affairs Department has provided Kohanga Reo with some on-going support, including (limited) budgetary resources, as well as operating space and personnel assistance.

- Dr. Jeffrey Waite, formerly a research officer with the Maori Language Commission, has been appointed by the Ministry of Education to develop a national languages policy, which is to include provisions for bilingual education in English and Maori. (The Press, Jan. 12, 1991).


- School Charter provisions, mandated following the restructuring of educational administration in October, 1989, require that all state and
integrated schools, "... provide opportunities for students who wish to learn the Maori language and culture" and to "... provide for students whose parents wish them to be educated through the Maori language. This could be through the provision of local or distance education and may include the use of language and cultural resources of the Maori community." (Mana Maori ... Sec. I, Sub 5, P. 17). Since there is no primary school Maori language correspondence curriculum, this Charter provision indicates that primary schools must provide on-site services to meet these requirements. An independent authority, the Education Review Office (ERO), has been set up to monitor these Charter Provisions, but administrative restructuring in 1990 created significant reductions in the number of ERO staff. (Today's Schools, the "Lough Report").

As Joan Rubin (1977) has pointed out, policy making is not a substitute for sound planning and if clear means of implementation are not provided, then policy will remain a matter of rhetoric rather than of substance. That this has been the case with New Zealand initiatives to reestablish Maori as a language of state school instruction is indicated by the proceedings and recommendations of three recent educational hui, which will be briefly summarized below:
• A remit advocated at the 1984 Maori Education Development Conference held at Turangawaewae clearly articulated Maori disaffection with the existing education system and left no doubt concerning the perceived inability of the system to provide for the needs of Maori children:

This conference declares that the existing system is failing Maori people and modifications have not helped the situation (quoted in Douglas, 1984, p.2).

• Similarly, the Matawaia Declaration (cited in Benton, 1988a), calling for the establishment of an independent Maori Education Authority, was adopted at Te Hui Reo Rua o Aotearoa ki Matawaia, the annual meeting of teachers, parents and community members involved in bilingual education. A report issued following this hui, the Matawaia Declaration, calls for, "... the establishment of an independent Maori Education Authority" to "establish Maori control and autonomy of Kaupapa Maori education from pre-school to adult education". The Report states as the reason for this stance widespread "dissatisfaction with the current commitment and lack of forward planning by [the] present Department of Education". (cited in R. Benton, 1988a, p.1).

• Three hundred people attended the Hui Rangatiratanga, a conference organized by Maori teachers and hosted by the New Zealand Educational Institute (the national primary teachers' organization), held at Rotorua, in July, 1990. Key speakers at this Hui reiterated dissatisfaction with the state educational system's failure to address Maori concerns and the conference passed a recommendation for the establishment of a parallel and independent Maori education system. (The Dominion Sunday Times, July 15, 1990).

Moreover, the Ministry of Education's Corporate Plan: 1990/1991 (Ministry of Education, 1990b) indicates that there is a very real gap between the policy
goals set out for Maori language education and resources which are available to effectively implement these goals. The **Plan** states specifically that existing resources for Maori language education are inadequate in the areas of:

1. Curriculum development.
2. Teaching resources.
3. Well-trained and fluent bilingual teachers.
4. Bilingual and immersion pedagogy.
5. Information available to Boards of Trustees and school staff.

While clearly-articulated policy support exists on a number of levels, not only for the Maori language, but for Maori language education as well, it is apparent that many of these policies remain to be translated into carefully planned and adequately resourced programmes which satisfy the requirements of the Maori community. On the whole, despite a number of significant policy provisions promoting the Maori language, it would appear that the implementation of these policies has demonstrated a certain "lack of seriousness of purpose". (R. Benton, lecture, Education Department, University of Canterbury, Sept., 1990).

**Mass Media:** - Beginning in 1967, the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation gradually adopted a policy of Maori pronunciation of Maori proper names, and at the present time all announcers follow this policy. Initially, this change met with considerable public protest, as the predominant practice is to anglicize Maori terms. (R. Walker, 1987). A 1990 study conducted by the Department of Human Resource Management and Massey University (reported in McGregor, 1991) found that, "... none of the 200 New Zealand news executives surveyed were fluent speakers of Maori and none could conduct an interview in Maori. Eighty nine percent said
they understood only a few terms of common usage ... with 10% stating they had a basic vocabulary of Maori." (p. 44). Moreover, McGregor comments on the growing concern among media commentators about news coverage of Maori issues, which has been credited with helping to determine the negative tone of race relations in New Zealand.

Currently, less than one per-cent of television programming time in New Zealand is in the Maori language, most of which concentrates on news and public affairs programming. (D. Fox, 1988 and 1990). Likewise, only one hour and 37 minutes of public radio broadcasting per week is in Maori. (John Craig, Radio New Zealand, personal communication, January, 1991). However, an independent Maori service, Radio Aotearoa, broadcasts full time national programming with some Maori language content. Additionally, there are a number of community-operated Maori language or bilingual radio broadcasts in local districts (see Nga Whakahaere Reo Maori, 1990, for a listing of these stations). The continuation of all of these radio broadcast initiatives is threatened by fiscal restraints.

Although the National Library reports that no statistics are available on the numbers of books and serials currently published in Maori, a spokesperson for the Maori Language Commission states that, " ... the number is very light." (Personal communication, Jan., 1991).

The paucity of mass media communication in the Maori language is troubling in view of the fact that such elements are seen as vital factors in language revival programmes.

The mass media at the disposal of each ethnic group - radio, television and the press - may well affect the survival of the language as well as its quality. (Mackey, 1977, p. 248).
Media support for the Maori language is in sharp contrast to that provided by for the Basque language, for example, where a huge and multi-faceted infrastructure of support, including a full-time Basque-language television station as well as a bilingual (Basque and Spanish) station. There are also heavy subsidies to Basque-language publishers and writers, massive translation efforts and a concerted effort at text book production. (R. Benton, lecture, Education Department, University of Canterbury, Sept., 1990).

**Sociological Factors**

**Economics and Employment:** - At present, New Zealand is experiencing an economic recession which has led to a level of unemployment not seen in this nation since the 1930s. Maori have been very hard hit by the current downturn in the economy: about one-fifth of the Maori labour force lost their jobs between 1987 and 1989, chiefly in unskilled and semi-skilled manufacturing and primary sector jobs. (New Zealand Planning Council figures, cited in Spoonley, 1990, pp. 94-95; see also Department of Statistics, 1987a, *Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy*, 1988, Vol. 1, pp. 176-177). These unemployment figures have significant implications for New Zealand educational planners, as unskilled Maori leaving school, "... are simply unable to gain jobs." (Spoonley, 1990, p. 94).

Maori workers are heavily concentrated in occupations requiring few or no formal qualifications and are only a fifth as likely an non-Maori to be employed in professional/technical and managerial occupations. Movement of Maori into these positions in the 1970s tended to be slower than for other ethnic groups and higher unemployment during the 70s held in check the

---

2 See Parker, 1989, pp. 2-5, for coverage of current Maori social statistics.
trend toward higher representation of Maori males and females in professional occupations. (Department of Statistics, 1987a, in Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988, Vol. 1, p. 129). Douglas (1984, p. 5) reports on the low numbers of Maori holding professional positions: although Maori children make up 20% of the primary school rolls, only 5% of their teachers are Maori. Additionally, although one quarter of all non-geriatric patients in general hospitals are Maori, there are not enough Maori health care professionals to staff one large city hospital.

Social and Educational Well Being: - In addition to employment statistics, there are a number of other social indicators which show that within New Zealand society, Maori generally occupy the position of a separate, and underprivileged, "caste minority". (See Ogbu, 1978). Typically, Maori enjoy a lower standard of health and a lower life expectancy than non-Maori, and a lower level of educational attainment, as measured by (mainstream) performance scales. They live in poorer housing in poorer suburbs and figure in disproportionately high numbers among the prison population. (Department of Statistics figures, cited in the Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988, Vol 1, p. 42).

In terms of physical and psychological well-being, the health of Maori children is an area of great concern and has been included as one of ten priority areas in New Zealand child health policy. (Health, p. 13). Rates of rheumatic heart disease amongst Maori school children, for example, are equivalent to rates amongst black children in Soweto. (Kenna, 1991, p. 15).

For all population groups in New Zealand, participation in tertiary education, "... is disturbingly low by international standards." (Department of Statistics, 1987a, Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988, Vol. 1, p. 131). In particular, students from lower socio-economic groups and
Maori and Pacific Island students tend to be under-represented in universities. (pp. 132-133). However, Maori participation at Polytechnic institutions is somewhat higher, about 10%, compared with 5.1% for universities. These proportions have remained fairly constant since 1981, but Maori enrolment at Colleges of Education has increased somewhat from 5% in 1982 to 12.6% in 1989. (Ministry of Education, 1989, Maori Education Statistics, Table 19)

At the secondary level, although Maori retention rates have improved over the years, 1989 figures still show a large gap of 32 percentage points between Maori and non-Maori pupils attending school in Forms 3 - 6. At the 7th form level, the retention gap widened slightly in 1989. Approximately 16% of male Maori pupils and 13% of Maori female pupils leave secondary school before Form 5 - that is, they leave before taking any qualifying examinations. This compares with 4% for both male and female non-Maori pupils. (Ministry of Education, 1989, Maori Education Statistics, Table 9)

Figures for secondary school attainment levels indicate that during the last decade an increasing percentage of Maori pupils who are retained beyond the fourth form level are passing minimum level School Certificate examinations. (This increase may be reflective of increased levels of youth unemployment.) However, there are still large gaps between higher level examination results for Maori and non-Maori. While there has been an overall inflation of secondary school attainment for both Maori and non-Maori pupils from 1979-1989 and the percentage of Maori who leave school with no formal qualifications has decreased by 43% during this period, the percentage of decrease for the same period is 57% for non-Maori. This indicates that the skills gap between achievers and non-achievers is closing more quickly for non-Maori than for Maori. (Ministry of Education, 1989, Maori Education Statistics).
At the primary level, Maori pupils have, on average, also scored lower than their Pakeha counterparts on Progressive Achievement Tests (PATs) of Reading Comprehension and Reading Vocabulary (Beck and St. George, 1983). Richard Benton notes that the practice of keeping children an extra year at the primer level, "... seems to be applied to Maori children much more often than non-Maori." (1987a, p.21). He goes on to report that an inordinately high number of Maori students are likely to be placed in lower streams at secondary school. Additionally, Benton (1987a) writes that the absenteeism rate for Maori children, both at primary and secondary levels, is higher for Maori children than for either European or Pacific Island students. Further, Benton reports that "... suspensions and referral to off-site centres ... affect Maori pupils to a much greater extent than non-Maori." (p.6).

The failure of the education system to meet Maori needs was a major concern expressed in submissions to the Royal Commission on Social Policy. Stemming from this concern, submissions from both Maori and non-Maori gave strong support for Maori control of education for Maori children. In particular, submissions expressed support for immersion and bilingual education, especially as follow-through measures for children entering school from Kohanga Reo. Additionally, submissions called for the involvement of kaumatua, kuia and other Maori community members as paid staff members in educational programmes and for the recognition of "Maori" qualifications. (Wylie, 1988, Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988, Vol I).

**Attitudinal Factors:** Public reaction to the Maori "renaissance" and to changes in education, such as the ones called for above, has been divided. Research conducted jointly by the Maori Language Commission and Massey
University, completed in 1990, indicated that two-thirds of New Zealanders believe the Maori language has a place in modern society, including the educational sector. Twenty-five per cent of the respondents felt that the Maori language should occupy a greater place than it does at present, 25% favoured increased use of Maori on television, on signs and within government departments. Attitudes were most favourable in the upper North Island and among women and younger people. South Islanders tended to report less favourable attitudes. (R. Nicholson, Maori Studies Department, Massey University, personal communication).

The growth of interest in Maori language as an optional school subject at a time when language subjects in general have been increasingly less popular indicates that the Maori language is seen as a source of national cultural identity and pride by a very large number of New Zealanders. (R. Benton, 1981). However, there are strong indications that compulsory Maori language education does not enjoy wide-spread popular support. While 72% of respondents to a Department of Statistics survey (1987b) reported a "very great deal" or "quite a lot" of support for Maori language education for those who want it, only 15% voiced similar support for Maori language education for all students. Forty-three percent of Maori respondents, on the other hand, supported a policy of Maori language for all students. (Table 53, pp. 540-541).

Responses to the 1987 Draft Syllabus for Maori Language from primary school teachers and other interested parties (Slyfield and Gilchrist, 1988) indicated a variety of attitudes toward teaching Maori language in the schools. Respondents most likely to support the Maori language syllabus

---

3 Perhaps one of the most significant of Slyfield and Gilchrist's findings was that when asked to choose one resource which they felt would be most important for implementing the Maori language syllabus, 91% of teachers specified human resources. (p. 19).
were marae members; Maori resource teachers; those from Nelson, Hamilton, Taranaki and Wellington education board areas and intermediate schools and schools with high numbers of Maori students. Respondents least likely to support the syllabus were community members (40% did not support any aspects); PTAs; school committees and those from the Southland and Canterbury education board areas. (p. 15).

The researchers reported that the most frequent (written) comment received was that while people supported the aim of understanding and respecting tikanga Maori, they did not support the use of Maori language in education, especially the reading and writing of Maori. (p. 16).

Overall, approximately half of the respondents supported all or most aspects of the syllabus. The authors note that this figure is far lower than the 87% of respondents contacted in a separate study who supported the 1986 draft art syllabus (p. 23).

It would be surprising if attitudes toward Maori language education were not in some way influenced by more general social and educational attitudes. A survey conducted by the National Research Bureau for the New Zealand Herald, revealed that 73% of New Zealanders believe Maori have social equality with the rest of the country and 69% believe Maori have economic equality. (The Press, Oct. 19, 1989, p. 3). Given the official social and economic indices reported above, it must be that these widely-held popular perceptions are based on equality of opportunity, rather than on equality of outcomes. If this is the case, then popular opinion may mitigate against "special treatment" for Maori pupils which would include greater involvement of Maori in the teaching sector as well as provisions for a more culturally appropriate pedagogy.
Spoonley (1990) notes that a number of factions within New Zealand society have opposed changes to incorporate Maori language and culture in the state school curriculum. Among these factions, Spoonley lists conservative and vocal Christian groups who have lobbied against taha Maori in the education system because of its "anti-Christian" nature. Spoonley also notes resistance from conservative members of the New Zealand middle class, who decry "social engineering" aspects of Maori language and cultural education. Further, Spoonley writes that the New Right has become increasingly opposed to Maori "special privileges" funded by the tax payer. (pp. 95-96).

The terms "apartheid" and "separatism" have been applied to calls for the establishment of a Maori school system. (See remarks of Geoffrey Palmer and Winston Peters [Riddell, 1990] as well as the comments of C. Knight, Principal of Christchurch College of Education [England, 1988]; and Spoonley, 1990, p. 96. cf. Johanni-Piahanna, 1988, pp. 61-62). This is in contrast to the acceptance of parochial schools, which are heavily subsidized by the government.

Moreover, there is (unsubstantiated) concern among some educators that school instruction through the Maori language will only serve to widen the skills gap between Maori and non-Maori. (See J. Flynn, 1988.and R. Walker, 1987, pp. 215-216).

Bill Edwards, Christchurch District Manager, Department of Maori Affairs, has noted that colleges of education give low priority to Maori language and culture. He also reported that his Department has abandoned its practice

---

4 It should be noted that colleges of education have not, historically, been in the vanguard of reform in Maori education. "The shift of emphasis toward a greater appreciation of Maori culture, which began in the primary schools in the thirties, did not reach the teacher's colleges ... until the mid-fifties." (Watson, 1967, p. 16).
of organizing "sleep on the marae" wananga (schools of learning) for school principals, "... because it became apparent that the return in improving racial understanding was infinitesimal." (The Press, July 15, 1988). Similarly, a South Island School Inspector reported that second language teaching in Maori is often seen by school staff and school managers as a "fly by night" scheme supported only by a few on the outskirts of popular opinion and that those desirous of establishing bilingual programmes often have a "battle" on their hands. This inspector also reported that bilingual programmes were "fish out of water" in South Island schools, and that negative staff attitudes toward bilingual programmes had hampered operations at two of the schools in his jurisdiction.

However, despite lack of acceptance of the value of Taha Maori in schools on the part of individual educators, both the Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) and the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI - primary school teachers organization) have indicated a great deal of support for bilingual and immersion education. (See the NZEI Report Progress in Maori Education, July, 1990, Section 3.2, p. 21 and the PPTA's Moving Forward, 1988):

Maori children have the right to be taught their language, history and culture in ways that build up their own self respect. And they need teachers who recognise that there are distinctively Maori ways of learning. (Post Primary Teachers Association, 1988, p. 15).

This concern is in contrast to the obstructionist position adopted by some teachers' organizations in the United States. The Boston, Massachusetts, teachers union, for example, fearing that monolingual English-speaking teachers might face redundancies, strongly opposed the implementation of bilingual programmes in that city. (MacDonald and Kushner, 1982).
Above all, widespread support for Maori language education has come from the Maori community. The Executive Summary of the Report of the Taskforce to Review Educational Administration (Administering for Excellence ..., 1988) highlights this support:

The Maori people have told us that they want their children to be bilingual and bicultural, and at ease in both the Maori and Pakeha worlds. As well, they want the opportunity for all Maori children to be educated in the Maori language, in an environment that respects Maori values and uses Maori forms. (p. xiii).

Additionally, this Report states:

The idea of a separate system to cater for their children's educational needs was made especially strongly by Maori people who made submissions to us. (p. 36).

This last point was also stressed in a report prepared for the Maori and Islands Division of the Department of Education:

The strong lobby for alternative Maori schools outside the system indicates the strength of feeling within the Maori community about what is perceived as inadequate, token response to pressing needs in the Maori education field. (D. Grace, Bilingual Education, no date, pp. 5-6).

As R. Benton pointed out in an Education Department lecture at the University of Canterbury in September, 1989, the language issue is one which has united many disparate Maori factions - young and old, conservative, moderate and radical - and there is no doubt that retention and expansion of the Maori language and Maori language education enjoy widespread support within the Maori community.

**Summary**

If we examine the situational factors discussed above from the point of view of Fishman's (1976) assertions that 1) "Schools can't go it alone for bilingual
education" (p. 111), and 2) that support from both majority and minority speech communities is necessary if bilingual education is to succeed, then there are some encouraging predictive indicators for Maori language education in New Zealand:

1. There are some official supports, including legal, political, and governmental policy supports, for maintenance and expansion of the Maori language and for Maori language education.

2 There is clear attitudinal and practical support for Maori language education from groups within the Maori community, as well as some support from non-Maori.

3. Significant numbers of New Zealanders, both children and adults, are actively engaged in Maori language learning.

Nevertheless, three additional considerations must also be kept in mind:

1. There is considerable resistance to educational change designed to give greater recognition to Maori language and culture.

2. At present, as was the case with past attempts to reform the New Zealand educational system in order to meet Maori needs, policy supports have not been transformed into well co-ordinated and adequately-resourced programmes.

3. Low numbers of Maori in the South Island appear to have exacerbated the problem of lack of cohesive support for Maori language education. Approximately 10% of New Zealanders of Maori descent reside in the South Island and there are only eight South Island local authorities which have Maori-descent populations of over 1000.

If Landry (1987) is correct in his assertion that insufficient linguistic vitality in the home must be countered by increased educational and community efforts, then it appears that, although some work has already been done, much remains to be done if the place of the Maori language is to be securely re-established in family, community and school milieux.
Conclusions

A number of situational factors have influenced the revival of Maori as a language of instruction in the New Zealand public school system. Most prominent among these factors are:

1. Concern for the rapidly diminishing number of native speakers of Maori.

2. The continuing overrepresentation of Maori in a variety of negative social indices, especially indices of educational underachievement.

3. The desire for a just society and an equitable education system, coupled with the belief that increased recognition of the mana of the Maori peoples will help to promote these outcomes.

4. An economic climate which makes equity goals more difficult to attain and which makes it virtually impossible for unskilled school leavers to find employment.

5. A revival of interest, especially among Maori, but also among some non-Maori, in the preservation and enhancement of the language, culture and value systems of the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa.

6. The establishment and rapid growth of Kohanga Reo, indicating the assertion of Maori autonomy in language revitalization efforts.

Taken together, these factors have provided the basic rationales for Maori language education programmes.

Rationales

Stemming from the specific concerns described above, several basic rationales have been advanced for the implementation of Maori-English bilingual programmes in New Zealand state schools and for the public funding of Kaupapa Maori immersion schools. These rationales may be categorized according to Wong-Fillmore and Valadez' (1986) and Fishman's (1976) schema, outlined in Chapter One, above.
Compensatory Rationales

Official justification for bilingual education programmes falls mainly, but not completely, into the "compensatory" category. In other words, bilingual education is officially viewed as counterbalance to the educational "disadvantages" historically experienced by Maori children. According to a Senior Education Officer for the Department of Education (interview, April 4, 1989) the Department's main reason for establishing bilingual programmes was, "... the widening achievement gap." This spokesperson further noted that cultural maintenance was a "secondary" official goal.

R. Benton also states that the official rationale for securing a more prominent place for Maori language and culture within the education system was, "... in large part, ... the disparity in educational achievement between the Maori population and other New Zealanders." (1987b, p. 2). Benton's assertion is borne out in a statement made by Mr. Phil. Goff, former Minister of Education, who announced government funding for kaupapa Maori schools, "... as a trial for raising Maori scholastic achievement." (The Press, Dec., 21, 1989, p. 6).

Similarly, Ohia (1988, pp. 7-8) writes that the rationale for establishing secondary school bilingual units was, in part, the concerns expressed by school principals, school boards and teachers for 1) Maori children's need to "achieve equity in education" and 2) "the behaviour and general attitude of Maori students". Behavioural concerns were also given as a reason for the establishment of bilingual education by a school administrator referred to in Wagemaker's study. (1988).

However, there is some question whether compensatory bilingual programmes can alleviate the educational problems which they have set out
to address (see Fishman, 1976 and Ranby, 1979). It may well be that unless far-reaching, systems-wide change, including active promotion of anti-racism (see Cummins, 1986a and 1986b), as well as change in the language of instruction, takes place, then bilingual programmes will eventually come to be regarded as just another in the long line of unsuccessful remedial developments for Maori pupils.

Compensatory measures [including bilingual education in state schools] ... are still failing to overcome the basic problems of achievement: structural preclusion and manipulation. (Parker, 1989, p. 7).

**Cultural Maintenance and Language Revival:** Official concern with the underattainment and attitudes and behaviour of Maori students has been matched with concern within the Maori community. (See Department of Education, 1982). *Administering for Excellence* (the "Picot Report") states, "... that the revival of Maori language and culture is not seen [by the Maori people] as an end in itself, but as the key [to] lifting the educational performance of Maori children." (1988, 7.2.1, p. 65).

Nevertheless, it must be kept firmly in mind that rationales for bilingual and immersion schooling expressed by members of the Maori community go well beyond academic achievement alone and embrace a number of linguistic, social and spiritual dimensions as well. (See Chapter Two). Kaa, et al. (no date) make it clear that there are a variety of motivating rationales for the establishment of Maori language educational programmes:

It is still a deep yearning within Maori people that our young people succeed in the Pakeha world with no lessening of ... standards. However, it is not enough for Maori people just to be successful in Te Ao Pakeha at the expense of Te Wairua and Te Ao Maori. It is by placing equal emphasis and equal status on [these] three sections of our kaupapa that the hopes for our Maori people are. (p. 14).
A further issue of great concern to many Maori is that of providing continuation of the Maori cultural and linguistic pre-school experiences of Kohanga Reo children. Ensuring this provision has been a major rationale for creating bilingual and immersion programmes. The Review of the Core Curriculum (1984) states explicitly that:

Close links will need to be established between Kohanga Reo centres and junior classes in primary schools. (Sec.8,ii, p.33).

Although Kohanga Reo was initiated as a response to the "imminence of Maori language death" the movement had a further effect. This was the increased politicization of Maori people, especially young mothers, who demanded that schools change radically in order to accommodate Kohanga children and to ensure that these children would not lose their Maori language skills when they entered school. (R. Walker, 1984. See also Hyland, 1988). This pressure has not always been met with a satisfactory response. For example, at Masterton East in the Wairarapa, "... parents agitated for 18 months to get whanau class help from the Department of Education." (interview data, spokesperson for Maori and Islands Division).

**Social Rationales:** A South Island school inspector has noted that parents (both Maori and non-Maori) who have enrolled their children in bilingual primary school programmes are, "... often more interested in the whanau set up" than in bilingual education, per se. According to this inspector, vertically-grouped whanau classes are based on co-operation, replicating the family system where children, "all have a place and a duty to look after one another." The whanau also includes "family outside of school" and thus facilitates Maori community involvement in the educational process. (interview data).

Two further, and broader, social rationales for bilingual education are those of 1) providing language and cultural enrichment for all New Zealand
school children and 2) promoting an appreciation of cultural pluralism or, to state it more baldly, better race relations:

Learning Maori is related to two issues of concern to [all] New Zealanders, their sense of national identity and an acknowledgement of ethnic and cultural diversity. (Review of the Core Curriculum (1984, Sec 8, ii, p. 32).

**Political Rationales:** - Finally, it must be noted that Maori language schooling is, "... primarily a political, rather than an educational issue." (R. Benton, 1981, p. 75). In the long term, Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa seek to promote the full participation of Maori people in all aspects of New Zealand social and economic life through enhanced personal and cultural awareness and self-esteem, as equal partners, maintaining their distinct identity and value systems not as well-assimilated members of a colonized minority. Tino Rangatiratanga, the power and authority of Maori people to make decisions in all areas that affect their lives, has been identified by C. Dewes, Principal of Kaumata Kura Kaupapa Maori, as one of the primary rationales for kaupapa Maori education. (NZEI Rourou, July 27, 1990d, p. 3). The political conflict inherent in Tino Rangatiratanga is, of course, that under this kaupapa Maori stand to gain an increased share of, and control over, the nation's material and institutional resources, including educational resources.

**Summary and Conclusions:** - Maori/English bilingual programmes in New Zealand state schools are based on a variety of rationales; compensation for educational underachievement, the desire for improvement in Maori children's attitudes and behaviour at school, cultural maintenance and language revitalization, educational enrichment for all New Zealand students, and aspirations for the future social and economic well-being of the Maori peoples. There are, however, strong indications that, in practice if not in theory, these rationales may be in conflict with one another. For
example, if the principal rationale for bilingual education is increasing Maori pupils' retention rate at secondary school, then there is little reason to mount a large scale effort to train fluent Maori teachers or to provide Maori language resources on a scale commensurate with English language resources, as inadequately-resourced programmes, such as the programme described in Wagemaker (1988), are already accomplishing this goal. That there is little likelihood of such programmes promoting additive bilingualism is immaterial in such a case. So long as the compensatory rationales are met and students "assimilate" more readily, then such programmes can be said to be "successful" in achieving their objectives. Furthermore, compensatory programmes which are not "too Maori", especially in their linguistic content (see reference to Slyfield and Gilchrist, above, this Chapter) are less likely to meet with resistance from community and school staff.

However, it seems logical to assume that "bilingual programmes" which offer very little in the way of Maori language, and continue to do so over a long period of time, must eventually be seen to trivialize the language they ostensibly promote and, by extension, its speakers. Therefore, "compensatory" programmes where little Maori language teaching is actually carried out may be said to work in a manner counterproductive to "language revitalization" goals and may actually work against the empowerment of Maori.

Another conflict produced by the variety of rationales which have given rise to New Zealand bilingual education is created by the paucity of Maori-language resources. If programmes such as the Taha Maori programmes, instituted in many, many New Zealand schools, are expected to give some knowledge of Maori language and culture to all students, then there may be few resources "left over" for more intensive programmes seeking to promote
a high level of fluency and literacy. In fact, it has frequently been the case that across-the-board "enrichment" courses have been in competition with "language maintenance" classes for the scanty number of available Maori language resources. Resource teachers of Maori, for example have often been unable to offer more than minimal assistance to bilingual classes, as they are also responsible for the promotion of Taha Maori throughout all classes in a number of schools. (interview, Resource Teacher of Maori, Nov., 1990).

In conclusion, although mainstream school bilingual programmes may appear to support enrichment or language and cultural maintenance rationales, they are actually guided by compensatory rationales, based on "cultural mismatch" or "cultural deficit" notions, which serve to maintain the inequitable power relationships between Maori and Pakeha both within schools and within New Zealand society as a whole. That this cannot be otherwise, given the current assimilationist climate in New Zealand, is indicated by Mackey (1977):

It is important to determine at the outset the extent to which the objectives of a particular bilingual education program agree with the dominant ideology. A program whose objective is the maintenance of a minority language will have little status in a nation dominated by the ideal of achieving unity through uniformity and of integrating all its citizens into the mainstream. (p. 233).
Chapter 5

Macro-level Analysis

Operations and Outcomes

Introduction.

This section will describe and discuss provisions which have been established at the national and regional levels for the operations of Maori language education. Although the focus of the discussion will be on state primary school bilingual units, some mention will also be made of pre-school, intermediate and secondary programmes, both in the private and public sectors. Topics to be covered include: the numbers and types of programmes and pupils; support services; teacher training, recruitment and selection; and learning resources.

Operations

School Programmes

The variety of rationales for Maori/English bilingual education, involving linguistic, cultural, educational, social and political aims, has given rise to several bilingual and immersion educational options, both within the New Zealand state school system and within the private educational sector as well. (See descriptions of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori in Chapter Two). It would be a mistake, however, to view a balanced programme of Maori/English bilingual education as an option freely available to all New Zealand pupils. That many Maori parents would avail themselves of this option if given the opportunity is demonstrated in the high enrolment figures for Kohanga Reo (given below, this chapter).
Although the reintroduction of Maori language schooling goes back 15 years to the establishment of the first state bilingual school in 1976 (R. Benton, 1984), about 90% of all Maori children (about 10,000 at each primary school grade) are still enrolled in mainstream English language state schools. According to Benton, less than 2% of Maori primary pupils attend a bilingual school; about 8% are enrolled in bilingual classes and less than 1% attend community-operated Kura Kaupapa Maori. Up until 1991, there were six early total immersion Kura Kaupapa Maori in operation and a further five were approved by the Ministry of Education in 1991. Recently, government financial support for these schools has been approved under a 1989 Amendment to the Education Act in a similar manner to funding provided for Catholic "special character" schools. Nevertheless, Kura Kaupapa Maori remain, "still very much a marginal alternative in the official view." (R. Benton, Education Department Seminar, "Issues in Maori Education", University of Canterbury, 5 September, 1990).

Nationally, in 1990, there were 38 state secondary schools offering bilingual classes (1909 pupils); and 38 full primary, 89 contributing primary, 22 intermediate, and 5 area schools with bilingual units (6697 pupils). (Annual Return of Secondary Schools, 1 July, 1990; Annual Return of Primary & Intermediate Schools, 1 July, 1990).

In total, one third of all Maori pupils at secondary school and 8.1% of all secondary pupils take Maori language as a subject. (Maori Education Statistics 1989, Ministry of Education, p. 2). Additionally, 209 pupils are enrolled in Kura Kaupapa Maori, 1825 pupils attend bilingual schools and 222 are in Maori secondary schools. (List of All Bilingual & Kura Kaupapa Maori Schools At 9 October, 1990).

An examination of official figures reveals that provision for Maori language education is especially poor at the intermediate level. In addition, a large
proportion of secondary school offerings teach Maori language as a second language option, much as French, for example, is taught, rather than in bilingual programmes teaching through the Maori language.

Statistics compiled by the Ministry of Education also show that 2.3% (199) of Maori South Island primary school pupils are enrolled in bilingual classes (Annual Return of Primary & Intermediate Schools 1 July, 1990) out of a total number of 8534 South Island Maori primary school pupils. (Table 5 of Maori Education Statistics 1989.) At time of writing there are no official bilingual schools operating in the South Island (List of All Bilingual and Kura Kaupapa Maori Schools at 9 October, 1990), but one Christchurch kaupapa Maori school was approved for Ministerial funding in 1991.

It is interesting to note that although most bilingually educated students are Maori, there are non-Maori enrolled in these programmes as well. Nationally, in secondary school bilingual units, approximately 95% of the enrolment is Maori and in primary school units the figure is about 91%. In the South Island, however, the Maori enrolment in primary school bilingual units is only about 77%. (Annual Return of Primary & Intermediate Schools, 1 July, 1990; Annual Return of Secondary Schools, 1 July, 1990). Findings of the present study indicate that this difference may be an important one.

**Pre-School Immersion.**

Approximately 33% of Maori pre-school children aged 2 1/2 years and above are enrolled in Kohanga Reo. (Ministry of Education, 1989, Maori Education Statistics, 1989, p. 1) and there are also many Kohanga children under the age of 2 1/2. Figures supplied by the Kohanga Reo Trust (personal communication, Dec. 1990) show that there are 616 Kohanga in operation nationally, with an enrolment of 10,879 children. Sixty-one of these pre-school language nests,
with 940 pupils, are located in the South Island. These enrolment figures demonstrate a groundswell of support by the Maori community for Kohanga Reo (97.5% of Kohanga children are Maori [Maori Education Statistics, 1989, Table 3]), especially considering the fact that quite substantial fees are charged by Kohanga, which lack adequate funding compared with other early childhood education programmes.

Of children who attend primary school bilingual units nationally, about 39% are ex-Kohanga Reo pupils. (Annual Return of Primary and Intermediate Schools, 1 July, 1990).

**National and Regional Support Services.**

At the national and regional levels, limited support services exist to promote the operations of Maori language education. These supports include Te Wahanga Maori, the section of the Ministry of Education which replaced the Education Department's Maori and Islands Division; Te Runanga Matua, a policy advisory group representing grassroots iwi interests which reports to the Minister of Education; and a regional network of advisors for Maori education. Nevertheless:

... the paucity of highly skilled Maori people in power-positions [is an] issue requiring close scrutiny. Of the six Maori school inspectors in the country, only one holds the position of liaison inspector for Maori education. The remainder are responsible for other curriculum areas, and all are isolates among their respective regional teams of monocultural Europeans. [Therefore] policies and practices based on deficit thinking often go unchallenged, and things Maori are lowly placed on the scale of priorities. (K.W.D. Grace, 1987b, p. 8).

---

1 Following educational restructuring in Oct., 1989, the position of inspector of schools was eliminated. However, Maori in authority positions "pepper potted" throughout the new Ministry continue to lack real power, as, frequently, they can raise only one voice among many. At time of writing, Maori advisors, among their manifold responsibilities, have attempted to provide services which formerly were carried out by Maori inspectors. (Interview, resource teacher of Maori, Feb. 15, 1991).
Support services also include those provided by resource teachers of Maori (N=55) operating in school districts throughout the country. Resource teachers are frequently qualified and experienced teachers, but they have been offered very little in the way of training for their present positions. Additional support for some bilingual classrooms is given by kaiarahi reo (N=105), community-appointed, Maori-speaking language assistants working in bilingual classrooms whose salaries are centrally funded by the Ministry of Education. There are also kaiawhina, Maori language classroom helpers, who operate in a manner similar to kaiarahi reo, but whose salaries are funded by local schools. (Interview, Rawiri Brell, Ministry of Education, Feb., 12, 1991 & Bilingual Education, 1988). While kaiarahi reo receive salaries commensurate with those paid to Scale A teachers, kaiawhina’s salaries correspond to those paid to unskilled ancillary staff. (Maori Language Teachers, 1990). No formal training programmes or qualification requirements exist for either kaiarahi reo or kaiawhina.

There are indications that field support personnel, advisors and resource teachers of Maori, are often inexperienced and unable to "cope" with the wide variety of responsibilities which they hold. 2 These responsibilities include not only support for bilingual units, but also for taha Maori and English as a second language programmes. (Department of Education, Statement of Purpose, no date, pp. 4-5). According to Maori and Islands Division of the Department of Education, "Support services for Maori education are stretched to the limit because of the dual thrust of taha Maori across the system and Maoritanga for Maori children." (Bilingual Education, p. 8).

---

2 The whole of the South Island is served by two Maori advisors, who are not fluent speakers of Maori. Of the total number of Maori advisors nationally (24), there are only five North Island advisors who are fluent speakers. Of the 55 resource teachers of Maori, less than ten speak Maori fluently. (D. Grace, 1991).
Teacher Training.

On a very limited scale, some provisions have been implemented for Maori language teacher training, which in almost all cases involves learning to teach Maori as a second language. All six colleges of education have lecturers in Maori language and culture, (although they are not necessarily fluent speakers of Maori) and some instruction in Maori language and culture is a compulsory aspect of teacher training for all trainees. In separate interviews, however, two trainees described these compulsory offerings as "mickey mouse" and "fairly trivial". and noted that, because of the limited number of lecturers, students often had to teach the courses.

Te Ataakura trainees, who hold a marae Trustees' certificate of competency in Maori language and culture, "He Tohu Matauranga Maori", \(^3\) are offered a shortened, one- or two-year course preparatory to becoming fully-qualified secondary school teachers (since 1986), and, more recently, primary school teachers (1988).

One South Island College of Education lecturer has, however, expressed serious reservations about the acceptance of Te Ataakura at his institution:

"It was a hard fight to get Te Ataakura this year (quota of four placements, 1990). There are no resources (no library or learning materials or staff) provided for this course. It achieves only frustration for me and the students and denigrates the programme." (interview, Nov. 22, 1990).

This lecturer also stated that Maori interests are often marginalized and misinterpreted by College management, and a great deal of his time is spent in

---

\(^3\) Teachers already in service who hold a certificate of attestation may apply for higher salary gradings. This certificate may also serve as an extra qualification for admission to teacher training colleges, but it does not guarantee admission. (Kaa, 1988).
justifying requests for resources which other departments take for granted. (interview, Feb.15, 1991).

Although clear evidence exists to demonstrate that bilingual, bicultural programmes are frequently staffed by teachers who possess neither of these attributes and although there are hundreds of applicants for Ataakura positions, nationally only 20 to 30 positions are available each year. (interview, college of education lecturer, Feb. 15, 1991). One official employed by the Ministry of Education voiced the opinion that it would be fruitless to offer more places to prepare candidates to teach in bilingual or immersion programmes, "because there aren't enough lecturers to train them." (interview, Feb., 1991). It would seem that, in general, colleges of education, like state schools seeking to promote a number of underlying rationales for bilingual education, are spreading scarce Maori language resources across several programmes and thereby undermining effectiveness.

An additional difficulty for the Ataakura programme is that graduates are expected by some secondary school principals to teach not only Maori, but another subject as well. Why this should be so when there are few people trained to teach Maori, and almost none who are fluent in the language, remains an unanswered question. Several Ataakura graduates have been unable to find placement in South Island schools, and have had to relocate to the North Island to find teaching posts. (Kapa, 1990).

In addition to Te Ataakura, a shortened "Division K" course (normally two years full-time, or three years part-time) is available to kaiarahi reo who wish to obtain primary school teaching qualifications. The part-time option allows kaiarahi reo to retain their employment and salaries while they are training. "Division K" was inaugurated in 1989 and offers 25 places nationally (1990). However, courses are available only at three North Island Colleges of
Education. According to the South Island College of Education lecturer quoted above, "We haven't been able to do anything for kaiarahi reo. The Minister decided we don't have enough down here." (interview, Nov. 22, 1990).

The small numbers of kaiarahi reo admitted for bilingual teacher training and difficulties with Ataakura are especially worrying in light of Nancy Modiano's (1974) study which found that indigenous teachers who were familiar with tribal language and attendant nuances of tribal culture were much more successful than more highly qualified "outside" teachers in working in indigenous language programmes with Maya-Quiche Indian children. (p. 165). Spolsky (1977) also reports that "emphasis now [in bilingual education] is moving to teacher-training programs that do not break cultural ties and social attitudes." (p. 20: See also W. Holm, 1982).

In addition to Ataakura and kaiarahi reo training programmes, a one-year course in bilingual teaching methodology operates at Hamilton College of Education, offering places for a total of twelve practising primary, secondary and kindergarten teachers in 1991. (The Education Gazette, July 16, 1990). According to Carol Parker, New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI) President for 1990 - 1991, this is the only College of Education that is actually producing "qualified" teachers of Maori. (Maori Language Teachers, 1990). There is also an outpost component to this course, which seeks to recruit community members, such as those active in Kohanga Reo, as well as formally-trained personnel who wish to teach through the Maori language. (W. Houia, Seminar on Bilingual Education. Aranui Primary School, Christchurch, Nov., 1990). Intensive training is also offered by Auckland College of Education which, beginning in 1990, offers a three-year specialised training course (twelve places) in Kaupapa Maori teaching.

The Advanced Studies for Teachers Unit at Palmerston North College of Education offers several papers in conversational Maori, Maori language and
bilingual teaching methodology (Te Reo Maori) and offers an off-campus bilingual teacher training course in Napier for I2 trainees who are fluent speakers of Maori. A five-day Teachers Refresher Course for teachers in bilingual programmes or Kura Kaupapa Maori will be offered by the Ministry in 1991. (The Education Gazette, Sept. 14, 1990, p. 625).

That training for Maori language teaching is woefully inadequate, however, is demonstrated by the results of a 1990 survey conducted by the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) which show that only about one in three North Island Maori/English bilingual and immersion programme teachers is fluent in the Maori language and that many of these fluent teachers are older women nearing the end of their teaching careers. This study further revealed that although teachers who are not fluent may sometimes rely on kaiarahi reo and kaiawhina for support, 28% of surveyed schools operating bilingual or immersion programmes do so without the aid of either. As a result of this study, the NZEI has called for an increase in numbers of kaiarahi reo and for a reinstatement of total immersion courses for teachers as a short term solution to this problem. In the long term, the NZEI recommends that Colleges of Education be required to produce sufficient numbers of trained teachers who are fluent in Maori to ensure full staffing of bilingual and immersion classes. (NZEI Rourou, Oct. 26, 1990b. See also R. Benton, 1985a).

The lack of planning for Maori language teacher training which continues to plague the operations of bilingual and immersion programmes has been highlighted in a number of reports over the years. (See Literature Review, Chapter Two). Dick Grace, former Senior Executive Officer of the Maori and Islands Division of the Department of Education stated,

"In 1985 I wrote a paper asking that courses in teachers colleges for training bilingual staff be given priority. If we'd done that in 1986, we would have the teachers now." (interview, April 4, 1989).
The number of children currently engaged in Maori language education at all levels of the system, and particularly the large numbers of pre-schoolers attending Kohanga Reo, make it imperative that provision for training programmes receive top priority at colleges of education. If colleges are unable or unwilling to undertake this responsibility, then funds should be diverted to other institutions more capable of accomplishing this long-deferred task.

**Recruitment of Maori Teachers**: Recruitment campaigns are in operation which are directed at prospective Maori teacher training applicants and their communities and targets have been set to increase numbers of Maori primary school trainees. Nevertheless, both R. Walker (1987) and R. Benton (1988a) have pointed out that academic credentials, rather than maturity and motivation, are still the primary qualifications for entrance to colleges of education and this has served to disadvantage Maori candidates seeking to become teachers.

A North island bilingual teacher contacted during the present study expressed the belief that recruitment for Maori language teacher training programmes should be directed toward Maori applicants. Reasons given to support this position included that, in addition to the greater likelihood that these candidates would have at least some knowledge of and keen interest in te reo, only Maori people themselves have the wairua and community connections necessary to successfully implement educational programmes truly reflective of their own cultural values. (interview, May 30, 1989).

It must be kept in mind that admissions policies aimed at Maori applicants do not represent the beginnings of a racially discriminatory teaching service. Rather, they begin to redress the current proportional imbalance between Maori and non-Maori teaching staff which currently exists and signal an end to present de facto discrimination. (See J. Metge, quoted in He Huarahi, 1980, p. 70). At present, the New Zealand education system, "... is separatist in the
extreme because of its obvious, almost total bias toward the majority culture." (K.W.D. Grace, 1987b, p. 8).

**Material Resources for Maori Language Education:** Although the shortage of fluent Maori teachers is undoubtedly perceived by many as the greatest problem in the implementation of bilingual and immersion programmes, there is also a critical shortage of Maori language curriculum guides and learning materials. (See the Ministry of Education's *Corporate Plan*, 1990).

There are signs, however, that Learning Media, the section of the Ministry of Education responsible for producing school materials, is making some headway in its efforts to increase the number of Maori language publications and curriculum aids, although they still fall far short of English language resources. According to a South Island resource teacher of Maori, "You could safely say that less than 5% of classroom materials are written in the Maori language and this is probably a generous estimate." (interview, Feb. 15, 1991).

In 1990/91, Learning Media plans to assign just under $1 million (about 15% of its total budget, excluding staff time) to the production of Maori language resources. Learning Media employs three full-time Maori language editors, much of whose time is taken up with "commissioning and editorial demands", an editorial assistant, one art editor and several assistants, out of a total full-time equivalent staff of 57.

Teaching materials offered to schools include a recently published (1990) Maori language syllabus for use with all children in all primary schools, which is accompanied by a beginners Maori language course for teachers. Maori language is incorporated as an integral part of the range of Learning Media resources, for example, in page numbers in the mathematics texts and Maori
songs in recent music materials. There are also a few audio-cassettes, videos, picture packs and filmstrip materials available in the Maori language. Reading materials are primarily designed for beginning readers, but a few are geared toward older children.

Resource planning includes provision for 18 new reading titles a year (by 1992) with emphasis on increasing levels of difficulty. It is anticipated that the Ngata Dictionary will be published in 1991 along with glossaries for special subjects which are being developed with the Maori Language Commission. In addition, four anthologies of translations from School Journals are in preparation and expected to be in schools in early 1991.

Audio-visual production currently being researched include further readalongs from He Purapura readers, picture sets arranged around proverbs and three videos of Maori artists (all due late 1991 or 1992).

Learning Media reports experiencing difficulties in obtaining Maori language scripts, either original or translated, especially at an "advanced" level, i.e. above Standard Two level. One creative solution to this problem was a Learning Media-sponsored short story competition, which solicited new Maori language stories which could be incorporated into later publications.

Despite recent efforts, however, "... there is no doubt that there are inadequate materials for Maori language bilingual programmes." (B. Mabbett, personal correspondence). This shortage is exacerbated by the fact that teachers untrained in bilingual methodology may lack a full range of language development techniques necessary for the maximum utilization of materials which are produced. (Mabbett) There is also difficulty in the distribution of materials. Although Learning Media supplies most materials free of charge to schools with bilingual units which request them, these requests have sometimes not been forthcoming, even though a list of available titles appears

In addition to materials prepared by Learning Media, there are also a few commercially produced Maori language publications suitable for school use, although they tend to be limited in subject matter and reading levels. In addition, *Te Wahanga Kaupapa Maori* of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research has very limited resources 4 with which to create materials for Maori language education and has developed a computer network for the dissemination of information and promotion of Maori language classroom writing projects.

Overseas studies (Elley, 1991) show that "book floods" are highly effective means of promoting school children's acquisition of a second language. This is particularly the case when classrooms contain several hundred titles in the target language. Such an approach would hardly be feasible in New Zealand at present, however, given the dearth of Maori language materials. The paucity of printed resources should be of especial concern to Maori language planners if they are serious about promoting additive bilingualism, as it is highly unlikely that oral language alone will supply sufficient input to accomplish this task, especially as so few "bilingual" teachers are competent speakers of Maori and there is so little media promotion of Maori language.

**Conclusions**

There is no doubt that state support for Maori language education has increased somewhat over the last two decades. What must not be lost sight of,

---

4 *Te Wahanga Kaupapa Maori* is charged with a wide range of responsibilities for bilingual education which include research, curriculum- and materials-creation functions, as well as responsibilities relating to the dissemination of information to schools and communities. The unit relies on the services of one full-time and one part-time researcher.
however, is that practical support for bilingual and, especially, for immersion education, has been far less than that received by across-the-board Taha Maori programmes. For example, 10% of the Maori Language Factor funding is allocated for the specific benefit of Maori learners in total immersion situations, while 90% is bulk funded to Boards of Trustees. (Grace, 1991). However, because of failure to achieve systems-wide change, the quality of language education provided in bilingual programmes is questionable. The results of the NZEI survey cited above, for example, demonstrate that teacher training for Maori language education has been completely inadequate.

Although the infrastructure has been improved somewhat in recent years, especially in the area of materials creation, there is still a wide gap between the real and the ideal worlds of New Zealand bilingual education. The implementation of bilingual education necessitates a great deal of planning and resourcing of programmes at the macro-level (see Literature Review, Chapter One). This would include a carefully-thought-out system of goals, strategies, desired outcomes and methods of assessment, backed up by adequate personal and material resources. Without this support system in place, it is highly unlikely that programmes can fulfil the hopes with which they have been invested.

An examination of the macro-level provisions for the operations of bilingual programmes can leave little doubt that New Zealand initiatives to reinstate Maori as a language of school instruction are, in the words of one school inspector, "... still very much at the launching stage; the canoe isn't properly in the water yet." (personal communication, Aug., 9, 1989). As will be demonstrated in the micro-level chapters below, there is a fair amount of discouragement among professionals and non-professionals regarding the operations of Maori/English bilingual units. While participants are not cynical about bilingual classes per se, there is a great deal of cynicism directed toward
government agencies which have failed to "deliver the goods" for bilingual programmes.

**Macro-level Outcomes**

**Introduction**

Because of the operational constraints described above, it is impossible at present to evaluate in any comprehensive manner the outcomes of New Zealand bilingual programmes. At this point, it seems to make more sense to evaluate the school system's response to providing conditions which make bilingual education possible (see preceding "Operations" section), than to examine the outcomes of the programmes themselves, either individually or collectively. (R. Benton, 1985c). In the long term, it may be important to note Skutnabb-Kangas' (1981) injunction for the evaluation of outcomes:

> ... a good deal has been said about how minority children perform at school in linguistic and other tests, and so on. However, ... it makes much better sense to evaluate educational results in terms of parameters which measure results of social injustice: rates for suicide, crime, alcoholism, psychiatric difficulty, and unemployment. (p. 323).

Although this type of assessment would require a longitudinal research design spanning decades, rather than years, it is an approach which should be considered carefully.

**Positive and Negative Outcomes - Preliminary Conclusions**

Both short and long-term effects of Maori/English bilingual education remain, in general, unidentified, but several outcomes of state-sponsored bilingual programmes, both positive and negative, have come to light in the limited number of bilingual education studies which have been mounted. (See Wagemaker, 1988; Ohia, 1988; R. Benton, 1985b & 1989; Dow and Rolfe, 1983).
On the positive side, according to the studies listed above, there have been reports of increased satisfaction, both on the part of parents and older students, with school programmes where Maori language and culture form part of the curriculum. School staff have reported that Maori students enrolled in bilingual units tend to present fewer behaviour problems and better attitudes toward school and stay at school longer than do other Maori students. As well, there are suggestions that English language skills, contrary to the fears of some, are not endangered when pupils receive at least a portion of their instruction in Maori. There is also the positive, although very limited, effect of promoting the professional training and credentialing of Maori educators. For example, at the time of writing, 39 kaiarahi reo are engaged in teacher training.

On the negative side, however, although immersion programmes and bilingual schools staffed with fluent teachers of Maori may be "holding the line or increasing" the use of Maori, the many bilingual programmes which lack fluent teachers, are merely "token" efforts leading to "unsubstantial gains." (R. Benton, Seminar, Sept. 5, 1990, Education Department, University of Canterbury). Benton makes it plain that little else can be expected of programmes operated on "the cheap".

There are also indications that bilingual classes in state primary schools are failing to meet the linguistic, cultural or social needs of children entering them from Kohanga Reo. In the words of one South Island parent, "Bilingual units are falling down when it comes to carrying on from Kohanga Reo: where can an opening be found where both Maori and Pakeha can learn the two skills together?" The case was put more strongly by kaumatua Hohua Tutangaehie at a Community Forum, Rehua Marae, Christchurch, Dec. 7, 1990:

"Kohanga Reo dies at the Primary School gates ... ". 
Submissions from parents who attended this hui indicated that within weeks of entering school, Kohanga children start to lose confidence in themselves as learners and their acquired fluency in Maori begins to diminish, "because of the racism encountered there". Among these grieved and disaffected parents were some whose children were enrolled in state primary school bilingual classes.

**Potential Explanations**

Based on information gleaned from the Literature Review and from the macro-level data, several explanations for the school system's failure to provide continuation of the pre-school experiences of Kohanga Reo graduates, or to demonstrate clear benefits for Maori pupils, can be put forward at this point. Firstly, bilingual units are woefully under-resourced. Secondly, there are strong indications that the rationales for Kohanga Reo and the fundamental principles which underpin bilingual programmes may be very different (see Chapter Two for a discussion of the principles guiding Kohanga Reo). Thirdly, and most fundamentally, bilingual programmes are still firmly controlled - at all levels - by non-Maori. The empowerment of the Maori community which could have taken place along with the advent of bilingual education (see Cummins' empowerment theory, 1986a and 1986b) does not appear to have occurred. Simon (1986 and 1984) offers evidence that programmes of Maori language and culture may be accepted by school staff only insofar as their impact is minimal and the status of the "real" Pakeha culture remains unthreatened:

... it is clear that decisions in regard to the schooling of Maori children, ... remain firmly in Pakeha hands. Officers of Maori Education - just as the Maori teachers in the schools - may be heeded or ignored according to the perspectives and wishes of the Pakehas in authority. [This] reflects the power-deficiency of the Maori within New Zealand society as a whole. (Simon, 1986, p. 41).
Therefore, although a modicum of surface change has taken place in conjunction with the 20th century reintroduction of bilingual education, there have been no underlying and significant structural changes. In terms of curriculum content; classroom organization and management; peer group interaction and interaction between adults and children; assessment procedures; and above all, governance of programmes, state school bilingual units principally represent "sticking plaster" attempts to satisfy Maori needs. (G. H. Smith, 1990, p. 73).

Kohanga Reo, on the other hand, are radically different from mainstream preschool offerings, such as public kindergartens and Play Centre groups.

Kohanga Reo ... are not simply modifications of old ways of educating. ... They are significant innovations which represent a new conceptualisation of both the processes of education, as well as its institutional contexts. (K. Irwin, 1989, pp. 15-16).

Therefore, it is hardly surprising that a major outcome of bilingual programmes has been disappointment on the part of parents and community members who supported Kohanga Reo and who looked for a state school response which would provide a genuine alternative to mainstream, monocultural education. Graham Smith has noted with some irony that monoculturally-derived solutions to Maori children's problems tend to be viewed with much greater favour by non-Maori than by Maori. (1990, p. 73).

**Conclusions**

An examination of the slim body of data emanating from bilingual units regarding educational, and other, outcomes indicates that:

1. while compensatory goals, such as improved behaviour and longer retention at secondary school may result in some cases,
2. linguistic, cultural, social and political gains remain elusive.

A possible explanation for the failure of state programmes to adequately promote the enrichment rationales favoured by many members of the Maori community, and particularly those supportive of Kohanga Reo, is offered in Fishman (1985a). In this paper, Fishman questions why some community language schools in the United States are much more successful than others in promoting the intergenerational transmission of minority languages. He concludes that the answer is primarily social, rather than educational, in nature. According to Fishman, successful ethnic language schools serve minority communities which:

1. Maintain a separate identity, clearly distinguishable from that of the majority community and
2. Possess a degree of economic and political power of their own.

The "segregation" implied in the first qualification is, by and large, perceived as threatening by the New Zealand public and the New Zealand public educational system. This makes it very difficult for Maori to function as Maori in the public arenas of New Zealand life, although many have strongly resisted cultural assimilation. In regard to the second qualification, it must be noted that Maori are politically and economically marginalized within the larger society. Therefore, if Fishman is correct, significant social change, as well as educational change, will need to take place if the school system is to respond to demands for Maori autonomy and to succeed in promoting Maori language survival and revival.
Section 4

Micro-level Findings and Discussion

Chapter 6

Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For language maintenance and revival to succeed, there must be strong, practical and protracted commitment from both minority and majority speech communities.</td>
<td>What indications are there to show family and community support for the revitalization of the Maori language, in general, and the establishment of bilingual education, in particular?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, alone, cannot compensate for lack of linguistic vitality in the home and within the larger social milieu.</td>
<td>What factors appear to inhibit or constrain these activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The preceding section has presented a description and analysis of the macro-level contexts for New Zealand bilingual education. However, it must be kept in mind that the success or failure of national and regional bilingual education policy depends to a large extent on implementation within the contexts of individual schools and local communities, i.e. on micro-level factors.

The type of adaptations necessary and the ability to implement [bilingual education] policy depends on the social structure of the community, its language distribution pattern, the political and educational criteria of administrators, the attitude of the population and the motivation of parents. (Mackey, 1984, p. 163).
The present section presents and discusses findings garnered from case study research of six schools and school communities in order to supply sorely-needed New Zealand and, particularly, South Island data on what actually happens (and why it happens) within schools and school districts which engage in bilingual education. The study focused on six state primary schools which have implemented "official" bilingual programmes (see Table 6.1) staffed by a kaiarahi reo, who possesses a Tohu Maatauranga certificate signifying marae-attested competency in Maori language and culture, and a state qualified associate teacher, who was typically both monolingual and monocultural. These six programmes were all located within "mainstream" full or contributing state primary schools and, typically, expanded from lower to higher grades as the whanau children advanced through primary school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>350-399</td>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*N.E. -Std 4</td>
<td>60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>300-349</td>
<td>5-9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.E. -Std 3**</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>35-39%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.E. -Std 4</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>35-39%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.E. -Std 4</td>
<td>60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.E. -Std 2**</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>5-9%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New Entrants
** Plans to extend to St. 4

*** Not applicable. Kaiarahi reo works with Maori and other interested pupils throughout school.

This section not only describes local findings, but also interprets the reported data within the framework of research and theory detailed in the Literature
Review chapters. Further, this section looks to the macro-level findings presented above for analytical and explanatory elucidation. Therefore, the objectives of this section, on the one hand, exploratory and descriptive, and on the other, conceptual and analytic, are to create links between (1) the insights gleaned from an examination of theories, models and principles discussed in the Literature Review; (2) the explanatory potential of macro-level analysis; and (3) the in-depth, situational knowledge afforded by case study research methodology. It is hoped that, in this way, this section can provide more than a merely "journalistic" account of the programmes under consideration.

Macro-level findings have been included as an essential portion of this research study because they help avoid what Lofland (in Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p. 182) refers to as the "analysis interruptus", to which ethnography is prone (that is, analysis which fails to reach a logical climax or conclusion). In like fashion, context-specific micro-level data is also crucial to the formation of a concrete, as opposed to abstract, understanding of New Zealand bilingual education and offers, in its turn, a powerful explanatory tool with which to make sense of national and regional phenomena.

Aims and Procedures

The present section is designed to identify and interpret both common patterns of development and the exceptional strengths and weaknesses of the six bilingual programmes under study, utilizing, as do the preceding chapters, the framework provided by Spolsky's theoretical model. The direction for the description and analysis presented here has been guided by the focal questions presented at the head of each chapter. In order to accomplish these aims, the section draws frequently on the perceptions of various participants, revealed in survey and interview data, as well as on
recordings of observed patterns of interaction between various individuals and groups. Mention is also made of physical evidence (Maori language resources, for example) and documentary material (for instance, School Charters).

The basic problem encountered in this multi-site case study was to capture the uniqueness of each of the six schools, while presenting a collective picture - and, at the same time, to avoid repetitive detail and excessive length. Although no ideal solution to this dilemma presented itself, a compromise was reached, whereby a collective picture of the overall situations, rationales, operations and outcomes is presented as well as a discussion of unique features, briefly, and only when they seem to contribute to an overall understanding of the general situation.

It was the original intention of the researcher to identify each school with a pseudonym, so that the reader could readily distinguish between sites. In the interests of ensuring maximum confidentiality, however, this plan was discarded. To further ensure confidentiality, although school data presented in tables located throughout this section refer to schools by number, a specific number does not always correspond to the same school.

Types of Schools and School Communities: - As can be readily apprehended from the data presented in Table 6.1, the size and location of the six schools under study varied considerably. The study included small urban and rural schools, as well as larger schools situated in major urban centres. There was also considerable variation in the social, cultural, and economic make up of the school communities. Statistics compiled by school administrators indicate that in all communities, Pakeha families predominated and that the Maori school enrolment ranged from approximately 10% to 40% of the school rolls.
In some schools there were small numbers of children for whom English was a second language: typically, these children’s families had immigrated from South East Asian or Pacific Island nations. Pacific Island children, many of whom were born in New Zealand, made up 20% of the roll at one of the urban schools under study. At another urban school, the principal reported that recently-arrived Cambodian families, whose children made up nearly 9% of the roll at his school, were gradually replacing Maori and Pacific Island families in his school district. However, in one district, there had been a considerable increase in the number of Maori families, many of whom had recently relocated from the North Island.

In addition to serving populations of heterogeneous, and, at times, fluctuating ethnicity, the six schools under consideration also served a variety of socio-economic groups. Three of the urban schools were located in communities characterized by a high proportion of state housing, a high percentage of solo parents (70% at one school) and a relatively high number of low or low-to-average income earners. The Charter of one of these schools notes that there were a number of constraints on school operations, including high staff turnover, inability to generate locally raised funds and a lack of facilities and equipment generally available to other schools located in the same city. At a second of these schools, the principal reported that, "the main concern of people in this area is coping with life."

It is not the case, however, that all of the schools involved in this study were located in disadvantaged areas. A third city school was situated in a mixed housing area, drawing on a community where approximately 50% of the families earned more than $20,000 per annum, but where others were considerably less well-off. The fifth urban school drew children from a wide geographic area and from a diverse socio-economic population, approximately representative of the New Zealand population as a whole. Because of the mixture of socio-economic groups, the principal of this school
reported that a certain "minor amount of stratification" existed within the school.

The one rural school under consideration in this study was located in a somewhat sparsely-populated valley and coastal region where school parents were chiefly employed in horticultural, agricultural, fisheries and tourism-related occupations. These parents worked in a variety of capacities, some as business or trades people, and others as orchardists, artisans or farmers. Families tended to fall into several identifiable subcategories, including those from a pacifist commune, several religious groups, those pursuing alternative life styles, and also a small group of parents who wanted their children to develop knowledge of Maori culture.

It may be concluded from the situational factors described above that South Island Maori/English bilingual units did not, overall, suffer from the "ghettoization" characteristic of many Hispanic bilingual programmes in the United States and some bilingual programmes in the North Island. Although several programmes under study were located in "underprivileged" areas with high concentrations of Maori and other ethnic minority populations, others programmes were sited in "better" areas where middle class non-Maori families overwhelmingly predominated.
As can be seen in Table 6.2, within whanau classes there was also an ethnic mixture of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Non Maori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1**</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures from: Annual Return Of Primary and Intermediate Schools, National Summary of Primary Schools with Bilingual Education Units and Pupils, 1 July, 1990.

** No separate whanau class at this school.

Because of the large amount of missing data on Parents' Questionnaire items referring to socio-economic status (SES) and also because some schools did not maintain records of parents' employment, it was impossible to accurately categorise the socio-economic backgrounds of whanau students. Nevertheless, there was ample evidence to suggest that pupils from a wide variety of backgrounds were enrolled in the programmes under study. At one school, for example, (which did have a high rate of return for parent questionnaires [69%] and between 3 to 8 missing cases out of a total of 24 responses on items relating to parents' SES) parents reported that 54% of fathers and 40% of mothers held university degrees, and that 38% of fathers either operated their own businesses or worked as foremen or managers. Forty-six percent of these fathers fell into the highest SES category of the most recent Elley/Irving scale. Typically however, pupils who were enrolled in the six programmes under study appeared to come from families of somewhat lower SES levels. For example, at one school with a 72% return
rate for the Parents" Questionnaire (but with up to 65% missing cases on items relating to parents' SES) no parents reported holding any tertiary qualifications, and 38% of the responding fathers were unemployed.

This integrated situation, whereby at least one bilingual programme under study catered to more affluent, majority group students, had both advantages and disadvantages for bilingual education. On the one hand, they indicated an encouragingly broad base of community support for Maori language education. On the other hand, however, there was a danger that programmes geared towards both minority and majority students, viewed as an attractive, enrichment "extra", would not provide the high concentration of effort required for successful language revitalization.

A further problem, reflective of inequities within New Zealand as a whole, is that where Maori families did make up a substantial and, most often, economically disadvantaged, segment of the school community, they often lacked the political cohesion and strength to effect significant impact on school policy. In two cases, no Maori were elected to Boards of Trustees because several candidates were put forward by different Maori community factions and, therefore, the Maori vote was split. (Principal interview data). Although within each school area there may have been individuals or groups of Maori who lobbied forcefully for significant educational transformation through the adoption of bilingual, bicultural education, those who maintained strong positions were sometimes denigrated by school staff and community members as "radicals". As one resource teacher of Maori noted, "When Maori people try to do something for themselves, they're labelled 'activists' ", and, as such, are ignored by the educational establishment.
Viability of Maori Language and Culture

**Demographics:** The fact that Maori living in the South Island comprise only about 10% of the total New Zealand Maori population had important implications for the functioning of bilingual units, as will be demonstrated in the Operations section below. In none of the schools under study did Maori children make up a majority of school enrolment and at some schools the number of these children was very low. It is important to note that numbers of children who had received Kohanga Reo pre-school exposure to Maori language and culture was far lower than the total number of Maori children enrolled in the bilingual units under study (see Figure 6.1). According to national survey data supplied in the Annual Return of Primary and Intermediate Schools, July 1, 1990*, (which reported on six schools and was therefore more complete than Parent Questionnaire data which collected information on only four sites) approximately 46% of the total number of whanau class students in the six schools under study had had Kohanga Reo experience. This created difficulties in organizing school programmes to cater to the specific needs of Kohanga Reo children.
Community attitudes: Interview data gathered from parents and resource teachers of Maori presented a precarious picture of Maori language vitality in the local communities involved in the study. Nevertheless, two sources indicated that although, locally, there had been considerable loss of Maori language, there was a resurgence of interest among Maori folk, especially following the increased awareness of Maori language and culture generated by the Te Maori exhibit during the mid-1980s. Observations of local community involvement in Kohanga Reo and in the bilingual classes confirmed that in each of the communities there was at least some evidence of local Maori support for rejuvenation of the language and in some cases this support was extensive, including at one site a marae-sponsored Ataarangi course. In each community there appeared to be a core group of Maori determined that their language and culture would not die out. However, there were also occasional reports that some Maori did not "want to know" about anything concerning the language.
Overall, community attitudes toward the Maori language were reported by parents of bilingual class pupils (see Table 6.3) to be relatively favourable. Eighty percent of the parents in all four schools where Parents' Questionnaires were distributed who responded to question # 7d indicated that the Maori language was at least "somewhat" important to people in their school districts, while only 20% reported that the language was seen to be "unimportant" or "not very important". There were considerable differences among schools on this question, with a range of from 61% to 100% of parents reporting that the language was perceived to be at least "somewhat" important. There were also significant differences between the responses of Kohanga and non-Kohanga parents.

Not surprisingly, a number of comments offered by parents showed that within each community there was a broad spectrum of opinion on this subject. These comments may be summed up in the following response from one parent:
"[The Maori language is] extremely important for some and not very important for others."

These findings appear to show somewhat more positive attitudes toward Maori language than was indicated by the Massey University attitude survey (reported in Chapter Four), which employed a representative sampling of the New Zealand population as a whole, but there are at least two possible explanations which could account for this difference.

1. It is probable that responses from Kohanga Reo parents (N=22) biased the present study's findings, as they would be far more likely than non-Kohanga parents (N=38) to associate with people who held favourable attitudes to Maori language.

2. It may also be the case that the bilingual school programmes were located in areas where relatively favourable attitudes toward Maori language already existed or that Maori language school programmes raised community perceptions about the importance of Maori language.

The present findings do, however, fall in line with the findings of the Royal Commission on Social Policy (Wylie, 1988) which demonstrate, at least among Maori people, strong affirmation of the importance of Maori language.

**Institutional Support:** - In each school community under study there were pools of institutional support for Maori language and culture, including Kohanga Reo and marae, as well as university, polytechnic, and perhaps, college of education and school day and evening classes offering courses in tikanga and te reo Maori. The amount and quality of this support differed considerably from district to district. In one instance, three fully-functioning Kohanga Reo fed children into the school's bilingual unit. At another site, however, the kaiarahi reo stated that the local Kohanga, severely under-resourced and under-utilized (three children), was characterized by personality conflict, high tutor turnover and little Maori
language. Interviews with local participants also indicated that although some marae whanau were highly motivated and had retained the language, at least one other whanau was "struggling" to re-establish itself.

With one exception, all bilingual units under study were the only primary school programmes of their type offered in their local municipal or rural districts. Although there were no intermediate school programmes mentioned by participants in any of the areas, in three other cases participants noted that networks had been formed between high school bilingual programmes and the primary school bilingual whanau.

**Integration with Kohanga Reo:** - In all but two cases, there was some on-going communication established between the bilingual units and the local Kohanga. In several instances, there was extensive contact, involving several visits each week, when, for example, Kohanga and bilingual unit children went swimming together or where Kohanga children approaching their fifth birthdays spent time in the bilingual unit to familiarize themselves with the school whanau and school routine. One school under study had a Kohanga Reo on site, housed within a previously unused temporary classroom, and several children remained with that Kohanga whanau beyond the normal school entry age.

**School Contact with Local Marae:** - Contact between the bilingual units and local marae, although tenuous at best in one case, was very well established in the other five areas. One kaiarahi reo reported that as whanau children become aware of protocol, they were often asked by Kaumatua to say grace or to karakia at the marae. In another community, the marae located nearest to the bilingual unit had appointed an educational sub-committee which worked closely with the school, and which had requested and been granted leave to appoint a Board of Trustee member. In
the majority of cases, local marae members served on selection panels for kiaiarahe reo.

**Children's Contact with Maori Language in the Community:**

Based on Parent Questionnaire responses (item #8) which requested information on children's contact with the Maori language, the following picture emerges of the types and frequencies of extracurricular contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.4: FREQUENCY OF MAORI LANGUAGE CONTACT OUTSIDE OF CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Questionnaire, Item # 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes how often your child or children enrolled in the bilingual class have contact with the Maori language outside of class.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 almost never</th>
<th>2 less than once a month</th>
<th>3 at least once a month</th>
<th>4 at least once a fortnight</th>
<th>5 at least once a week</th>
<th>6 almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hears Maori spoken at home by parents</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hears other Maori-speaking relatives or friends</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches Maori language TV</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends culture club</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads Maori books</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Marae functions</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other contacts?</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of responses to the Parents Questionnaire (item #8) indicated that there was a wide range of frequency and types of Maori language contact to which bilingual class children were exposed. Combining the most frequent categories, 4 - 6, the types of contact most frequently reported, from most to least frequent, were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watches Maori language TV.</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hears Maori spoken at home by parents.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hears other Maori speaking relatives.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads Maori language books.</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends culture club.</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends marae functions.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most interesting trend which emerges from analysis of data in Table 6.4 is that there was a bimodal distribution of responses. For each item, approximately 40-60% of all respondents indicated that their children had almost no extracurricular Maori language contact, while approximately 25 -45% had such contact at least once a week. The middle categories of frequency of contact were rarely selected, with the one exception of "attends Marae functions" where 25% of respondents reported that children attended less than once a month.
An examination of responses given by Kohanga (N=22) and non-Kohanga (N=38) parents (see Table 6.5) offers a clear explanation of this bimodal trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Contact</th>
<th>Kohanga Mean*</th>
<th>Non-Kohanga Mean*</th>
<th>Level of difference**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hears parents speak Maori</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hears other Maori speaking relatives or friends</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches Maori language TV</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends culture club</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads Maori books</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Marae functions</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contacts</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** t- test analysis

In almost all cases, parents reported that children who had been actively involved in Kohanga Reo had significantly more frequent and different types of extracurricular contact with Maori language than did children who had not had extensive Kohanga experience. Interestingly, the only variable on which there were no significant contact frequency differences reported between Kohanga and non-Kohanga children was that of Maori language TV. It is highly probable that this is because television is the one type of contact to which almost all children have equal access.
Interviews with several parents indicated that if more Maori language books had been available with English translations and Maori pronunciation guides, then they would have been keen to read these books with their children at home.

**Community and School Staff Reaction to the Bilingual Programmes**

According to responses to the Principals Questionnaire (item #17), community reaction to the bilingual programmes established at each school was, generally, neutral or "somewhat favourable".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Very Favourable</th>
<th>Somewhat Favourable</th>
<th>Neither Favourable nor Unfavourable</th>
<th>Somewhat Unfavourable</th>
<th>Very Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, no principal indicated that his school's bilingual programme had met with a "very favourable" response and there were some indications of suspicion or uneasiness regarding the units. Principals' comments in relation to the issue of community response to the establishment of bilingual programmes included:

"[The bilingual class] has potential - mostly beyond the school's power to change - to be divisive."

"[Reaction] varies among various groups, but I feel they think it is good for the Maori people, although out of school
behaviour [of some whanau children] has tended to make some parents rethink the wisdom of the idea."

"Little comment from parents, probably satisfied. Also satisfies those who don't want any Maori language."

Based on coded questionnaire responses, (Principals Questionnaire, item #16; Kaiarahi Reo Questionnaire, item #18; Teachers Questionnaire, item #17) there was also a neutral or fairly favourable response to the establishment of bilingual units among staff members of schools where these units were housed (see Table 6.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff reactions assessed by:</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Neither favourable nor unfavourable</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teachers</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi reo</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questionnaires completed by associate teachers of whanau classes typically indicated that their bilingual units met with, "neither favourable nor unfavourable" or "somewhat favourable" reaction from school staff members. No associate teacher reported that the classes met with "very favourable" or "very unfavourable or indifferent" reactions.

At two schools, kaiarahi reo reported a "somewhat unfavourable "reaction on the part of the school staff to the bilingual units in their schools. Interestingly, there was only one staff questionnaire response, from a kaiarahi reo, which indicated a "very favourable" reaction on the part of school staff. This exceptional response may be explained by the fact that at this particular school there was no separate bilingual or whanau class, but
rather the kaiarahi worked with three junior teachers in their classrooms. The kaiarahi reo at this site stated that:

"Maori children do well at this school and this continues at high school where the Pakeha principal is bilingual and supportive of taha maori."

Interview data revealed that this unique arrangement, whereby the kaiarahi reo worked in all junior classrooms rather than in a separately established whanau unit, apparently suited all concerned at the school. However, this unique utilisation of the kaiarahi reo's time and effort met with a very critical response from Maori and Island Division officials, who felt it was not in line with established policy and would not promote bilingual competence or provide the concentrated support for Kohanga Reo children which was envisaged when kaiarahi reo were introduced into schools.

**Resistance to Change:** - Although coded questionnaire responses indicated a generally middle-of-the-road or mildly positive reaction to locally established bilingual programmes, interview data painted a somewhat more sombre picture: in each of the six schools there were strong indications that some community and school staff members were actively hostile toward the schools' bilingual units. Furthermore, there were indications that this hostility had imposed significant constraints on the operations of whanau programmes. A resource teacher of Maori, discussing his impressions of the several South Island bilingual programmes with which he had been in contact stated:

"There's always negativity - one unit trying to struggle along in an institution that doesn't really want it. Even if the principal's keen, you have to battle against staff. It only takes a handful of teachers or parents who are outspoken coming to the principal or teacher to make them slow down or stop."
Several principals reported that they were in a sort of tight rope situation vis-
a-vis local communities over equity issues in general and their schools'
linguistic programmes in particular. In order to cope with the dissension
that appeared to stem from the implementation of bilingual education at his
school, one principal stated that while he avoids conflict situations with
antagonists, he does so without "caving in". This principal noted that while
some Board of Trustee members were highly supportive of the school
whanau and te reo Maori, other members were, "highly antagonistic",
although their arguments "weren't logical". He further reported that a few
parents withdrew their children from his school because of the
establishment of the whanau class, "especially certain religious groups."
(interview data).

An associate teacher at another school, who had (unsuccessfully) circulated
a list of candidates for Board of Trustee election who were favourably
disposed to the bilingual unit, reported that the Board which was elected was
"very weak" on bicultural and multicultural issues, concentrating its
support on "tolerance" for all ethnic groups.

One kaiarahi reo who was voted onto her school's Board of Trustees stated
that she had worked, "sensitively through the anti-taha Maori feeling" in
her community, especially among members of a religious group which
"objected to Maori 'myths and gods' ", which were perceived to present
"threats" to Christian theology. Once again, the situation at this particular
school, where there is no separately established whanau unit, appeared to
have been strongly influenced by the necessity to placate negative
community attitudes.
At another site, the kaiarahi reo serving on the Board of Trustees described:

"... a lack of understanding [on the part of Board members] of the importance of Maori. They just don't get it. They see it as another minor subject, like art. There's quite a bit of opposition, although they indulge us because they know we want it."

Associate teacher comments frequently, as may be expected, revealed considerable differences among the reactions of individual staff members:

"Mixed, generally not unfavourable."

A second associate teacher reporting mixed reaction commented:

"Some are exceedingly interested and supportive, others are indifferent or quite negative. I feel it would have been a valuable exercise to discuss the setting up of the bilingual unit with the staff before it happened. Any fears or concerns could have been aired or discussed, instead of occasionally running into a brick wall now."

Echoing this statement regarding friction resulting from lack of communication over the establishment of bilingual units, a parent at another school stated her opinion that negative reception of the bilingual unit resulted from:

"... the underhanded way it was instigated. That started the ball rolling."

One associate teacher who commented on a negative staff reaction by some colleagues taught at a school which had, in previous years, been beset with community and school controversy which nearly led to the closure of the whanau unit. A resource teacher of Maori assigned to this school stated that the controversy centred around, "the special treatment" of whanau children, in that there was a kaiarahi reo working alongside the class teacher, small numbers of students (19) and special funding for the setting up of the bilingual class.
Although the situation at this school was certainly more inflammatory than most, the whanau here was hardly unique in eliciting negative staff reaction to what were perceived as "extra privileges" accorded to bilingual units. In all but one case (where there was no separate whanau unit) associate teachers and/or kaiarahi reo stated, in unsolicited statements during unstructured interviews, that at least some other teachers were "envious and watchful" about the "extras" given to whanau classes. One associate teacher reported that other teachers were unaware that the kaiarahi reo could not, according to policy stipulations, serve as a reliever in the whanau classroom, but must always work under the supervision of the associate teacher:

"If there's any release time available, I don't get it because [they think] there are two adults [a teacher and a kaiarahi reo] in the [whanau] room. [But] I don't use the kaiarahi to release me, as I don't feel it's her role."

Additionally, interviews with staff (kaiarahi reo, principals, associate teachers and resource teachers) at four of the six schools revealed a concern on the part of some staff about a "gang" situation resulting from the establishment of a whanau unit. This concern was expressed at schools with both relatively low and relatively high numbers of Maori students in both the general school and bilingual unit populations. Two possible explanations for these concerns may be (1) negative media stereotyping (see McGregor, 1991) and (2) that in at least one school where such concern was expressed, whanau class children appeared to have been the subjects of playground abuse from children in other classes. One kaiarahi reo, at the relatively affluent school where the principal reported a certain amount of social "stratification", stated:

"I think our kids get quite a bit of abuse in school. It's, 'Oh, you're in that Maori thing.' I have heard our children called 'niggers'."
In one case, whanau children had been criticised by school staff, according to the kaiarahi reo and the associate teacher, for being overly confident about their leadership roles within the school as a whole. Ironically, at this same site, both the kaiarahi reo and the associate teacher indicated that they felt under pressure from other teachers who remained unconvinced of the merits of bilingual education, especially for children thought to be already at risk educationally. These sources indicated that parents were led to believe that they had to make a choice between the bilingual class and academic advancement for their children.

"Teachers feel that children who aren't familiar with [English language] nursery rhymes are 'culturally deprived', but they forget about Maori learning games, myths, and stories." (kaiarahi reo).

At the single site where negative staff criticism of the bilingual unit appeared to have been effectively neutralized, several unique conditions obtained. The associate teacher was also a well-respected Senior Teacher and the leader of the junior school syndicate and had previously been involved in team teaching with non-whanau staff. She was also a former resource teacher of Maori and an articulate advocate for bilingual education who served on the evaluation committee for the Maori language draft syllabus and had involved her school in the trialling of this syllabus. With one exception, all staff members of this school attended weekly classes run by the associate teacher in order to develop skills in Taha Maori and enhance opportunities to successfully implement the draft syllabus. Also, the kaiarahi reo at this school was a mature woman held in high regard by the Maori community of her district who had had considerable experience working with Taha Maori in school situations. Therefore, unlike most other kaiarahi reo, she was familiar with school routines, procedures and teaching behaviours before she began her work.
This exceptional case indicated that it appeared to take a considerable amount of expertise, experience and mana in order for bilingual staff to advocate effectively for their programmes (see reference to tutors as advocates for Reading Recovery programmes in Clay, 1987). In many other cases, the associate teachers were first-year appointees who were only just feeling their way into the profession and into their schools and who were completely unfamiliar with bilingual methodology. In most other cases, as well, kaiarahi reo began their assignments with no prior training or experience in classroom management (although most of them had had Kohanga Reo experience), which left them at a considerable disadvantage in promoting the benefits of bilingual education to more experienced and "better qualified" staff members.

Integration of the Whanau Unit within the Host School: - Although there have been references throughout this section to "separate" bilingual or whanau units, in all cases under study the bilingual classes were highly integrated, in both physical and operational terms, with the rest of the schools in which they were located. Whanau classrooms, (which were were in some cases separated from each other if there were two at a school) were located within "mainstream" classroom blocks. Whanau and non-whanau children shared common play areas and play times and whanau children regularly attended classes in reading and mathematics, for example, with non-whanau peers. Overall, the content of the bilingual curriculum matched and co-ordinated with that of other junior classrooms. In addition, whanau children participated in syndicate and school-wide assemblies and sports activities on a regular basis. At two schools there were active culture clubs attended by both whanau and non-whanau children.

In all instances, children enrolled in classes throughout the schools under study received at least some exposure to Maori language and culture, and frequently resource teachers and, to a lesser extent, kaiarahi reo assisted
other staff members to develop skills in these areas. At one school, each staff meeting commenced with a short Maori language lesson. In five out of six cases, there were Maori language signs and posters displayed in public areas of the school. At one site, however, where controversy over the whanau unit had been most vituperative, a Maori language poster was observed only in the principal's office.

Without exception, field notes and interview data recorded that principals supported, and in most instances took pains to ensure, that bilingual units would not form a separate "segregated" enclave within the larger school. Almost certainly, these steps were taken in order to avoid resistance to the bilingual units. In fact, at one site, the principal instituted vertical "whanau" grouping throughout the school, chiefly so that the whanau class would not "stand out" as different. Avoidance of difference was also mentioned by a resource teacher of Maori at another location, who observed that, reflective of the "one nation" theme, "most teachers are committed to treating all children 'the same', mostly how they treat their own children."

It is important to observe, at this point, that majority cultural attitudes in New Zealand strongly favour assimilationist, as opposed to pluralistic, patterns of social organization. (See Chapter Four). Assimilationist preference on the part of school teachers and administrators has also been well documented (see Simon, 1986) and therefore it is not surprising that such attitudes appeared with some frequency in the survey and interview data presented here.

Both Kohanga and non-Kohanga parents (Parent Questionnaire, item #4) tended to reject the suggestion that the whanau classes should have less contact with the rest of the school. This is an indication that parents, like principals, favoured the integration of whanau classes within the mainstream schools.
It is not to be assumed, however, that all key participants viewed the close integration of bilingual classes and host schools as desirable policy or practice. One kaiarahi reo was highly critical of the monocultural educational structures within which the bilingual unit at her school functioned. Mandatory whanau class participation in the junior syndicate was seen by this informant as highly problematic, as this co-operative organizational structure made it very difficult for her to maintain preferred whanau practices, such as tuakana/teina "buddy learning" relationships, or to promote continuity of Maori language instruction. As whanau children were constantly "to-ing and fro-ing" to other (monolingual) classrooms this increased the pressure to use English. At a second site, a mother whose children were enrolled in in the bilingual class suggested that she, and other parents, would be more involved in the everyday functioning of the class if there were separate facilities and space for whanau parents to congregate for mutual support and to discuss a range of issues of mutual concern, as was their habit at Kohanga Reo. In another case, the associate teacher adamantly refused, to the detriment of cordial relationships with other teachers, to compromise her programme in order to conform to syndicate expectations. For example, she always began the school day for her children with karakia and himene, even if this meant missing a morning assembly attended by other junior classes. (During the period of contact following the main data collection phase of this study, it was revealed that this associate teacher had resigned her position.) That whanau children, who tended to associate with each other outside of class (field observation data), were sometimes at risk of playground name-calling and bullying or of being labelled "gangs" (see above, this section), have been mentioned as further inducements for providing separate educational facilities.
Reaction to Proposed Alternatives: - Related to the issue of integration of whanau units within host schools is the issue of providing separate educational facilities promoting Maori language and culture outside of the mainstream state educational system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.8: REACTION TO KURA KAUPAPA MAORI (separate Maori language schools.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi Reo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanga Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kohanga Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 6.8, survey responses (Principals Questionnaire, item #19) gauging principals reactions to separate Kura Kaupapa Maori revealed that four out of the six principals either did not respond to this question (although there was almost no other missing data on these questionnaires) or stated that they were not "sure" or had "limited knowledge" of this type of education. The two who did respond, however, commented unfavourably on the "separatist" nature of kaupapa Maori schooling:

"Let's learn as one people - we're all New Zealanders."

One of these respondents voiced the opinion that, "What is wanted in nga Kura Kaupapa could be easily handled in the school system." In fact, this principal, influenced by a strong group of Maori women in his community, had gone to exceptional lengths to develop plans to ensure that his school would accommodate parental and community demands for the provision of
a Maori language immersion programme for children of parents who were desirous of such an alternative. (Field observation data).

More favourable reaction to Kura Kaupapa Maori was indicated by associate teachers (Teachers’ Questionnaire, item # 21) and especially by kaiarahi reo (Questionnaire, item # 22), whose responses were unanimously favourable. There was a sharply divided response to the question (item # 4) eliciting parental reaction to a separate Maori language school, with Kohanga parents generally expressing more positive attitudes toward this option than did non-Kohanga parents. Groups most favourable to Kura Kaupapa Maori were kaiarahi reo, then associate teachers, then Kohanga parents (whose responses tended to be bimodal). (Table 6.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.9: REACTION TO TOTAL MAORI IMMERSION EDUCATION.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable  Not Sure/No Response  Unfavourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%         17%           66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teachers  100%        -            -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi Reo   100%          -            -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in Table 6.9, principals (Questionnaire item #19) tended to express negative views about immersion education. The one principal who indicated a favourable reaction stated that immersion was unfeasible at his school because they lacked a fluent Maori-speaking teacher. In sharp contrast to principals' reactions, however, both associate teachers and kaiarahi reo (Questionnaire items # 21 and 22) universally expressed support for Maori language immersion programmes. Parents' questionnaires did not contain a separate item on immersion education.
Summary

1. Clearly, the issues of Maori "segregation" and "New Zealand apartheid", which have struck strong emotional chords throughout the country, have had an impact on the thinking and behaviour of school personnel engaged in the bilingual education programmes under study. They also appeared to have had a significant (constraining) impact on the development of these programmes.

Related to this issue, there were divided participant responses to Questionnaire items regarding Kura Kaupapa Maori (separate Maori language schools). All kaiarahi reo and approximately half of both associate teachers and Kohanga parents favoured this option: no principal and few non-Kohanga parents expressed support.

There was also a divided response to questions regarding Maori language immersion education. All associate teachers and kaiarahi reo, but only one principal, favoured this alternative.

2. In addition to controversy within schools regarding "segregation" issues, other constraining influences on the programmes under study were the negative reactions on the part of individuals and groups within the local communities which tended to put advocates for bilingual education in a defensive position. Certain religious groups appeared to have been particularly antagonistic to the establishment of whanau programmes and, while it is difficult to gauge exactly how much effect they have had on the operations of the programmes, their opposition must surely have influenced attitudes within the communities and schools to some extent.

3. Additionally, while there was evidence of some good will toward the whanau programmes on the part of school staff, there were indications at each of the school sites that some staff members were envious of perceived "perquisites" accorded to whanau teachers and children, such as the assistance provided by the kaiarahi reo, smaller class sizes and "extra" funds and materials.

4. While there was considerable resistance to the introduction of bilingual, bicultural change in the schools under study, strategies to counteract this resistance seem to have been limited to principals' efforts to "integrate" the bilingual programmes in such a way that their impact on the rest of the school would be minimal and that differences between bilingual classes and other classes would be minimized as well. Managed in this way, it apparently was hoped that the new programmes would present little or no perceived threat to existing values, systems and social relationships.
5. There were no indications that resistance to change within the schools and school communities under study had been met with well-planned, cohesive, and empowering efforts to familiarize staff and community members with the goals and operations of bilingual programmes. Neither were parents or other participants informed of the benefits which have been demonstrated to accrue to minority- and majority-culture children who receive a competently-planned and carefully-implemented bilingual education. Poor management of change resulted in a great deal of suspicion and apprehension regarding the bilingual units which may otherwise have been averted.

Despite these constraints, there were other, more auspicious, signs which generally augured well for the successful outcomes of the programmes under discussion:

1. There was some evidence of linguistic vitality in the home and community in each of the six areas. Many bilingual class pupils had regular extra-curricular contact with Maori language in a number of functional contexts, often in the home, where parents, relatives and friends furnished this contact. Maori language television has been identified as a further important means of Maori language input for both Kohanga and non-Kohanga children. Typically, however, bilingual class children who had attended Kohanga Reo had significantly more frequent and more varied contact with the Maori language than did their whanau classmates who had little or no Kohanga Reo experience.

2. The bilingual units under consideration did not exist solely to serve "underprivileged" Maori children. One half of the schools contacted in this study were located in socioeconomically mixed areas, overwhelmingly populated by the majority language and cultural group. Limited data also suggested that bilingual class whanau were also a mixed group, in terms of parents' reported education and employment levels, and that programmes served both Maori and non-Maori pupils. Therefore, it may be concluded that bilingual programmes received at least some support from the majority community, as well as support from the minority Maori population, who have spearheaded the Maori language revival movement and who have been responsible for the initiation and spread of one very effective community resource for Maori language - Kohanga Reo.
Chapter 7

Micro-Level Findings and Discussion

Rationales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUE</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are strong indications that the operations and outcomes of bilingual programmes are closely related to their stated and unstated rationales.</td>
<td>What are the stated and implied rationales of the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there general agreement amongst the various groups involved with the programmes, regarding basic goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given the limited available resources and constraints under which the programmes operate, are the goals feasible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

As the operations and outcomes of bilingual programmes are inextricably linked to and determined by the rationales under which they have been established (Spolsky, 1978; Fishman, 1976; Wong Fillmore and Valadez, 1986) and as, at the macro-level, there is clearly demonstrated conflict between compensatory, language maintenance and enrichment goals, it is important to include in this formative evaluation of six bilingual units a thorough discussion of the micro-level rationales, both expressed and implied.

"Evaluation should begin with the question, 'What did the programme set out to accomplish?'". (Macnamara, in Mackey, 1977, p. 232).

Overview

Within each school, observational, interview and questionnaire survey data revealed a plethora of principles and underlying goals (rationales) for
bilingual education. However, in all cases but one, where a preliminary policy for the whanau unit had been proposed, rationales had not been organized or prioritized, and, without exception, there had been no assessment of goal feasibility. In all cases, as indicated by observational and interview data, the bilingual units under study lacked specific and detailed strategies to implement their goals. Moreover, since clear understanding of basic aims and their relative importance had not been determined, effectual evaluation, which could have provided much-needed feedback to guide further planning, could not and had not taken place.

**Language Maintenance and Revival Rationales**

**Staff Rationales:** - An analysis of responses from kaiarahi reo, associate teachers (questionnaire items #1a, 1b & 1c.) and school principals (4a, 4b & 4c.), who were asked to select the first, second and third most important aims for a bilingual class, showed that many respondents appeared to be unable to sort desirable aims into these three hierarchical categories, thus reflecting a lack of goal prioritizing. For example, two associate teachers commented:

"All the aims are tied together."

"Sorry - can't divide everything up. There are many important aims."

The respondents frequently listed two, or more, distinct aims under one category, drew arrows or crossed out to indicate they had changed their minds, and in general, displayed difficulty in answering this item. Therefore, it seemed inadvisable to weight responses in accordance with their placement in first, second or third most important categories.

In order to facilitate analysis, therefore, following the assignment of responses to pre-determined coding categories, each coded response was
given a score of "1" and the summed scores from all three staff groups is represented in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Total (N=17)</th>
<th>Kairarahi Reo (N=4)</th>
<th>Associate Teachers (N=7)</th>
<th>Principals (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and expansion of Maori language</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a bicultural learning experience</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote confidence and self-esteem in a supportive environment</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation with the Maori community</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attain curriculum goals</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help children to get along with other races</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the mana of the Maori people</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several interesting trends emerge from this analysis, although the data must be treated with caution as a total of only 50 responses was spread over eight coding categories:

1. School staff identified a variety of aims for bilingual education programmes.

2. Maori language maintenance and expansion was seen by staff groups to be the most important aim for bilingual education, with the two objectives of providing a bicultural learning experience and promoting confidence and self-esteem only slightly less favoured. These three aims were generally seen to be at least three times more important than any other aims.
The responses of kaiarahi reo showed greater intra-group cohesion and more intense focus than did the responses of the other two groups. It would appear from this, coupled with the reported and demonstrated difficulty which teachers, especially, had in sorting aims into first, second, and third most important categories, that kaiarahi reo had clearer perceptions of and were better able to prioritize aims than were teachers and principals.

It should be noted that although only one respondent stipulated "raising the mana of the Maori people" as an important aim, there were indications that other participants gave this aim highest priority.

"Tino Rangatiratanga - our aims fall here. If we'd looked at this in the beginning we would have been more effective."
(Resource teacher of Maori, interview).

It is also interesting, and somewhat puzzling, to note that despite the fact that all three staff groups cited linguistic aims more often than other aims, adequate resources to support this aim - Maori-speaking teachers, books, curriculum, syllabi and advisory services - simply did not exist. (See Chapter Five, above, and Chapter Eight, below). Although all staff respondents indicated in interviews and survey responses that they were concerned with lack of resources for their bilingual programmes, none of them made the connection between lack of resources and the feasibility of language maintenance goals. It would appear, therefore, that at both the macro- and micro-levels, rhetoric favouring Maori language maintenance and revival took precedence over action on behalf of this objective and that positive attitudes far outstripped planning and practical support. Rubin (1977), Dodson (1979), Lapkin and Cummins (1984), R. Benton (1985b), and Spolsky (1987) have pointed out the dangers of this approach and the implications for unsuccessful outcomes if thorough planning and resourcing are not implemented, carried through, and, above all, consistently monitored so that necessary changes and adjustments can be made.
That the six schools under discussion did not really expect their bilingual programmes to promote Maori language fluency is reflected in the nomenclature adopted to describe the programmes. In all cases, the bilingual classes were referred to as "whanau" classes, and in one case the researcher was pulled up sharply by a principal for describing the unit as a bilingual class.

As one resource teacher of Maori observed, the (unstated) official view is that bilingual programmes have been created to meet superficial needs, not to bring about significant change:

"The programmes are just a patch up. All the same inherent difficulties [for Maori children] are still there. Bilingual education is just another cultural 'problem' to a lot of Pakeha people."

**Parents' Rationales:** Interestingly, parents' reasons (see Table 7.2) for choosing bilingual education for their children, as reported in the Parents Questionnaire, item #1, corresponded very closely with the "major aims" reported by school staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>Total (N=60)</th>
<th>Kohanga parents (N=29)</th>
<th>Non-Kohanga parents (N=31)</th>
<th>Level of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrich child's language and culture</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give children a good education</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-like atmosphere</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on from Kohanga Reo</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's choice</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Many parents indicated more than one choice.
Parents, like staff, appeared to favour bilingual education because it could a) provide children with linguistic and cultural enrichment and b) promote affective goals in a family-like learning environment. Unlike staff, however, who placed curriculum attainment goals rather low in their priorities, parents indicated that "giving children a good education" was a very important reason for choosing to place their children in a bilingual classroom. Several possible reasons may be offered to explain this divergence:

1. It may be that staff took educational objectives as a given aim for all classrooms, and, therefore, did not specifically mention them in relation to bilingual programmes.

2. Interview data shows that some teachers, while valuing educational aims highly, felt that achievement in this area would follow as a result of meeting other objectives.

"I'm very concerned with children's skills and educational development, but they follow after self-esteem and group security." (associate teacher).

3. Parents, perhaps, did not interpret a "good" education in terms of narrow, academic criteria alone, but thought of a "good" education as one that also enriched a child's language and culture, and/or provided a warm, family atmosphere. As one resource teacher of Maori noted, "Maori people have a whole range of ideas about desirable education."

4. Parents may have responded to this item with a specific "good" teacher in mind.

Responses to item #1 of the Parents Questionnaire (see Table 7.2) did not show significant differences between Kohanga and non-Kohanga parents' reasons for choosing a bilingual class, apart from the "family-like atmosphere" choice, which was selected by Kohanga parents at twice the rate of non-Kohanga parents. Obviously, "to carry on from Kohanga Reo" was also selected almost exclusively by Kohanga parents: the 3% of non-Kohanga parents who indicated this item probably had had children enrolled in Kohanga for too short a time period or too infrequently to be counted in the Kohanga group.
However, responses to item #2, requesting information on parents' perceptions of the relative importance of ten suggested aims for a bilingual class, showed several wide gaps between the opinions of these two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Kohanga Mean</th>
<th>Non-Kohanga Mean</th>
<th>Level of diff.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the Maori language alive</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Maori cultural dimension</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping children succeed in school work</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing children with fluency in spoken Maori</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing children with literacy skills in Maori</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping children to like school</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving children confidence</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a warm, family-like atmosphere</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving the children the chance to participate in both Maori and Pakeha activities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching children to work and play cooperatively</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 not important, 2 somewhat important, 3 important, 4 very important, 5 extremely important

* t-test analysis

As indicated in Table 7.3, both groups of parents viewed all of the suggested aims as important. The means for Kohanga parents were generally at least
midway between "very important" and "extremely important" for nine of the ten aims, while non-Kohanga means generally fell between "important" and "very important". However, there were significant differences between the responses of the two parent groups for six of the ten rationales. Aims which elicited significantly higher ratings from the Kohanga parents, (all at the .001 level of significance) were:

1. Keeping the Maori language alive.
2. Providing fluency in spoken Maori.
3. Providing children with literacy skills (reading and writing) in Maori.

Non-Kohanga parents tended to rate most highly the aims related to affective and social goals, and rated "Providing literacy skills in Maori" as the least important aim.

**Conclusions**: It would appear that while both groups of parents supported general language and cultural enrichment goals, when they were asked to make more specific choices, Kohanga parents tended to value linguistic goals far more highly than did non-Kohanga parents. This hypothesis received confirmation during interview sessions with parents. For example, one parent, voicing an attitude expressed by several other non-Kohanga parents involved in bilingual programmes, stated, "we're interested in warmth and caring, even more than the language." One mother, who described herself as a "liberal", reported that she was more interested in the "bicultural aspect" than in language and did not appear to be concerned that "the children aren't learning much Maori." A resource teacher of Maori at this same site noted that:
"This school's bilingual programme will not create fluent speakers - they're attempting to create an atmosphere promoting language and culture."

However, it is not to be concluded that non-Kohanga parents were universally indifferent to promoting high levels of Maori language skill, including literacy skills, in bilingual classes. It is merely that they tended to be significantly less interested in these objectives than was the Kohanga cohort.

**Compensatory Rationales**

Although school staffs' and parents' voiced support for language maintenance was matched by officially-stated concern for this rationale at the macro-level, there was little survey evidence to show that compensatory goals for bilingual education, so highly promoted at the national level as a means of closing the achievement gap between Maori and non-Maori students, figured at all in participants' thinking at the local level. Nevertheless, interview data revealed that compensatory goals may have been one of the unstated goals, or "hidden agendas", leading to the establishment of the bilingual programmes of at least three schools under study.

One kaiarahi reo reported that the bilingual programme had been the previous principal's "baby" and that he had placed all the "troublesome kids" in the whanau. At a different site, there were indications that all age-appropriate Maori children had been placed in the whanau unit, irrespective of their, or their parents', interest in Maori language and culture. At another school, the kaiarahi reo related her indignant reaction

---

1 It must be noted that compensatory goals were not mentioned specifically in any of the questionnaire forms, in the way that linguistic, cultural and social goals for example, were mentioned in order to assist respondents in considering various possible rationales for bilingual education. This may have contributed to the lack of responses indicating support for compensatory rationales. Another possible explanation is that parents and school staff may have considered that is was too early to worry about primary school pupils' academic achievement.
to the Board of Trustees' persistence in regarding the bilingual unit as another special needs or special education project, and declared firmly:

"We are not a problem area like Reading Recovery."

If indeed, compensatory rationales, unstated but obdurate, were primary rationales for the bilingual programmes under consideration (and there was vague, but ominous, evidence that this was the case in at least some schools), this does not bode well for their success, either as means of enhancing the academic achievement of previously low-achieving (in the system's terms) minority students² and, certainly, not as mediums for language and cultural maintenance and expansion. In fact, as has been demonstrated in the macro-level discussion, if compensatory goals hold primacy there is little possibility that linguistic objectives will be seriously promoted at all. Neither is there much chance that sufficient pressure from local participants will be brought to bear on national-level decision makers to provide the resources necessary for successful promotion of fluency and literacy in the Maori language.

**Specific Policy on Rationales**

Although a number of worthwhile, and perhaps not so worthwhile, rationales existed to justify the establishment of bilingual education at the six schools under study, in only one case was there a clear policy statement detailing the overriding rationale, general objectives, specific goals, and daily operational guidelines for the bilingual unit. The promulgation of this policy resulted from concerns on the part of the associate teacher and other whanau members about the possible effects of an impending change in school staffing, which would bring a new principal into the school. The

---

² See Fishman (1976) for a discussion of the unpromising nature of compensatory education.
policy specifies, for example, that the class and teachers would work closely with the local marae and Kohanga Reo. According to the associate teacher:

"I didn't want them to tell us we could only visit the marae and Kohanga so many times a term."

Although policy development may have resulted as a response to a specific perceived threat to one bilingual programme, there are a number of other reasons why all schools contacted in this study should formulate similar policy statements:

1. In view of the fact that at least some school staff members surveyed in this study experienced difficulty in identifying and prioritizing the aims of their bilingual programmes, and also considering that two groups of parents appear to favour somewhat different primary aims for bilingual classes, it would seem that the development of comprehensive policies for their bilingual units, beginning with a clear declaration of rationales, could provide a much needed focus for the operations of the programmes.

The formulation of policy would give all participants an opportunity to first, openly discuss and, then, decide why they want a bilingual unit. This would enable school staffs, parents and community groups to establish and prioritize clear rationales for bilingual education programmes which best serve their particular needs.

2. Once rationales have been set, clear objectives toward which to work could be set down. These objectives would provide a basis upon which to assess the feasibility of the stated rationales. If necessary resources were unavailable, they would have to be obtained or rationales re-examined. In other words, a clear policy statement would prevent programmes from being set in place when there was no conceivable hope of achieving their stated aims.

3. As a result of listing specific objectives, programme evaluation, based on the attainment of these objectives, could then take place. Evaluation would provide indispensable feedback upon which to base future operations, showing what aspects of the programmes were working well and indicating what types of change might need to take place.

4. As mentioned above, clearly stated policy could protect the bilingual units from the vicissitudes of staff and Board of Trustee changes.

5. A clear policy statement, including daily operational guidelines, would also enable parents to make informed choices about enrolling their children in the units.
Chapter 8

Micro-level Findings and Discussion

Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorough planning and resourcing, as well as follow up support and monitoring are all essential components of successful bilingual programmes.</td>
<td>Do the programmes under study have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a clearly-defined clientele?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- clear-cut objectives and strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a well-planned curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- provisions for continuity of instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are strong indications that previous reform policy in Maori education failed because &quot;new&quot; programmes were merely adaptations of existing programmes rather than real alternatives addressing the needs of culturally-distinct Maori students.</td>
<td>How adequate are material and personnel resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective are support services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much decision-making authority has devolved to the Maori community in the implementation, operations and evaluation of the bilingual units?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effectively bilingual are the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are their operations bicultural?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishment of Bilingual Units

At the time of initial contact (Term I, 1989) each of the bilingual programmes under study was entering its second to fourth year of operation as an "official" bilingual unit. In most instances, however, unofficial Maori studies programmes, usually dependent on the services and expertise of itinerant teachers of Maori (later known as resource teachers of Maori), Maori community members, or one or two school staff members, had been implemented for as long as eight years before the official programmes began. Official programmes, unlike the earlier unofficial programmes, were specifically sanctioned and supported by the Department of Education,
and, later, the Ministry of Education, which, following approval of a school's application to house one or more bilingual classrooms, agreed to fund the kaiarahi reo's salary and, in some cases, provided a small start-up grant.

According to Principals' reports (questionnaire items # 1 & 2), the impetus for the establishment of the bilingual programmes under study sprang from several sources, typically from school staff and resource teachers of Maori concerned with continuity of educational experience for Kohanga Reo children. In one case, Department of Education officials approached the school and requested that the unit be established, rather than the more typical scenario, where schools applied to the Department for official status.

Guidelines issued by the Department of Education stipulated that a Planning-Advisory Committee, comprising members from the school, the community, the Education Board and Department of Education Maori Advisory unit, should be set up in each school housing an official bilingual unit to assist in the development of the bilingual programme and to promote communication between Educational Boards, the Education Department and the public (see Department of Education, 1982, A Guide Towards Bilingual Education for New Zealand Schools). However, these committees, which would have provided much-needed professional and community expertise and experience, were not established in any of the six schools.

In all cases, principals reported that schools received very little planning assistance in establishing the bilingual units at their schools:

"Very little initial advice given ... ."

"Tried to set up a committee from the community and Kohanga. Didn't get off the ground. Kohanga parents did not really seem to know what they wanted, or perhaps, to be fair, did not understand procedures and steps necessary to get there."
"Little support from Advisors or Maori and Island Education, some support from Resource Teachers of Maori and inspector with Maori responsibility."

"Only input was from the Inspector in charge of Maori and the Itinerant Teacher of Maori [later, Resource Teacher of Maori]."

As will be demonstrated below, failure to establish the prescribed planning committees had serious repercussions in the subsequent operations of the bilingual units. In the absence of planning-advisory committees, bilingual programmes were left largely rudderless and leaderless, with no one person or body responsible for co-ordinating and managing the planning or operational stages of development, or of providing follow up evaluation in order to make necessary adaptations and changes. By default, leadership and management roles were assumed by school staff, particularly associate teachers and kaiarahi reo, but also school principals and assistant principals, all of whom lacked sufficient training to adequately undertake these responsibilities and who were also heavily committed to other duties.

**Selection of Clientele**

In all cases, Kohanga Reo children were given priority enrolment in whanau programmes. However in none of the six schools were there sufficient numbers of these children to make up a "full" classroom (see Figure 6.1). Therefore, Maori children who had not attended Kohanga, as well as non-Maori children whose parents indicated interest in bicultural education, were enrolled along with Kohanga children in the whanau classrooms under study (Principals' Questionnaire, item # II). Typically, principals enrolled children in the whanau units giving first priority to Kohanga children, then Maori children, and, finally, to other children whose parents indicated a preference for whanau class enrolment.
At one site, teacher interview data revealed that two Samoan pupils who spoke English as a second language (ESL) students, as well as several non-Maori children "who weren't really interested", were placed in the whanau class because of its "accepting" atmosphere. There were also indications at this site that not all parents of whanau class children had given informed consent for their children's placement in the bilingual programme (parent interview).

The notion that a smaller than normal class could exist to serve Kohanga children exclusively appears not to have been considered at any of the sites. Although the reasons for this were not made clear to the researcher, in all likelihood the decision to enrol children from such disparate backgrounds in whanau classes resulted from jealousies and controversy regarding bilingual units and from a desire on the part of school principals to avoid a situation whereby whanau classes were seen to receive more favourable treatment than other classes.

Only one principal (questionnaire item # 11) reported the necessity of restricting entry into the bilingual unit at his school and, similarly, only one principal indicated that there were difficulties in finding enough children to fill the bilingual class(es). However, it is highly likely that the close match between numbers of children seeking enrolment and available places in whanau classes was more nearly related to the extreme flexibility of entrance requirements than to actual numbers of children whose parents wanted a bilingual, bicultural learning environment.

**Culture of the Classroom**

Field notes record a great many references to the incorporation of Taha Maori within the classroom operations of all six whanau programmes under consideration, including the one exceptional case where the kaiarahi
reo worked with three different teachers. While not all of the elements described below were present in each of the programmes, some of these elements were present at all sites. However, two whanau classes stood out as distinctly more "Maori" in ambience than the others. Children enrolled in the whanau classes at one of these sites, for example, followed the Kohanga Reo practice of removing their shoes before entering the school building in order to show respect for a place of learning. In one of these cases, there was a very influential and dedicated group of Maori parents, referred to in field note shorthand as "Nga Wahine Toa" who supported the whanau class activities. At the other site, the associate teacher had had previous experience as a resource teacher of Maori and the kaiarahi reo was an older person with a great deal of experience working in school programmes promoting Maori language and culture. At both of these sites, as well, the whanau class had a high proportion of Maori pupils.

The most obvious aspect of Taha Maori in five of the six programmes was the vertical grouping of children of different age groups within one classroom. This arrangement afforded opportunities for tuakana/teina relationships to develop and promoted co-operative learning. Although children were most frequently observed to work in divided age groups on English language portions of the curriculum, the entire class participated throughout the school day in activities such as shared book reading (Maori and English), waiata and haka, and, in one instance, the entire whanau class composed a letter expressing condolences and offering assistance to a family whose home had recently been destroyed by fire. During these activities, it was not at all uncommon for a smaller child to take part while seated in the lap of an older pupil, or for children to request or offer assistance to one another.

Maori arts, such as poi, action songs and haka were used extensively at all sites, not only as a joyful expression of cultural awareness and affinity, but also as a teaching strategy to promote oral and reading skills and vocabulary
development as well as to develop physical co-ordination and musical skills. In one instance, song lyrics were observed to lead into a discussion of tribal differences and local history.

Other elements of Taha Maori which were frequently observed included the security provided by warm interpersonal relationships among children, teachers and kaiarahi reo. In several cases, other adults, typically parents, but at one school the cleaner, also formed part of the classroom whanau and were seen to interact closely with children and to provide additional Maori language input. At one site, a mother who had just been released from hospital visited the whanau in her wheelchair, so that she could offer reassurance and receive comfort, not only from her own child, but the rest of the whanau as well.

Elements of Maori spirituality were observed in five out of the six programmes, with morning and afternoon karakia and grace before lunch a typical classroom activity. At the one school site where karakia were not said, there had been considerable resistance to the whanau programme from religious groups within the community.

Maori customs of hospitality, such as mihi to first-time visitors and the sharing of food, were observed features of several of the programmes. In one case, local marae members, who were very involved in the activities at this school, had prepared a hangi for the school's bilingual whanau.

Largely because kaiarahi reo shared their experiences and expertise with the whanau classes and because associate teachers were sensitive to the cultural needs and differences of their students, Taha Maori was an integral part of the classroom experience in all sites under study, not an "add on" dealt with in a perfunctory manner. Nevertheless, a number of participants expressed the viewpoint that, because of the limitations imposed by the
school system of the dominant-culture, although certain modifications had
taken place, the whanau classes were not essentially different in their
approach than other, mainstream classes. One mother, whose statement
typified these views, noted:

"We’re still turning out brown-skinned Pakehas."

**Pupils’ Maori Language Background**

Because some whanau children had received considerable pre-school and
extra-curricular exposure to Maori language, while others had very little or
none, the pupils who were enrolled in these classes exhibited a wide range of
Maori language abilities. In all but one case, associate teachers and
kaiarahi reo (questionnaire items # 6) indicated that there were differences
in the whanau children’s fluency in Maori language; with six of the eleven
respondents reporting "a great deal" of difference. However, only one
respondent stated that these differences created "a big problem". That
large differences in the language backgrounds of whanau pupils should not
be perceived as creating much difficulty is somewhat surprising in view of
the fact that overseas research (Terrell, 1981) indicates that additive
bilingualism is best promoted in classrooms where children have similar
levels of target language proficiency.

Staff comments suggested that two reasons why differences in fluency were
not felt to create teaching/learning problems were 1) that individual
differences were catered for by grouping children within the classroom for
some activities according to Maori language ability and 2) that less fluent
children learned from those who were more advanced. Observational data
indicated, however, that the children most fluent in Maori language were
not extended in the bilingual units, and in this way, differences were
eventually minimized. As one teacher commented:
"The differences were great at the beginning of the year - some understood no Maori - but this is much less of a problem now."

Presumably the less fluent "caught up" while the fluent "marked time".

**Maori Language Use in the Classroom**

A further reason why differences in children's Maori language fluency may not have been perceived as a large problem was that, according to observational data and questionnaire reports, neither associate teachers nor children in the whanau classrooms used a great deal of Maori language and that almost all basic subjects were taught in English. Although in all instances, some Maori language was observed to be used by kaiarahi reo, associate teachers, and in several cases, by other Maori-speaking adults present in the classroom, in a natural manner throughout the school day, there was actually a very narrow range of functions for which the language was employed.

Typically these functions included oral activities related to socio-cultural and spiritual domains (such as greetings, karakia, himene, waiata and haka) or to managerial functions (such as giving orders, warnings or praise) rather than to informative or investigative uses (see *Tīhe Mauri Ora*, 1990, pp. 42-43 for a comprehensive listing of classroom language functions). One exception to this general rule included the use of Maori language in conjunction with the Basic School Maths curriculum, which provided an excellent opportunity for Maori language instruction as it involved manipulative use of concrete materials on which no English print appeared and, yet, was essentially a language-based programme. The second important informative and investigative use of Maori language was in conjunction with reading activities utilizing both the early-reader texts and audio tapes supplied by the School Publications Branch of the Ministry (or
Department) of Education, books borrowed from the National Library Service, and teacher or kaiarahi reo produced reading materials, such as "blown up" books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.1: TEACHER USE OF MAORI LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Questionnaire Item # 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How much Maori language do you use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during an average school day?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Observational data indicated much less Maori language usage.

No associate teacher reported (Table 8.1) using more than 50% Maori language during a typical school day, and it is doubtful if any of them used more than 25% Maori language. Four out of six associate teachers who responded to this item reported that they typically used 10% or less Maori language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.2: USE OF MAORI LANGUAGE BY KAIARAHI REO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi Questionnaire Item # 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How much Maori language do you use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during an average school day?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi reo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi reo 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi reo 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiarahi reo 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses (see Table 8.2) given by kaiarahi reo indicated that they used far more Maori language than did associate teachers (none reported using less than 25%), but associate teachers normally carried out all large group teaching activities, frequently relying on the kaiarahi reo when they could not supply the correct Maori language term or phrase. Kaiarahi reo, utilizing much more Maori language than did the associate teachers, usually confined their teaching activities to individual or small group instruction. Therefore, although kaiarahi used more Maori language than did the teachers, overall, teachers supplied far more language input (usually English) than did the kaiarahi.

The net result of these arrangements was that children, in fact, received very little Maori language exposure during an average school day and, predictably, except for the socio-cultural, spiritual activities described above, produced very little of it themselves (see Krashen, 1981, for a discussion of comprehensible input and language acquisition). Field notes record almost no instances of children initiating conversation in Maori, either in the classroom or in play areas. However, it is not to be assumed that the problem was one of attitude, for most children were demonstrably proud of the Maori language which they were able to produce, both in speech and in writing.

Rather, the difficulty appeared to be that, in addition to limited Maori language input, neither teachers nor kaiarahi reo had had opportunities to develop adequate skills in bilingual education methodology. Again and again, field observations record that when conversation in Maori broke down, both adults and children reverted to English. For example, there is only one recorded example of a teacher's attempts to expand a child's Maori fluency by rephrasing the child's English-language utterance in Maori and encouraging the child to repeat the Maori phrase. Very often, the classroom
adults would tell students who were struggling to produce a Maori word or phrase, "Just say it in English."

Clearly, staff of bilingual classrooms need to possess high levels of skill, both in a wide variety of functions of Maori language, including cognitive academic functions and in bilingual teaching methodology. If teachers lack these skills, as they did in the programmes under study, then whanau class pupils will be unlikely to attain fluency in the target language or to reap the full benefits of a bilingual education. According to the "threshold" hypothesis (Cummins, 1981), it is only when both languages are developed to a high level of age-appropriate proficiency that positive linguistic and cognitive outcomes can be expected to result from bilingual education.

**Conclusions: Maori Language in the Classroom:**

As it stands now, there is a very real danger that, for those few children who enter school with Maori as their stronger language (and with the entrenchment of Kohanga Reo the numbers of these children are beginning to grow), the programmes under study will not promote bilingualism, but semi-lingualism. One mother whose son entered a whanau class after considerable school and home immersion exposure to Maori language reported that her child experienced linguistic confusion and frustration with his school work, particularly with reading. At two other sites the associate teachers voiced concern that children's writing demonstrated a linguistic "confusion" between Maori and English, and field observations at other schools uncovered many examples of code switching, exhibiting grammatical, syntactic and lexical interchange of Maori and English, in children's printed work.

For children whose strong, or only, language is English, the whanau programmes under study provided a valuable language enrichment experience, in that children were exposed to some Maori language in a
limited variety of learning contexts. However, the programmes fell far short of providing the language-rich environment offering a wide range of comprehensible input in Maori which could be expected to produce additive bilingualism.

The low levels of Maori language used by children and adults in whanau classes was a cause for widespread concern among Kohanga parents (see Chapter Nine, below) and concern was also suggested by staff survey questionnaire responses. With one exception, all teachers and kaiarahi indicated (questionnaire items #12) that at least 50% of the language used in a bilingual classroom should be Maori, although Table 8.1 (above) shows that teachers, who provide most of the language in whanau classrooms, typically use much less Maori language than this and observation data indicates that children used very little indeed. All of the kaiarahi reo and five out of seven of the associate teachers surveyed agreed with the statement, "More Maori language should be spoken in class." (questionnaire items #4).

**Classroom Resources**

That the students enrolled in the whanau classes appeared to be making very slow progress in acquiring Maori language skills was almost certainly related to the fact that in terms of material, and especially personnel resources, their classrooms were very inadequately equipped to provide instruction through the Maori language. The findings of the present study confirmed those of previous studies (Wagemaker, 1988; Ohia, 1988; Spolsky, 1987; R. Benton, 1985b; Wagner, 1985; Holm & Holm, 1984) which showed there to be a dearth of Maori language educational resources.

**Curriculum:** Neither curriculum guides, nor developed strategies for implementing a bilingual programme, were available to associate teachers
and kaiarahi reo. Interview data revealed that the lack of these types of resources created considerable stress for bilingual staff:

"You're never quite sure where you're going; there's no formal, explicit programme. Start, here, go back, step ahead; you're all over the place." (interview, kaiarahi reo).

**Learning Materials:** As reported above, Maori language teaching and learning materials were completely inadequate when compared with the numbers and types of English language resources which were available for primary school instruction. Furthermore, there was every indication that this paucity of material resources significantly hampered the operations of bilingual units.

As could be anticipated, significantly more Kohanga than non-Kohanga parents (questionnaire item # 4) indicated concern with the amount of Maori language materials available in their children's class. The mean scores for both groups of parents, respectively, was 4.6 and 3.4 on a Likert-type attitude response scale ranging from "1" (I strongly disagree) to "5" (I strongly agree) with the statement, "My child's class needs more Maori language books and materials."

Teachers' survey (questionnaire item # 14) and interview responses generally indicated that while the quality of Maori language materials was quite high and that the numbers of Maori language materials, especially early level reading books, had increased in recent years, they were still woefully inadequate when compared with English language resources.

"Where you might have five titles at a certain level in English, there's only one in Maori." (kaiarahi reo)
A resource teacher of Maori noted that, compared with English language resources, such as those produced for the Basic School Maths programme, Maori language resources were:

"... from the second hand store. We can't get the status."

Further, one teacher noted that the distribution of Maori language resources was inequitable, with bilingual units located outside of main urban centres tending to be overlooked.

In general, bilingual staff reported (Teacher and Kaiarahi Reo Questionnaire items #14) that they needed more information about available materials and offered a number of suggestions for materials that they would like to have access to in future. These suggestions included:

- A complete range of graded readers.
- More material on video and audio tape.
- Picture books and books with simple and repetitive captions.
- Wall charts, such as alphabet charts, charts with poems, maths charts, maps, and calendars.
- Units for topic studies, especially maths, science and social studies topics, including lists of resources.
- Simple puzzles and crosswords.

Furthermore, parents suggested that Maori language readers be provided with pronunciation guides and English translations, so that they could learn at home with their children.

Survey and observation data indicated that kaiarahi reo, associate teachers and resource teachers of Maori spent a great deal of time and energy creating their own resources, such as translations of already existing
materials, and that these locally-produced resources were frequently of very high quality and very appealing to children. They also made good use, via expansion techniques, such as the use of locally-produced crossword puzzles, riddles and card games, for example, of the published materials to which they had access.

Personnel Resources

Inadequate planning for Maori language education was reflected in the shortage of personal, as well as material, resources for bilingual programmes. Interviews with parents, Kohanga whanau, kaiarahi reo, teachers and principals, indicated that the lack of properly trained, Maori-speaking teaching staff was the single biggest concern for schools seeking to promote bilingual education. In terms of classroom teachers and support personnel, such as advisors and relieving teachers, the bilingual programmes were, again, woefully under-resourced.

A second point which must be reinforced here is that the failure of the bilingual programmes under study to successfully promote additive bilingualism was in no way related to the dedication, professionalism or hard work of the classroom teachers and kaiarahi reo who staffed the bilingual classes. In all cases, these staff members made Herculean efforts to overcome the limitations imposed on them and to provide the best possible learning environment for the children in their care.

Associate Teachers

Selection: - Typically, the associate teachers of bilingual units were recruited from among the existing teaching staff at each of the schools under study or through advertisement in the Gazette published by the Department, or Ministry, of Education. Responses (N = 7) to the Teacher
Questionnaire item #9, "How were you selected for your job in the bilingual unit?" yielded several interesting, and disturbing, responses which indicated, yet again, the overall lack of planning for the operations of bilingual classes:

"They couldn't find anyone else."

"Offered long-term relieving position, had little idea it was to be in a bilingual unit."

"I wasn't given any choice - I was told a kaiarahi reo had been appointed to my classroom."

"It was a question of 'Who else can?'".

Responses to item # 10 of the same questionnaire, "Did you have a clear picture of what your job would involve before you began working in the bilingual programme?", were similarly illuminating:

"I was not prepared for my present teaching position. I still do not fully understand the programme."

"No."

"Not really ... ."

"No idea at all and no support was available from the Department as no job description had been prepared for us."

"Certainly not. I had not even heard of whanau classes before I came here. No training at C-T-C [Christchurch Teachers College] for multi-level teaching."

"[It was] left fairly much up to us to find a way."

However, one teacher reported: "Yes, I think so. I was very keen to do the job."

In all cases but one, the associate teachers were non-Maori and lacked Maori language fluency. One school, however, was successful in recruiting a Maori teacher who was proficient in the Maori language, and who was well-accepted by the Maori community in her school district. In fact, this woman, appointed after the main data collection phase of the research, was
the only Maori classroom teacher (mainstream or whanau) encountered in any of the six South Island schools under study.

**Teachers' Experience and Qualifications:** Associate teachers varied considerably in their qualifications and years of teaching experience. All were college of education (teachers college) graduates and some had passed university papers as well. Two associate teachers held Reading Recovery diplomas and two were former resource teachers of Maori. In two cases, the associate teacher was also a senior teacher of junior classes, while others had had extensive teaching experience. In two schools, however, the associate teacher was a first-year appointee.

Six out of seven associate teachers reported (teacher questionnaire item #9b) that their training had not adequately prepared them to teach in a whanau classroom and one respondent indicated that she was "not sure" whether this was the case. However, all associate teachers had made efforts to increase their bilingual/bicultural expertise, through evening Polytechnic courses, Ataarangi courses and Advanced Studies for Teachers Units (Palmerston North College of Education), for example, often on their own time and at their own expense.

At one site, the associate teachers joined the kaiarahi reo, principal and family members of whanau children in a weekly Maori language tutorial held at the school. Associate teachers contacted during the first year of the study (1989) had attended two week-long in-service hui, also attended by resource teachers of Maori and kaiarahi reo, sponsored by the Advisory Service of the Maori and Islands Division of the Department of Education (teacher questionnaire data, item #10). Following restructuring, however, in October, 1989, these advisory in-service courses were no longer offered.
In only one instance had the associate teacher received any specific in-depth training in bilingual methodology. When this teacher applied to her principal for funds from the Maori language factor funding to further this training at a week-long session for kaupapa Maori teachers, she was refused because the principal, acting on ambiguous instructions from the Ministry of Education, believed the money could be used only for Maori language materials. (See Thomson, 1990). At another site the associate teacher, who requested leave to attend a six-week advanced block course in Maori language at the local Polytechnic, had been turned down on the basis that she had already attended the beginners course. (teacher and principal interview data).

There are clear indications here that although associate teachers recognised the need for developing their expertise in Maori language and culture, and made personal efforts to do so, the educational system itself failed to offer adequate support in the form of pre- and in-service training. In fact, it appeared in some instances that the system actually discouraged teacher development.

**Teacher Change Over:** Typically, throughout the schools contacted in this study the change over (turn over) rate for associate teachers was very high: of the eight associate teachers contacted at the beginning of this study (Term 1, 1989), 18 months later only two of them were still employed in this capacity. Of these two remaining associate teachers, one worked at the school with no separate whanau unit. At two schools, with a total of four bilingual classrooms, there had been nine different associate teachers during the 18 months of contact. The kaiarahi reo at both of these schools reported that the frequent changes were disturbing both to them and to the children and created a situation whereby it was impossible to provide continuity of instruction or to promote a whanau atmosphere.
National figures for primary teacher change over (1989-1990) provided by N. Pole of the Statistics and Research Division of the Ministry of Education (projected over 18 months) was 59% - based on an annual change rate of 39% (14% out of teaching service and about 25% who changes jobs within the primary service). In the whanau classrooms under study, however, the change over figure was 100% over an 18-month period.

Interview data reveals that the associate teachers who resigned from their positions (none was encouraged or forced to leave) did so for a variety of reasons, including overseas travel, marriage plans, career changes or pregnancy, but the high staff turnover was also almost certainly related to the heavy pressures and responsibilities associated with bilingual classroom teaching (listed below) and to the difficulties experienced by monolingual, monocultural appointees to positions which required bilingual, bicultural expertise. In the words of one kaiarahi reo:

"It's not fair to expect a Pakeha to take on this role. It's too difficult; they don't have the preparation."

One North Island associate teacher summarized the difficulties experienced by Pakeha associate teachers as follows:

"Non-Maori lack the wairua (spirituality), the reo (language) and the community connections necessary to perform the job well."

That the associate teachers themselves recognised the limitations of placing non-Maori in bilingual teaching positions was evinced in three separate interviews, where the associate teachers spoke of "keeping the children warm" or "bridging the gap" until Maori teachers could be appointed. In the words of one associate teacher:

"We need more Maori teachers - as opposed to teachers of Maori."
It is especially important to note here that, apart from the fact that the Maori language belongs first and foremost to Maori people, it is far more feasible to equip bicultural and bilingual Maori with teaching skills than to attempt to provide monolingual non-Maori teachers with bilingual, bicultural expertise. Programmes to train teachers with insufficient knowledge of Basque language and culture to teach in Basque schools, for example, involve an intensive five to ten month training (offered by about 50 specialists), during which teachers are relieved of their classroom duties. For some trainees, this programme also includes living in a Basque-speaking home. (N. Benton, 1990). Unless the New Zealand educational system is prepared to provide this type of preparation for English-speaking teachers, then it would appear to make more sense to concentrate on providing Maori speakers with teaching credentials.

Despite the urgent need for expert teachers of te reo and tikanga Maori to staff bilingual programmes (New Zealand Educational Institute, Rourou 1990, Vol. 1, No. 18), interview data revealed that at one South Island College of Education, admittance procedures made it difficult, if not impossible, for such candidates to enter the teaching profession. The researcher interviewed two Maori women, both proficient in Maori language, whom she had previously observed in a whanau classroom situation and who appeared to have excellent potential as classroom teachers. Both, however, reported that they had been denied admission to Dunedin College of Education. One stated that she had been turned down because the Admissions Committee felt that her community involvement may have interfered with her studies. The second, who had had extensive experience in Kohanga Reo and bilingual primary school classes, said that she had been rejected on the basis that, as she had not been enrolled in a formal learning situation since high school, she would probably have experienced difficulty settling down to book work.
According to these reports, Maori language proficiency and involvement with the Maori community and Maori educational endeavours, attributes and activities highly valued by Maori, are not equally highly valued by at least one teacher training institution.
Responsibilities of Associate Teachers: - Observation, interview and questionnaire data demonstrated that associate teachers operated under unique constraints and carried special responsibilities which were not usually assumed by classroom teachers. These unique constraints and responsibilities may be summarised as follows:

1. Associate teachers worked without an established curriculum or clear educational guidelines.

2. Maori language resources, such as reading books and audio visual aids were inadequate when compared with English language resources. This meant that associate teachers, to a greater extent than is usual, created their own teaching materials.

3. Associate teachers were largely responsible for their own acquisition of second language skills in Maori, as well as the acquisition of expertise in bilingual teaching methodology.

4. The vertically-grouped whanau classroom setting necessitated extra planning and attention to individual pupil's needs.

5. Associate teachers handled parental concerns about the effects of bilingual education and assumed responsibility for involving parents and other community members in the daily operations of the whanau unit.

6. Associate teachers were expected to satisfy (sometimes conflicting) parental and community expectations for incorporating Maori language and culture into the school programme.

7. Associate teachers established liaison contact between the whanau class and the community, including Kohanga Reo and marae committees.

8. Associate teachers were responsible for supervising, training and co-ordinating activities with the kaiarahi reo.

9. Associate teachers frequently carried school-wide responsibilities associated with the whanau programme, which included countering the negative attitudes of some staff members or, alternatively, of supporting other teachers' bilingual, bicultural efforts.

All associate teachers reported (questionnaire item # 15a) that their teaching role involved "more work" than teaching in a regular classroom. In addition, all associate teachers, except those for whom the whanau class was their first assignment, reported (item# 18d) that they had made changes
in their approach to classroom teaching in order to carry out their duties as associate teachers. These changes included changes in teaching method and teaching style, classroom organization, parent contact and evaluation of children's progress.

However, as noted above, in only one case did the associate teacher receive the stipulated staffing incentive allowance of $947 specified in the Primary Teachers Award Section 3.25 (c). In fact, one principal who requested this allowance for the associate teacher at his school was told by the Ministry that it was "not available".

**Job Satisfaction:** - Despite the extra duties and responsibilities associated with bilingual classroom teaching, and also despite the educational system's failure to reward the special contributions of these teachers, none of the associate teachers who had had previous classroom teaching as a basis for comparison reported that their bilingual teaching assignments offered less job satisfaction than a regular classroom assignment (questionnaire item # 15a). In fact, three out of five associate teachers reported that their present role was more satisfying than previous assignments.

Two factors unique to whanau classroom settings may, at least in part, explain this satisfaction. Firstly, most associate teachers indicated (questionnaire item # 15a) that their students were "better off" in a bilingual unit. Secondly, survey responses (teacher questionnaire item # 16) suggested that, with one exception, associate teachers derived a great deal of satisfaction from working with kaiarahia reo. Comments such as the following were typical:

"It's neat having another adult (whom you like) in the room."
Nevertheless, the high change over rate for associate teachers suggests that although they may have perceived their jobs to be satisfying, they also may have experienced a high degree of job-related stress.

**Conclusions: Associate Teachers**

1. Associate teachers were well-organized, hard working and, above all, firmly committed to providing for the educational, social and cultural needs of their pupils.

2. Associate teachers carried responsibilities and duties not normally associated with classroom teaching.

3. The educational system had failed to provide adequate in-service and pre-service training for bilingual class teachers and had failed to adequately reward these teachers.

4. There is an urgent need to create opportunities for bilingual and bicultural Maori to become fully-credentialed teachers.

**Kaiarahi Reo**

**Head Office Policy:** A memorandum circulated by the Head Office of Maori and Island Education (7 April, 1988) established clear policy regarding the appointment procedures, placement, training, supervision and roles of kaiarahi reo. Several of the more salient features of this policy document included:

1. That kaiarahi reo were introduced to provide specialist support in Maori language and culture for children who were entering school from Kohanga Reo.

2. That their main function was to work alongside their associate teachers and use the Maori language throughout the school day.

3. That the appointment of kaiarahi reo was to be in consultation with local Maori groups.

4. That inservice training, supported by resource teachers of Maori and advisors on Maori and Pacific Island education, were to be made available to kaiarahi reo. Principals and associate teachers were also responsible for providing an induction programme and suitable ongoing training.
5. That on completion of their two year contracts, kaiarahi reo appointments were to be reviewed by district senior inspectors with a view to:

a. possible re-allocation to other schools.
b. awarding salary increments.

As has been noted above, however, policy is not the same as planning and in each of the whanau units under study significant aspects of the Head Office policy for kaiarahi reo were either ignored or inadequately implemented.

**Training:** - Pre-service and in-service training for kaiarahi reo was, for the most part, confined to attendance at either one or two week-long hui sponsored by the Maori and Islands Division Advisors (Kaiarahi reo Questionnaire data, item # 9b). Although questionnaire comments indicated that these hui were generally perceived as being quite valuable, they were also felt to provide insufficient training for classroom responsibilities. Only one of the four kaiarahi reo surveyed (item # 9c) stated that her training had been adequate, while another indicated that she was "unsure" and a fourth respondent reported that her preparation had been inadequate. As principals and associate teachers themselves were largely unfamiliar with bilingual methodology and had limited, or non-existent, Maori language skills, they could offer little in the way of meaningful additional training in these areas for the kaiarahi. That further language development was needed for kaiarahi reo was indicated by the fact that several described themselves as "competent" rather than "fluent" speakers of Maori.

**Support and Supervision:** - Following the administrative restructuring of October, 1989, the school inspectorate was disbanded and, for the remainder of 1989 and for part of 1990, no Maori language advisors were appointed in any of the school districts under study. This created a large gap in the managerial and support services available to kaiarahi reo. Because there were, and continue to be, no inspectors, it was impossible to follow
through on policy provisions to regularly review and upgrade kaiarahi reo's salaries.

Even prior to devolution, however, questionnaire and interview data suggested that support systems were not in place. As one resource teacher of Maori stated:

"Kaiarahi reo were put in schools and not monitored."

**Duties and Responsibilities:** - Although Head Office policy stipulated that the paramount duty of kaiarahi reo was to provide for the Maori language development of Kohanga children, in practice, this policy proved to be difficult or impossible to implement in the programmes under study. Children from a variety of language backgrounds were enrolled in whanau units, including large numbers of children who had had no significant Kohanga experience (see Figure 6.1). Observational data indicated that while kaiarahi reo endeavoured to cater specifically to Kohanga children, they frequently (as could be expected, given the warm family-like atmosphere of the whanau class) found themselves catering to other children as well. Kaiarahi reo were frequently observed to simplify their Maori language input, for the benefit of children with lesser skills in Maori language, or to switch to English when children appeared to become confused. They also tended to speak English when conversing with the associate teacher. The end result was that, throughout the school day, many opportunities to extend the fluency of Kohanga children were lost.

Although the role of kaiarahi reo differed somewhat from site to site, observation showed that they carried out a variety of functions in each of the six schools that often went far beyond their official brief. Included in these functions were:
Within the bilingual units:

- Providing Maori language input and a visible Maori cultural presence.
- Serving as educational role models.
- Promoting whanau security and warmth.
- Ensuring a smooth transition between Kohanga and school.
- Supporting associate teachers' awareness of and development in tikanga and te reo Maori.
- Planning Maori language curriculum and creating Maori language materials.
- Liaising with Maori families and Maori community bodies, particularly Kohanga Reo.
- Evaluating whanau children's linguistic, cultural, social and emotional development.

Within the wider school:

- Providing occasional Maori language and cultural enrichment in other classrooms.
- Contacting Maori parents or other community members.
- Advising on the handling of Maori pupils.
- Helping in preparing school assemblies or other special activities.
- Offering advice on the implementation of Maori programmes in the school.
- In two schools, the kaiarahi reo also assumed administrative duties as Board of Trustee members.

That kaiarahi reo experienced, and resisted, pressure to expand their role to include Taha Maori duties in the wider school was suggested by several kaiarahi during interviews:

"I'm in school to follow up Kohanga children. I've made it plain to the rest of the teachers that I'm not there to provide a service to the rest of the school."

"I've made it clear I'm not there for everyone."

One principal identified the kaiarahi reo at his school as "an under-utilized resource" and stated his intentions to use her "a little in the senior school."

**Selection:** - In the areas of supervision and support services, pre- and in-service training, and roles stipulated for kaiarahi reo, official policy was
not implemented in the local districts and schools under study. However, in terms of community involvement with kaiarahi reo appointment procedures, the Department of Education's guidelines did appear to have been followed, generally with good results. All kaiarahi reo and principals (questionnaire items #9) reported that the local Maori community in each of the six school districts was heavily involved in the selection of the kaiarahi reo. Four out of the six principals contacted reported that the selection process had worked out very well, but in two other cases, principals reported that they were less than satisfied with the selected candidates. In one instance, the principal felt that the kaiarahi did not have sufficient teaching skills and said that he would use a different selection process next time, including a Board interview and a period of observation with children. This dissatisfaction suggests a lack of awareness on the principal's part of what the duties of the kaiarahi reo actually were: kaiarahi were not, nor could they reasonably be expected, to function as trained teachers. This principal's comments also highlight the need for proper supervision and training of kaiarahi reo and for better communication between Head Office policy makers and the schools.

The second principal stated that, although the present kaiarahi reo in his school was highly satisfactory, the previous incumbent has been committed to a variety of roles within the community which made it difficult to fulfil obligations to the school. This comment is an important one, because it illustrates the double bind faced by many kaiarahi and other Maori working within the education system. Although the effectiveness of kaiarahi reo in involving Maori parents and Maori community members in the operations of the whanau units often depended on their being well-known within the community and their commitment to Maori community efforts, these social and community responsibilities made heavy demands on their time and energy. How this cultural conflict may be resolved remains to be seen, but it
was a very real issue of contention in several of the school districts under study.

**Attitudes Toward the Kaiarahi Reo:** - Across all schools, Parent Questionnaire comments and interview data indicated a high level of satisfaction with the kaiarahi reo. Overall, 56% of the non-Kohanga parents and 95% of the Kohanga parents (questionnaire item # 6) reported that the kaiarahi played a "very" or "extremely" important role in the bilingual classroom, while only 11% of parents indicated that the kaiarahi reo played an "unimportant" or "not very important" role. Parents indicated that the major contribution of the kaiarahi was in providing Maori language and a Maori cultural perspective. Parents also indicated that kaiarahi served as important role models and that they had established positive personal relationships with whanau class children.

That kaiarahi reo were generally viewed in such a favourable light is not surprising, given that each of the kaiarahi reo demonstrated a caring and concerned attitude toward children, an ability to work with them on a variety of learning tasks, and a determination to provide a Maori dimension to the school day. (field observation data).

**Division K:** - Interview data revealed that another crucial function performed by kaiarahi reo was that of providing stability and continuity in whanau classes where there were frequent changes of associate teachers. Typically, the kaiarahi reo contacted during the initial stages of the study had been with the whanau classes since their official inception. However, during the later stages of the study, three kaiarahi reo resigned their positions in order to enrol in teacher training institutions. If the off-campus "Division K" course, an in-service teacher training scheme designed to provide kaiarahi reo with teaching credentials (offered only at Hamilton, Palmerston North and Wellington Colleges of Education) had been available
in the South Island, then these kaiarahi reo would have had an opportunity to retain their positions while, at the same time, acquiring teaching skills and professional status.

However, despite multiple requests that the Division K programme be made available at Christchurch College of Education, the Department and, later, the Ministry of Education, and South Island Colleges of Education failed to make special provision for the training of kaiarahi reo. (principal interview data). As it currently stands, South Island kaiarahi reo who are accepted at colleges of education must resign their positions in order to gain professional qualifications. This may be done with great reluctance, as the whanau class children have come to depend heavily on their presence. (interview, kaiarahi reo).

According to Mr Goff, former Minister of Education (personal communication, 30 October, 1989), following consultation with the School Trustees Association, the intake of Division K was limited, both in 1989 and 1990, to 25 places across the country. In this same communication, Mr. Goff further stated, with no apparent irony, that the programme was, "... designed to provide as rapidly as possible fully trained bilingual teachers." Considering that hundreds of Maori language primary school teachers, trained in bilingual methodology, (see Spolsky, 1987) are urgently required if continuity of educational experience is to be provided for Kohanga children, an annual intake of 25 Division K trainees hardly appears to be a "rapid", or adequate, response.

**Isolation at the Interface:** - In many respects, the kaiarahi reo contacted during this study had been pioneers in promoting a Maori perspective within heretofore almost exclusively monocultural and monolingual school settings. There were many indications that this role required courage, determination and the ability to sustain grace under
pressure. Difficulties encountered by kaiarahi reo had almost certainly been exacerbated by the fact that, although their expertise had been attested to by Maori authorities, within the Pakeha system they lacked professional status.

Impressions based on observational, interview and survey data suggested that, in all cases but one, the relationships between kaiarahi reo and associate teacher were, for the most part, comfortable and respectful, with the kaiarahi definitely accorded the role of Maori "expert". As one associate teacher put it, "We've learned to tell what the other one's thinking." At only one site, however, was there an apparently frictionless relationship between the two. In other cases, as could be expected, difficulties of either minor or major proportions cropped up. Typically, these difficulties involved planning structured lessons and differences of opinion regarding some aspects of educational belief and practice.

"As associate teachers are not Maori, there are times when we disagree on how things should be done. I feel as if I must always justify and explain my actions." (interview, Kaiarahi reo).

The isolation of kaiarahi reo within schools was intensified by the fact that they lacked an established local, regional or national support network.

Within the overwhelmingly monocultural environments of the schools under study, the kaiarahi's was frequently the only Maori voice to be heard. In order to avoid conflict, kaiarahi reo advocated their positions from a non-confrontational stance. One kaiarahi noted:

"I don't like to step on people's toes, but I do get my message across."

That kaiarahi reo were expected to avoid confrontational situations was suggested in survey data collected from principals (questionnaire item # 9a). Five out of six principals indicated that the ability to "relate to" or "work
easily" with the school staff was one of the most important qualities for a kaiarahi reo. In fact, responses to this item indicated that the ability of kaiarahi to get along with staff was perceived by principals to be as important a job qualification as Maori language skills.

**Status:** - At most sites, it proved to be impossible to ascertain the role and status of the kaiarahi reo within the larger school, as somewhat conflicting reports made it difficult to formulate a clear picture of the actual situation. In all likelihood, the situations, themselves, were ambiguous, even to the participants. One kaiarahi reo reported that she was often "kept in the dark" by school authorities. "Nobody asks me anything or tells me anything." Nevertheless, it must be noted that when this kaiarahi refused to work with a person whom she considered to be an insensitive and unsuitable applicant for the position of associate teacher, the applicant was not hired. (interview, principal).

At another school, the principal openly criticised the performance of the kaiarahi reo during an interview with a school inspector and the researcher, in a manner which showed little respect for professional confidentiality.

At another site, where the kaiarahi reo was a School Board of Trustee member, job specifications for the kaiarahi reo's position included, in the researcher's opinion, patronizing stipulations regarding appropriate dress and punctuality. At this site, also, the kaiarahi, whom observation showed to be a highly talented and motivated instructor, was excluded from the whanau classroom for extended periods by the newly-arrived associate teacher, who wanted to establish classroom routines on her own. This kaiarahi reported:

"The [new] teacher didn't want me in for a few weeks. By the time I got there, the programme was all set. I was shut out
before I even started. You need your grounding ... a place where you're equal. I kept running to the loo; there was no where else to go."

When this associate teacher left after two terms, the temporary appointee who took her place, according to the kaiarahi reo, "asked for one week the same" [requested that the kaiarahi reo absent herself from the classroom].

Clearly, the indications at this site, and less obvious suggestions at several other schools, demonstrated that, within the educational hierarchy, the status of the kaiarahi reo may have been very low indeed. Indeed, the English mis-translation of the term "kaiarahi reo" as "language assistant", widely utilized by the Ministry of Education and within schools, is in itself evidence of the low status of kaiarahi within the educational establishment. "Kaiarahi reo" actually translates as "language expert" or "language leader". The term "kaiawhina" more accurately denotes a language "assistant".

**Conclusions: Kaiarahi Reo**

- Head Office policies regulating the appointment, training, duties and supervision of kaiarahi reo appeared to have been thoroughly formulated. However, in the six schools under study these policies proved to be unfeasible and/or unworkable. Kaiarahi reo, once appointed, were left largely on their own, with little direction from either the school inspectors or Maori advisors, who, according to policy stipulations, were responsible for providing them with training and supervision. Only one out of the four kaiarahi reo surveyed, however, described her training as adequate. Further, within individual schools, with the exception of a few resource teachers of Maori, staff lacked the expertise to be able to assist and advise the kaiarahi reo. In fact, kaiarahi reo and associate teachers, for the most part, worked out the bilingual programmes for themselves on a trial and error basis. They were also responsible for their own professional development.
There was no established support network to facilitate communication or represent the interests of kaiarahi reo working in programmes widely dispersed throughout the South Island.

Kaiarahi reo were generally considered by administrative officials, associate teachers and parents to be very important to the successful operations of the bilingual units and they performed a number of important duties not specified in their job descriptions. Nevertheless, there were suggestions that, in at least some instances, kaiarahi reo, who were often the sole individuals within schools to represent the Maori community, were isolated and marginalized in the daily operations and decision making processes which affected the bilingual units under study.

Several key findings and recommendations pertaining to kaiarahi reo emerged from the survey, observational and interview data.

**Recommendations: Kaiarahi Reo**

1. By default, in the absence of adequate support services and training, kaiarahi reo and associate teachers were responsible for formulating plans, devising strategies, and creating materials for their bilingual classes. They need release time on a regular basis in order to accomplish these tasks. It may be that resource teachers of Maori can assist in this process by acting as relieving teachers in bilingual classrooms.

2. Kaiarahi reo need the support of other Maori, both within the school system and in the wider community. As it stands, they are sometimes operating in lonely isolation within monocultural environments and among educational professionals insensitive to their cultural values and wary of their ways of doing things.

3. South Island kaiarahi reo should be offered in-service teacher training as a practical means of acquiring formal bilingual teaching credentials while, at the same time, retaining their positions in the whanau units.

4. Because of administrative gaps which resulted from the educational restructuring of 1989, no review of kaiarahi reo contracts has taken place since this time. Immediate action should be taken to undertake such reviews and to award salary increments to those who are in line for them.
Support for Bilingual Units

Educational Support Services: - One of the most significant findings of this study of South Island bilingual units was that important aspects of Head Office Maori and Islands Division policy were not implemented at the local level because of gaps in essential support services. As has already been outlined in both the macro- and micro-level analyses, at national, regional and local levels, insufficient provision was made for personnel resources, such as Maori language advisors and resource teachers of Maori, to support the operations of bilingual education units. For example, prior to October, 1989, there was only one Maori Inspector appointed to serve both primary and secondary schools in the whole of the South Island. At time of writing (1991), a total of two Maori Advisors are responsible for providing support services throughout the South Island for Taha Maori programmes in all schools, primary and secondary, as well as support for bilingual units.
Data collected during this study clearly revealed that the six South Island units had not received sufficient support, either at the inceptional or operational stages, to ensure that:

- The programmes were developed with full community consultation and in accordance with community perceptions of their needs.
- Significant responsibility and authority devolved to local community bodies.
- The programmes were well understood and well accepted within schools.

or that:

- Bilingual classroom staff and school administrators had a clear idea of their roles and functions.
- Available resources were channelled into the bilingual units in a co-ordinated and equitable manner.
- Formative evaluation took place on a regular basis in order to ensure that, when necessary, change could take place to improve the functioning of the units.
- Communication between local programmes and regional and national divisions of the educational bureaucracy were well established.
- Maori language support services, such as those provided by reading, language, and maths advisors; reading recovery teachers; and speech therapists, were on a par with English language services. In fact, Maori language services in these areas were almost nonexistent in the school districts contacted.
Evaluation of Support Services: - At four of the six school sites, associate teachers and kaiarahi reo made specific criticisms of the inspectorate and advisory and/or resource teacher services provided to the bilingual programmes. Included in these criticisms were that:

- Resource teachers of Maori and advisors were unfamiliar with the Maori language or wairua Maori. They also lacked expertise in or experience of bilingual teaching methods.

- There was frequently no discussion before implementing programmes.

- There was little specific direction about how a bilingual programme should run.

Typical comments regarding the lack of support services included:

"We have a good relationship with [resource teacher], but her involvement becomes less and less as her commitments grow." (associate teacher)

"Many Maori people in the community would be better qualified than the [resource teacher] appointees who, in some cases have little in the way of reo or wairua of Maori. However, as local folk lack educational qualifications, which the Board deems necessary, they are not considered." (parent helper)

"The local RTM [resource teacher] visits once a month (approximately)" but has "no real input because of Department policy and limitations of language and teacher experience." (associate teacher)

"We haven't had a visit from the D.S.I. [District Senior Inspector] for 18 months. We're operating in isolation." (associate teacher)

"Where are our Maori advisors?" (associate teacher)

"Although we're supportive, we're inadequate." (Maori advisor)

"No job description was available to me or my associate teacher for the first 18 months. We devised our own programme." (kaiarahi reo)

---

1 It is interesting, and telling, to note that Maori and Islands Division officials were highly critical of the programme which did eventuate at this site. 
Nevertheless, as demonstrated in Table 8.3, although the overall infrastructure to support the bilingual units may have had big gaps, individuals working within the educational system were able to offer valued support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>RTM</th>
<th>Advisors</th>
<th>Elders/</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>3 1.5</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3 2.5</td>
<td>-  - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnr Whn*</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>2 2 1 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5**3</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6**2</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kaiarahi reo divides her time equally between the Junior and Senior Whanau classes.
** No available data for kaiarahi reo.

1 Little or no support
2 Moderate amount of support
3 Great deal of support

As shown on Table 8.3, most associate teachers and kaiarahi reo indicated (Questionnaire items #5) that parents and principals offered a great deal of support to bilingual classes. Community elders and marae committees were reported to offer little to moderate support, while Teachers' College and university students appeared to offer very little. With two exceptions, most respondents also tended to rate the support offered by culture clubs as quite low. There was considerable variation in indications of the level of support given by resource teachers of Maori (RTM), school advisors and Kohanga Reo.
Support from Parents: - The group rated most supportive of the bilingual units were the whanau children's parents. All teachers and all kaiaraphi reo indicated they they received either "a great deal" or "a moderate amount" of support from parents whose children were enrolled in the bilingual units, while no respondents indicated that they received "little or no" support (Table 8.3).

Interview data suggested that the best means of involving parents in the activities of the whanau classes was to adopt an informal approach. One associate teacher mentioned that there was "no hope of a response" from parents if teachers attempted to get "too organized." This teacher found involvement was very high after parents discovered that they "could come in at all times and change nappies on the floor." Although this type of informality was not typical of the classes observed, one kaiaraphi reo, to the delight of children and adults, brought her infant daughter to work with her each day.

Responses to Parents Questionnaire item # 5, indicated that 46% of parents visited the bilingual unit at least once a week and that 84% visited at least once a term. Close to 100% of parents at all sites reported that they felt welcomed when they did visit. That parental involvement and support is so high is a tribute both to parents and to school staff for, as one parent pointed out, "very few of them [Maori of her generation] have good recollections of school."

Field notes corroborated questionnaire data indicating a high rate of parent participation in the whanau units. However, there were no reported observations of children's grandparents, or other members of this generation, being present in the whanau classes. This is disturbing, given the fact that older Maori are those most likely to speak Maori fluently. The
absence of grandparents, or other older members of the Maori community, in the whanau classes may be related, at least in part, to the concern expressed by two kaiarahi reo that elders would not receive a properly respectful reception in schools.

"I think it's scary to bring old people into school. You're never sure they won't be [unintentionally] treated badly."

This situation may offer a partial explanation for the relatively low level of reported support from community elders and marae committees.

Parents tended to be involved with the activities of the whanau classes for a variety of different purposes (Parents Questionnaire item # 5b), including: to pick up or drop off children (66%), to go on class trips (55%), to discuss children's progress (54%), and to observe classes (48%). Interview data at four of the six sites suggested that parents were, or sought to be, actively involved in decision making processes affecting the bilingual units as well, but at times they appeared to "lack clout". At one school, for example, whanau parents petitioned government to move the bilingual unit to a separate teaching block and to provide a second class:

"They [parents] wrote to the local inspector who never wrote back. Later, when we approached him, he said that the Department in Wellington never responded. But he didn't bother to notify us of this." (interview, associate teacher). According to another participant at this site, the Principal did not feel that there was a chance of a second teacher's being appointed, "so he hasn't pushed it".

At three other sites, at least, however, there were indications, based on interview data, that parents were effective advocates for determining the direction which whanau classes would take. Several meetings called to discuss the allocation of Maori language funds evolved into more general discussions of the operations of the classes and the roles of community members in regard to the classes:
"The [funding factor] meetings were the best thing that's happened in a long time." They established the necessity of, "consulting the community." (interview, associate teacher).

It must also be noted that, although parents appeared to be highly supportive of bilingual units, they were not uncritically supportive. Parent questionnaire responses (item #3) showed that between 65 - 99% of parents across schools were at least moderately satisfied with the bilingual classes attended by their children (see Table 9.3). In two out of the four schools where parent surveys were undertaken, however, approximately one-third of whanau parents indicated considerable dissatisfaction with the bilingual classes (Table 9.3). Kohanga parents tended to be significantly less satisfied with the operations of the bilingual units than did non-Kohanga parents and respondents' comments suggest that this dissatisfaction was related to the low levels of Maori language and the monocultural perspective reflected in the culture of the classroom.

**Principals' Support:** - Questionnaire data reported in Table 8.3 shows that principals were rated by 91% of associate teachers and kaiarahi reo as either moderately or highly supportive of the bilingual units at their schools. Typical comments regarding principals' roles in the whanau classes included:

"Very supportive. [He's] aware of not incurring problems from bigots." (kaiarahi reo).

"We're lucky in a lot of ways with _____ . He's keen on the Maori side." (parent).

"He wants the same things for Maori children that we do." (kaiarahi reo).

The overall impression, drawn from questionnaire responses and interviews, was that principals in at least half of the schools under study were committed to the whanau class concept for Maori and other interested
students. At one site, for example, the principal had taken a highly pro-active stance to ensure that the bilingual unit at his school would meet community expectations for a semi-autonomous bilingual, bicultural learning environment. This school was unique in that, during the final stage of this project, it had managed to secure, with considerable effort on the part of the principal, the services of both a Maori associate teacher and a kaiarahi reo. The principal at this school studied Maori along with the whanau staff and parents and had progressed to the point of being able to creditably acquit himself in Maori on the local marae. (Observation data).

More typically, however, based on interview and questionnaire data, principals appeared to be far less involved in the whanau classes than this principal, and far more conservative in their support for radical change involving community control of the education of Maori children. Principals appeared to be very concerned that the introduction of whanau or bicultural units would not divide the school or school community (See principals' responses to questionnaire items on immersion and Kura Kaupapa Maori, Chapter Six, above). In practice, this meant that "below the surface level, the school maintains its position". (Associate teacher).

That principals did not generally appear to advocate radical change in the education of Maori children, with attendant transfer of power to Maori parents and communities, may be related to their adherence (demonstrated by their responses to the survey questionnaire) to the cultural deficit theories which have played, and apparently continue to play, so large a part in the state school education of Maori children. (See Chapter Two, above).
TABLE 8.4: Responses to Principals' Questionnaire item #18
"Based on your experience, how do you explain the high 'failure' rate of Maori pupils in New Zealand schools?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>&quot;ethnic tendency to undervalue school learning.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>&quot;low expectations - self-fulfilling prophecy.&quot; (as no elaboration of this response was given it is impossible to know whose &quot;expectations&quot; were being referred to).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>&quot;low expectations of parents&quot; &quot;lower socio-economic background in most cases&quot; &quot;poor language development (either Maori or English).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>&quot;lack of confidence because they don't know the language [Maori].&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>&quot;negative attitude by some Maori parents&quot; &quot;peer pressure&quot; &quot;parents either consciously or unconsciously resist the European way of learning, consequently their children fail to apply themselves fully.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>&quot;lack of self-esteem.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to questionnaire item #18, with one possible exception, principals did not identify the school system as culpable in promoting Maori underachievement, but tended, rather, to implicate deficiencies or disadvantages experienced by Maori children and their families.

Four out of six participating principals indicated that Maori parents or communities did not expect, or did not encourage, school success. (One of these respondents, however, later criticised his own position on this question.) Other explanations offered by principals to account for the achievement gap between Maori and non-Maori included lack of self-esteem, peer pressure, low socio-economic status, poor language development, lack of interest in "generally European expectations" and an "ethnic tendency to undervalue school learning."

Interview data collected during the present study, however, which revealed Maori families to be very concerned with the academic achievement of their
children, contradicts the assertion that Maori are unconcerned with "school learning". Further, classroom observations revealed no suggestions that Maori children suffered from poor language development or that their peers exerted negative pressure in regard to school achievement.

Further analysis of Table 8.4 suggests that principals at Schools 3, 4, and 5 may have believed that programmes offering Maori language and culture as compensatory measures to counterbalance cultural deficits or differences had the potential to enhance Maori school achievement within the existing system. According to Fishman (1976), Ranby (1979), Cummins (1986a & 1986b), and Parker (1989), however, this is in all likelihood a spurious belief; systems-wide change appears to be necessary if minority students' academic potential is to be realized.

**Educational Support Staff**

At three sites, associate teachers indicated that the resource teacher of Maori had provided them with a "great deal of support". However, other respondents indicated that they received far less support from resource teachers. This is hardly unexpected, as resource teachers carried a number of responsibilities, including responsibility for Taha Maori programmes throughout schools, as well as support responsibilities for bilingual classes (see Visser and Bennie, 1991). Interviews with several resource teachers of Maori indicated that at least some of them, in the absence of inspectors and (temporary absence) of advisors which followed the educational restructuring of 1989, intended to become much more heavily involved in the operations of the whanau units in the future.

The relationship between the schools under study and Departmental and Ministerial educational support services for Maori language was described as follows by one local official:
"It's useless setting absolute guidelines. Schools will do what they think is necessary."

Although some local participants said that they appreciated the opportunity to formulate bilingual programmes appropriate to their particular needs, there were indications that many more would have preferred direct guidance from the Department and Ministry of Education. There were also indications that, in the absence of clear guidelines from inspectors and advisors, local programmes were forced to adopt a "hit and miss" approach to bilingual education, seldom commensurate with optimal outcomes.

**Support from Community Organizations:** As Table 8.3 indicates, Maori community institutions, such as marae and Kohanga Reo and community groups, such as culture clubs, were viewed as offering less support to the bilingual units than the parents of the whanau class children. There was some interview data to suggest that Maori community organizations may have been more forthcoming with support for the bilingual units had the units not been perceived as inadequate to Maori needs and aspirations.

However, interview data also suggested that community involvement in the classes may have been limited by the heavy commitments of Maori, as well as by disenchantment with the whanau units. While close ties between whanau units and Kohanga Reo and marae were characteristic of some units under study, there were also indications that Maori communities were hard pressed to provide support for a number of enterprises which required their help.

"There is a small pool of overworked, very involved, fluent speakers." (questionnaire comment, kaiarahi reo).
One result of the limited support offered by Maori community members was that non-Maori sometimes stepped into or were, more reluctantly, thrust into the forefront in representing the interests of the whanau classes.

"I'm part of the Maori community as much as a Pakeha can be. I'm fronting for Maori and doing my best, but I'm out of my depth." (parent interview).

Fishman (1976, p. lll) made the observation that minority communities "can't go it alone for bilingual education". There were strong indications from the present study that Pakeha can't go it alone either.

**Summary: Support Services**: Within the educational system, support services for the bilingual units were very much a "hit and miss" affair. In particular, kaiarahi reo and associate teachers were critical of the guidance and support offered by the erstwhile inspectorate, Maori language advisors and, to a lesser extent, resource teachers of Maori. There were clear indications that lack of a support infrastructure hampered the operations of the bilingual units under study. However, there was also evidence that some individuals working within support services offered much-valued support to whanau classes.

Parents were perceived by bilingual staff to be highly supportive of the bilingual units and, in all cases, a core group of parents demonstrated considerable commitment to the activities of whanau classes. Nevertheless, there were suggestions that schools were not entirely comfortable places for some Maori parents or other Maori community members.

There were clear indications that at most sites parents sought to become actively involved, not only in daily activities of the whanau classes, but also in decision making processes related to the bilingual units. In several instances they were frustrated in their attempts to do so.
In addition to parental involvement, Maori community institutions and organizations, such as marae, Kohanga Reo and culture clubs, offered some support to the bilingual units. However, the numbers of fluent speakers available to provide valuable Maori language input were limited and some Maori organizations may have been reluctant to associate themselves closely with the whanau units.

While most principals appeared to be supportive of the whanau units in their schools to some degree, their levels of commitment and types of involvement varied considerably from site to site. In most cases, principals appeared to have adopted a reactive (i.e., "not incurring problems from bigots"), rather than an innovative stance in regard to promoting the interests of the whanau class and appeared to advocate only minor change in parent and community control of Maori children's education. Despite indications that a significant minority of whanau parents advocated a more Maori approach to the operations of the whanau units, in only one instance did the principal actively support the parents of whanau children in establishing a semi-autonomous unit designed to promote additive bilingualism in a more authentically Maori environment.

**Recommendations: Support Services**

- Too much distance exists between policy makers at the Head Office of the Ministry and local bilingual units. This gap must be closed, as significant aspects of bilingual education policy appear to be unworkable or unfeasible at the local level.

- Adequate support services, on a par with services which support the English-language portions of the primary school curriculum, are an urgent requirement.
To promote family, and extended family, involvement and support of whanau classes, efforts should be made to make families as comfortable as possible in the bilingual units. This may involve a separate room where people can meet to socialise and to discuss the kaupapa. It would also require significant changes in the traditional relationships between parents and school staff members.

Community consultation is a necessary, but not sufficient, requirement for the successful operations of a bilingual programme. There is also an urgent need for increased scope in community management of the bilingual programmes under study if the programmes are to 1) receive wide-spread community support and 2) offer a real alternative to mainstream programming. (See W. Holm, 1982, on the community-run Rock Point Navajo School).

**Concerns**

**Questionnaire Data:** Triangulated questionnaire data revealed that a number of concerns regarding the operations of the bilingual units were held by parents (item #1b), principals (item #20), kaiarahi reo (item #23), and associate teachers (item #22) at all school sites. Many of these concerns were expressed by participants in all six schools, thus indicating that they were of a general, rather than a locally specific, nature. Most frequently reported items were:

- The availability of bilingual teachers. Some respondents stressed that these teachers should be Maori.
- The continuation of the bilingual units both within primary schools and at higher grade levels.
- Lack of educational guidelines and support structures.
Items expressed less frequently included:

- Inadequate Maori language materials.
- "Token" efforts on the part of government to provide for Maori language education.
- Conflicts between Maori and Pakeha educational beliefs and practices.
- The difficulty of providing a Maori-language programme and also finding time to cover all material in the English language curriculum. (Reported by associate teachers only.)
- Fluctuating roll numbers. (Only principals reported this concern.)
- Maintaining children's English language skills.
- Maintaining community acceptance of the programmes.
- Continued support for the bilingual units from the Maori community.

This last concern was expressed by only one respondent, a principal, who clarified his concern in the following manner:

"The nature of Maoris is against the idea. They find it too difficult to keep persistently and doggedly after the same goal. They also quarrel amongst themselves in a fairly destructive way."

This principal had not, apparently, considered the possibility that Maori in his community may have withdrawn support from the whanau unit because they were disillusioned with its operations. However, there was ample interview data collected at this site to suggest considerable frustration among the local Kohanga Reo whanau regarding this school's bilingual programme as a result of 1) inadequate management and planning and 2) the monocultural bias of some school personnel. Neither had this principal apparently considered that within both Maori and non-Maori community groups there may be widely-differing viewpoints and heated debate.
**Interview Data:** - Field notes compiled during unstructured interview situations revealed that participants in all six programmes expressed concerns regarding the operations of the bilingual units. Frequently those concerns reflected those reported in the survey questionnaires. In general, interviewees tended to voice uneasiness about:

- The minimal exposure to Maori language and culture which their children received in the whanau classes (of which Kohanga parents were especially critical).

- Continuation of bilingual education through higher grade levels, particularly at intermediate school. One associate teacher commented:

  "These kids [entering intermediate school] are fronting it once again, they were the first at the whanau here. It must tell somewhere along the line."

Another associate teacher expressed similar concerns on behalf of the whanau parents:

"They want continuation of the language skills, cultural pride and whanau security which have been fostered in the bilingual units and they are concerned that the children will lose out in these areas if they are mainstreamed in intermediate school".

- Lack of clear direction for the whanau classes.

- Lack of support services.

- Difficulties of catering for the needs of New Entrant to Standard 4 children within the same classroom.

- Concerns that bilingual units were "half pie" efforts "almost set up to fail." (resource teacher of Maori). One parent described Maori/English bilingual education as, "a third world option" and another stated:

  "Bilingualism is a token gesture. After being deprived of the language for 140 years, it's something. But really it's a matter of making provisions for Maori language at the end if anything is left."
Anxieties expressed during interviews may be grouped into two major categories:

1. Perceptions that the bilingual units were hastily implemented and severely under-resourced.

2. Perceptions that changes to incorporate Maori language and culture into the primary schools were chiefly cosmetic in nature and that, at bottom, Maori programmes could, at best, only struggle along under a Pakeha umbrella. Participants in the bilingual programmes under study frequently stated their feelings that the public school system could not adequately provide educational programmes incorporating a Maori perspective:

"Our children need a separate class with different rules and focuses. Tikanga wairua is missing from Pakeha schools: they don't know what you're talking about." (Kohanga parent).

"I wanted the children to write together with a buddy or mate. This has never taken hold. It's seen as taking authority away from the paid person. When younger children sit in the older one's laps it's frowned on [by Pakeha teachers] as babyish." (kaiarahi reo).

"Pakehas see that there's only one right way to teach." (kaiarahi reo).

"We've been submerged in the system. The only way it's going to come right is a separate unit." (resource teacher of Maori).

Summary of Micro-level Operations

The major findings gleaned from data collected on the operations of the six bilingual programmes were as follows:

**Clientele:** - At none of the schools under study was there a clearly defined client group for the bilingual programmes. As a result, both children with considerable pre-school experience in a Maori language and culture, as well as children who had not received this exposure, were enrolled in the same whanau classes. This enrolment practice was in direct contravention to one of the key principles of bilingual education, that is, that
children with similar levels of proficiency in the target language should be grouped together (Terrell, 1981; Thonis, 1981). In the programmes under study, children most proficient in Maori language often appeared to be "marking time" while others "caught up" with them.

A second difficulty arising from the grouping of both Kohanga and non-Kohanga children in the same classroom was that the parents of these two groups of pupils held very different expectations for the operations of the units (see Chapter Seven). As a group, Kohanga parents were significantly less satisfied (see Chapter Nine) than non-Kohanga parents with the whanau classes, chiefly in the areas of distribution of language functions and the lack of Maori language resources. Kohanga parents were also concerned with the monocultural perspective which they perceived to characterize their children's school experiences, as these experiences did not promote continuation of the linguistic and cultural gains which children had made in Kohanga Reo pre school immersion programmes.

The school whanau programmes also failed to provide continuation of two other key features of Kohanga Reo: 1) Maori control of Maori education and 2) whanau development. In all but one of the bilingual programmes under study, authority for the education of Maori children remained firmly in the hands of the state school system and parents and community members were involved as helpers, consultants or teaching assistants, but not as managers or learners. At one site, however, a separate immersion unit was set up which included a Maori language tutorial group for families and school staff.

Maori language use: English was, without a doubt, the primary language of instruction in the classrooms under observation. Sixty-seven percent of associate teachers contacted in the study reported using 10% or less Maori language during an average school day.
Kaiarahi reo reported using much more Maori language on an average school day than did associate teachers. However, as they tended to work mainly with small groups of children and to switch to English when speaking to children with little or no knowledge of Maori or for the benefit of the teacher, their effectiveness was minimised.

Children appeared to hold very favourable attitudes toward the Maori language, but, apart from a narrow range of cultural and social functions, used very little Maori language in class.

**Maori language resources:** Material resources to support a Maori language curriculum were totally inadequate or non-existent. In addition, the distribution of available materials was reported to be inequitable, with schools outside major urban centres tending to be overlooked. However, the quality of existing resources appeared to be high and the numbers of available resources, particularly of early readers, had increased in recent years.

The most pressing resource need, however, was fluent Maori teachers. The low numbers of these teachers was the major concern most frequently cited by participants in the bilingual programmes.

**Associate teachers:** Associate teachers participating in this study operated under unique constraints and handled special responsibilities not normally part of a classroom teacher's duties. One hundred per cent of whanau teachers reported that their teaching role in a whanau classroom involved "more work" than normal teaching duties. There were clear signals, particularly the high number of resignations, which suggested that whanau class teachers experienced significant job-related stress. Sixty per
cent of associate teachers, however, reported higher levels of satisfaction with whanau concept teaching than with "normal" classroom duties.

There were indications that associate teachers, who in all cases but one were non-Maori, were frequently out of their depth in a bilingual/bicultural classroom environment and three associate teachers indicated that they were only "bridging the gap" or "keeping the children warm" until Maori teachers could take their places.

Nevertheless, associate teachers observed in classroom situations demonstrated a high level of professional competency in the English language portion of the curriculum, a great deal of personal concern for their pupils, and a commitment to providing, insofar as they were able, a Taha Maori perspective.

**Kaiarahi reo:** Kaiarahi reo were identified as key personnel within the bilingual units by parents, associate teachers and principals and performed many functions both within the bilingual units and the school at large which were not part of their job descriptions. Although according to Ministerial policy, their major role was to support Kohanga children, within the contexts of the classrooms under study, where there were significant numbers of non-Kohanga children (ranging from 76% - 31% across all six programmes) this proved to be unfeasible.

**Training:** Almost without exception, associate teachers and kaiarahi reo had received only minimal training in bilingual methodology or no training at all. For most teachers and kaiarahi, training chiefly consisted of participation in either one or two week-long hui sponsored by Maori and Islands Division. Eighty-six percent of associate teachers surveyed, and half of the kaiarahi reo, described their bilingual training as inadequate.
**Support:** - Key educational support personnel and support services, including resource teachers of Maori and relieving teachers; advisory services in Maori language and other curriculum areas; and special education services, such as Reading Recovery, were either inadequate or totally unavailable to support Maori language in the bilingual programmes under study.

In all cases, core groups of parents were highly supportive, although not uncritically so, of the whanau units within which their children were enrolled. To a lesser extent, whanau classes received the support of Maori within the community, although this varied considerably from site to site.

Principals were also inclined to be somewhat supportive of the bilingual units housed within their schools. In all but one outstanding case, however, principals tended to confine their support to reactive measures, such as ensuring that the programmes did not create divisiveness within schools or school communities.

**Concerns:** - Questionnaire and interview data revealed that four participant groups, parents, associate teachers, kaiarahi reo and principals, held major concerns regarding the operations of the bilingual units. These concerns included the paucity of bilingual teachers, lack of provision for continuation of units throughout primary school and at higher grade levels and lack of an educational support infrastructure. There were also major concerns expressed regarding the "token" nature of provision for Maori language and a Maori cultural perspective within the bilingual units.

**Conclusions:** - A number of operational factors which have been identified by researchers as representing best bilingual education practice and preferred practice for the education of minority children have been
contravened in the programmes under study. Chief among these factors are:

1. Provision for comprehensible exposure to the target language in a rich variety of contexts. (Krashen, 1981).

2. Adherence to the "one teacher, one language rule". (Price, 1968).

3. Appropriate grouping of students according to target language proficiency, including segregating the linguistic groups in the early elementary grades to avoid peer exposure to English, which increases pressure to replace Maori with English. (Lapkin and Cummins, 1984).

4. An adequate resource infrastructure, including material resources (Elley, 1991), support services and teachers fully-fluent in the target language and fully-trained in bilingual methodology. (Dodson, 1985 & 1979).

5. Provisions for continuation of bilingual education, at least through the elementary grades, to ensure that educational benefits, not educational handicaps, are the result. (Holm, 1982)

6. Full community consultation and devolution of authority to minority communities. (Fishman, 1985a & 1985b).


Unless, and until, these factors become characteristic of the operations of bilingual programmes, they cannot be said to promote, in any serious manner, either additive bilingualism or the empowerment of Maori students or, in the long run, empowerment of the Maori community.

Nevertheless, it must be kept firmly in mind that although the programmes under discussion were far from optimal in a number of areas, they were certainly serving a variety of very important functions and providing for a number of needs which could not have been met by any other widely-available educational option. The major strengths of the bilingual programmes studied in this project were:

1. A teaching staff highly competent in mainstream curriculum practices and sensitive to the cultural and personal needs of their students.
2. Excellent educational role models in the person of the kaiarahi reo. Kaiarahi reo also provided important links between schools and local Maori communities.

3. A stimulating and supportive classroom environment, as well as exposure to a variety of linguistic and cultural enrichment experiences.

4. Active involvement and support of parents and, to a lesser extent, community groups.

There can be little doubt that the operations of the classrooms under study, if not effectively bilingual or bicultural, were certainly educational and represented an advance over previous primary school programmes which, typically, made little acknowledgement of the dual cultural heritage of New Zealand or the distinct needs and strengths of Maori pupils.
Chapter 9

Micro-level Findings and Discussion

Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCAL ISSUES</th>
<th>FOCAL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both majority and minority students of varying ability levels from a variety of cultural and economic backgrounds can be expected to profit from well-run bilingual programmes.</td>
<td>What are the reported cognitive, linguistic, cultural and social outcomes of the programmes under study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, international research offers clear evidence that students educated bilingually suffer no handicap in acquiring majority language skills or skills in other important curriculum areas.</td>
<td>How effective are these programmes in maintaining the linguistic gains and cultural identity fostered by Kohanga Reo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, it is important to keep in mind that attitudes of school staff, families and communities are vitally important to successful achievement.</td>
<td>What attitudes do participants hold regarding bilingual education?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The strengths and weaknesses of the operations of the bilingual units under study, discussed in the preceding section, coupled with factors at the situation and rationale levels of Spolsky's framework (1978), appeared to lead to a number of positive and negative outcomes for these programmes. As Spolsky predicted, the programmes affected changes, not only within school contexts, but also within the home, community and larger educational contexts and these outcomes will also receive attention.
Because of the complexity of the issues involved in the present investigation, it has been impossible to identify, let alone control for, all the variables which may have produced various effects in one or more of the settings, or to make hard and fast generalizations or predictions based on data from individual cases. In fact, it may well be impossible to determine to what extent outcomes ascribed to the bilingual programmes under study were not actually products of influences independent of schooling. (Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976). Therefore, there will be no attempt to establish a direct causal relationship between situational and operational variables and the outcomes of the programmes under study.

At present there seems to be no suitable way of integrating a comprehensive account of the interrelationships of factors within the basic model as we now conceive it. (Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976, p. 244).

A further difficulty in evaluating the educational outcomes of bilingual programmes is that no appropriate strategy to assess Maori language competency at the primary school level has been fully developed. However, the Tai Tokerau project (Peters and Marshall, 1989) has been very successful in developing culturally appropriate assessment of the Maori language competency of secondary pupils.

There is the additional problem of measuring affective outcomes, such as increased appreciation and pride in cultural difference, as no satisfactory instruments, particularly within the New Zealand context, have been devised for this purpose. In the ultimate analysis, it may be that these types of outcomes do not lend themselves to precise quantification. (See Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976).

Finally, except for a comparison of the English language skills of whanau and non-whanau pupils as measured by Progressive Achievement Tests,
there has been no attempt to compare the outcomes of the programmes under study with those of a control sample of non-whanau classrooms.

Nevertheless, keeping these caveats in mind, what the exploratory data amassed during this study does suggest is that:

1. a number of positive, and several negative, outcomes appear to have resulted from the operations of the bilingual units under consideration and,

2. there were indications that several key factors were linked to "successful" outcomes for the bilingual programmes.

3. "successful" outcomes appeared to be related to factors in the home and community, as well as educational, contexts.

**Linguistic Outcomes**

**Maori Language Development**

As fully adequate measures of primary pupils’ Maori language competency have not been devised, and as it proved unfeasible to record children's speech on audio tape, interview and observational data gathered during this study can offer only impressionistic evidence of children’s performance in this area. There is the further difficulty of the researcher's limited knowledge of Maori language and the question of her competency to assess Maori in an appropriate manner.

Firstly, as has been mentioned in the operations section, 18 months of classroom visitations at six South Island sites revealed that whanau class children typically displayed Maori language proficiency in only the very limited number of culture-related activities to which they had had repeated exposure and many opportunities to practice. Chiefly, these included karakia, mihi to visitors and Maori language musical activities. In other domains, their speech production appeared to be hindered by the "affective
filter", described by Krashen (1981), suggesting that they were not acquiring Maori as a natural result of sufficient comprehensible exposure but, rather, were attempting to "learn" lexical, syntactic and grammatical patterns. As Krashen predicted, the speech production of these children was generally slow and halting (single word or phrase production stage), or non-existent (pre-production phase). Although most children seemed to comprehend the Maori language speech of teachers and kaiarahi reo, and would, for example, sit down or go outside when asked, they showed little age-appropriate proficiency in either oral or literacy-related tasks. In written tasks, particularly, children tended to switch between English and Maori language codes. The researcher suspected that this code switching occurred because children lacked sufficient Maori lexical information to convey their intended messages, not because they actually confused the two languages.

At two sites, there were reports that following entry into the whanau classes, Kohanga children had actually "gone backward" in terms of Maori language speech production:

"It takes only a very short time for these [Kohanga] children to suss out the situation here, in that the classroom is a place to speak English." (interview, kaiarahi reo).

"At school, English has status. Children are astute enough to see socially determined issues." (interview, associate teacher).

Based on observational data, it could be assumed that the preponderant use of English language and its effects on Kohanga children, as reported by participants in these two cases, held true at the four other sites as well. Further, these reports confirm the findings of North Island studies (see Rata, 1989) which showed North Island "bilingual" programmes to be subtractive situations for Maori-speaking pupils.
It is not to be assumed, however, that, in the South Island classrooms under study, pupils' low level of Maori language proficiency was related to lack of motivation. In fact, almost all pupils appeared to be very keen to employ whatever Maori language they had at their command. High motivation and opportunity to use the target language have been identified as key variables in language acquisition (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Fishman, 1976; Carey, 1987; Baker, 1988) and many whanau class pupils not only displayed eagerness to use Maori language, but also appeared to have had some opportunity to hear and use Maori language in extracurricular contexts (see Table 6.4, above). These two positive factors suggest that, given sufficient comprehensible exposure to Maori language in school (Krashen, 1981; Cummins, 1981; and Landry, 1987) these children may be expected to develop high levels of Maori language proficiency, including both basic communicative and cognitive/academic linguistic skills, even though, for the most part, the language used in their homes was English.

**English Language Skills**

Psychometric data, in the form of norm-referenced Progressive Achievement Test (PAT) scores (presented in Tables 9.1 and 9.2, below), measuring children's English language abilities in reading comprehension, reading vocabulary and listening comprehension, were available at two of the six schools under study. However, comparable data was not available for all schools which participated in this study. Progressive Achievement Tests were not administered at one school site and, owing to the variable ages of the whanau pupils, insufficient numbers of tests were administered at two other sites to enable the researcher to draw valid conclusions. At a fourth school, there was no separately identifiable whanau class as the kaiarahi worked in three mainstream classrooms, and, therefore, there was no opportunity to compare the scores of whanau and non-whanau children.
The samples (N = 239) comprised all Standard Two to Four children enrolled in the whanau and "regular" classes at two of the South Island schools under study for whom PAT scores were available. (PATs were not designed for Pupils below Standard Two.) Of the 239 children, 139 came from School A and 100 came from School B. Approximately one quarter of the children were enrolled in the whanau classes and the remainder were in regular, i.e., non-whanau, classes. In both cases, according to principals' reports and parent questionnaire responses, there was a higher percentage of Maori children in the whanau classes than in the non-whanau classes. The official bilingual programme at School A was established in 1987 and at School B in 1988.

**Amount of Maori Language in the Whanau Classes:** At both schools, associate teachers' estimates and observational data suggested that the total amount of Maori language used by the teacher during the average school day was quite low, about 10%. At School A, the kaiarahi reo, who spent half of every school day in each of two whanau classes, estimated that she used Maori language about 75% of the time. The kaiarahi reo at School B, who also spent half a day in each of two whanau classes, estimated that she used between 25 - 50% Maori language. Observations indicated that this may have been an underestimation and that her usage of Maori was, in fact, much closer to the 75% used by the kaiarahi at School A.

**Background Information - School A:** At School A, approximately three-quarters of the whanau class were identified by their parents as Maori or part Maori. The other quarter of whanau pupils were identified as Pakeha or European. About 25% of the whanau class pupils had attended Kohanga Reo prior to school entry and approximately one-third heard Maori spoken at home by their parents at least once a week. Although detailed records of the socio-economic status (SES) of pupils at this site were not kept by the school, principals' and teachers' reports and parent questionnaire responses
indicated that, overall, for both whanau and non-whanau classes, children came from homes which represented a cross section of educational and income levels, with a higher percentage than the national average of families in the higher socio-economic categories (Elley/Irving, 1985 and Irving/Elley, 1977 scales). School staff at this site further reported that the whanau class children were "fairly typical" of all students at the school in terms of scholastic ability and family income and education levels.

**Background Information - School B:** Detailed records of family employment were maintained at School B and analysis of these records showed that, overall, the school district comprised a relatively low SES population with many families dependent upon government benefits. Mann-Whitney U tests were performed on the coded scores (utilizing the most recent Elley-Irving Socio Economic Indices for Males and for Females [1985, 1977]) of school-supplied information of parents' occupations. The results showed that fathers of the pupils in the whanau class were of a significantly lower SES than fathers of non-whanau pupils (p =< .01). There was no significant difference in the SES of the mothers of whanau and non-whanau children.

Approximately 85% of the whanau class roll at School B were Maori or part Maori children, according to parent questionnaire reports. Parents further reported that approximately one-third of the class heard Maori spoken at home at least once a week by their parents and about 40% of the whanau class had had Kohanga Reo pre-school experience. The principal of this school rated whanau children as "good" students in comparison with the rest of the school, but one whanau teacher viewed them as "average to below average" students.

**Procedure:** Progressive Achievement Tests were administered to all subjects by school staff in Term 1 of 1990. Reading Vocabulary tests were
administered to all children and, for the majority of children, Reading Comprehension and Listening Comprehension scores were also administered at the same time.

**Results and Implications:** The PAT results which were available in sufficient numbers from two of the six South Island schools included in this study indicated that there were no significant differences between the scores of children enrolled in the whanau classes and children who were enrolled in the mainstream classes. Scores on PAT Reading Comprehension, Reading Vocabulary and Listening Comprehension tests, were essentially the same for both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAT READING COMP.</th>
<th>PAT LISTENING COMP.</th>
<th>PAT READING VOCAB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q'ile</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Q'ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanau</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Whanau</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9.2: MEDIANS, UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES OF PERCENTILE SCORES ON PAT TESTS FOR WHANAU AND NON-WHANAU PUPILS AT SCHOOL B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAT READING COMP.</th>
<th>PAT LISTENING COMP.</th>
<th>PAT READING VOCAB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Q'tle Med Q'tle N</td>
<td>Lower Q'tle Med Q'tle N</td>
<td>Lower Q'tle Med Q'tle N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanau</td>
<td>25.0 46.0 65.0 25</td>
<td>10.5 25.0 43.5 28</td>
<td>13.0 35.5 46.0 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Whanau</td>
<td>26.5 42.0 60.0 72</td>
<td>14.0 32.0 55.0 69</td>
<td>17.0 32.0 50.0 58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAT STUDY SKILLS 1.</th>
<th>PAT STUDY SKILLS 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Q'tle Med Q'tle N</td>
<td>Lower Q'tle Med Q'tle N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanau</td>
<td>18.0 38.5 64.0 18</td>
<td>10.0 54.5 43.5 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Whanau</td>
<td>25.0 39.0 64.0 43</td>
<td>30.5 50.0 69.0 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of test results from School A (see Table 9.1) shows that average scores attained by whanau class children were sometimes higher, and sometimes lower, than scores of non-whanau children. However, Mann-Whitney U tests performed on these scores showed that none of these differences was statistically significant.

Table 9.2 shows a similar pattern for School B. Once again, Mann-Whitney U tests found no significant differences between the scores of pupils in whanau and non-whanau classes on any of the tests.

Although five of the eight comparisons favoured the whanau groups, the results indicated that there was no significant difference between the performance of whanau and non-whanau pupils at the same school on a variety of tests of oral and written English. This was true for both Schools A and B. Therefore, findings from this study do not support the contention that
the use of Maori as a language of instruction is detrimental to pupils' acquisition of English language skills.

In fact, the reverse appears to be true. The results of past studies, eg. Lauder and Hughes (1990, p. 48) and St. George and Chapman (1984, Table 4), which found PAT scores to be significantly correlated with SES, would lead to a prediction that at School B, the whanau pupils, with fathers of significantly lower SES than their non-whanau peers, would do less well on PAT tests, whereas both groups actually achieved at the same level. Lauder and Hughes' findings could, however, explain the higher scores attained by School A pupils, both whanau and non-whanau, when compared with scores from School B.

Similarly, Beck and St. George (1983) have shown that Maori children, on average, obtain lower scores on PAT Reading Comprehension and Reading Vocabulary tests than do European children. As there was a far higher proportion of Maori children in the whanau classes than in the non-whanau classes, according to principals' reports, judging from past trends, the whanau classes could have been expected to score lower on these tests than the non-whanau classes. Further, if education in a bilingual unit were a disadvantage to Maori children, then the scores from the whanau classes would be lower still. This, however, was not the case, as whanau children obtained scores which were essentially the same as those of their non-whanau peers, i.e., higher than might have been expected from a group with a high proportion of Maori pupils.

**Conclusions:** The results of the present study indicated that in two of the Maori/English bilingual programmes where sufficient data for analysis was available, enrolment in a whanau class did not appear to handicap children's development in either oral or written English language skills. It is possible that whanau enrolment may even have enhanced these skills.
These results support the findings of both overseas (see Chapter One) and New Zealand (see Chapter Two) research on the effects of bilingual education. A consistent pattern emerges that education through a minority language does not handicap majority language achievement. The results of the present study are consistent with findings of previous research undertaken in a wide variety of contexts, which shows that positive indications for the outcomes of bilingual education programmes appear to hold true irrespective of pupils' SES backgrounds, academic ability as rated by school staff or the relative international importance of the target language.

**Caveats:** - Three notes of caution must be sounded. Firstly, although triangulated data on pupils' backgrounds, such as relative academic ability and family SES, was reported by schools and by parents, it was beyond the scope of this study to closely match whanau and non-whanau pupils according to these factors. School data was sometimes missing or incomplete and interviews with the parents of all samples was not possible due to limitations of time and funding. Further, it may be that our present SES measures are incapable of assessing these factors for Maori children and Maori families (see Chapter Three). Therefore, although within each school there were no apparent indications that whanau and non-whanau pupils differed in regard to background factors, it is impossible to state positively that pupils' backgrounds were identical.

Secondly, it was impossible to state with any certainty that the two programmes where PAT scores were available were totally representative of the bilingual programmes under consideration. However, there were no indications that they were atypical.

Finally, as noted above, there was less Maori language used in the New Zealand whanau classes than the minimum 50:50 ratio which the term
"bilingual" has implied in previous studies. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that results from the present study are comparable with overseas data. The present findings must be seen only as suggestive, rather than conclusive. Clearly, more research on the linguistic effects of Maori language programmes is needed. However, as Spolsky, (1987) has warned, we should ensure that methods of evaluation are compatible with a Maori cultural framework and meet with the approval of Maori educators and community participants. New Zealand researchers must also keep in mind the dangers of a too-global assessment of bilingual education. While it would be foolhardy to ignore international research when designing our own, what we ultimately need are not exact replications of overseas studies, but rather research projects aimed at establishing what types of Maori language programmes work best for which children within uniquely New Zealand educational contexts.

Other Outcomes

Cultural Identity and Self Esteem

Numerous comments gleaned from interviews with parents, teachers and kaiarahi reo reflected the positive effects of the whanau programmes on children's self-image and self esteem. At two sites there were reports that the whanau class members were seen as "leaders" in some respects (principal interview) and as exceptional in their self-assurance:

"In the senior syndicate, our children stand out as confident. [This] is noticeable at school assembly, even in areas like Scottish country dancing or modelling. ... They're willing to give it a go." (interview, kaiarahi reo).

Many parents' comments also reflected their perceptions that the bilingual programmes promoted children's self-respect. One mother, whose daughter was enrolled in the whanau programme where the principal
described the children as "leaders", spoke of this child's pride regarding her
Maori heritage compared to an older sibling who missed out on the whanau
unit because he came through the same school a few years before the unit
was established. According to this parent, the older boy once dusted his skin
with flour before leaving for school in an effort to look like his Pakeha
classmates.

At this same site, another mother reported that it was "a relief" to find the
whanau class, as at her son's previous school he was "called names and
cried about his brown legs."

At another site the kaiarahi reo reported:

"Maori children here are achieving well and are well
integrated, along with Maori adults, into the general life of
the school without losing their identity."

At a different school, a parent of Pacific Island descent whose child was
enrolled in the whanau class and who happily embraced his dual cultural
heritage (Tongan and Maori), expressed regret that a similar programme
had not been available when she was at school.

**Attitudes and Behaviours**

At all sites the researcher was struck by the co-operative and helpful
attitudes of the children, both toward each other and to the staff. It was very
unusual to hear a child show disrespect to an adult or to behave in an
unkind way toward another child. The several instances of unacceptable
behaviour which were observed were reprimanded by whichever staff
member happened to be nearest and, following an explanation of why the
behaviour was not to be tolerated, the miscreant was very quickly forgiven
and absorbed back into the group's activities.
There were indications, based on questionnaire data supplied by kaiarahi reo and associate teachers (questionnaire items # 2a), that whanau class children benefited from the family atmosphere and co-operative learning environment of the bilingual classrooms. According to the comments of these respondents, both security and motivation resulted from the unique context of the whanau education. All of the kaiarahi reo and four of the seven associate teachers surveyed reported that the children with whom they worked were better off in a bilingual class than they would have been in a "regular" classroom. (Three out of seven associate teachers felt unable to make a clear response to the question of whether all children were "better off" in a whanau class, because, as one commented, "children's needs differ").

There were indications at several sites that the whanau atmosphere of the classroom extended to extracurricular activities as well. Field notes record examples of older and younger children of both sexes playing together during recess, with no one left out or excluded from the activities. Field observations recorded during an all-school sports day at one site recorded that the competitive jibing noted among some other classes was conspicuously absent from the whanau class, where children encouraged one another with abundant good humour.

As one parent put it:

"Our children stay together. They sleep together, play here in school together and do sports together. I love this school and my kids do too."
Effects on the Wider Community

In addition to the positive psychological and social effects on children noted at each of the sites, there were also several positive effects on families and communities which appeared to result from the whanau programmes. As has been mentioned above, at one site a whanau-based plan of action for adult Maori language learning, which included the school's principal, associate teachers, kaiarahi and parents, was set up with the assistance of a Polytechnic tutor. At another school, the kaiarahi noted that the bilingual whanau was accessing more resources as a family, for example by attending a Polytechnic course together.

In two other cases, kaiarahi reported that parents constantly commented that children were beginning to speak Maori at home and the father of one family which had recently relocated from the North Island noted that he now had to struggle to keep ahead of his daughter's progress in Maori.

At a third school, the kaiarahi reported that as the whanau children became familiar with marae protocol, the local kaumatua often asked a child to say grace or a karakia on the marae, which she felt to be "a very important outcome" of the bilingual programme. At another school, the whanau class had very close ties with the local marae and Kohanga which were within walking distance of the school. The principal at this site reported that children had been invited by the kaumatua to participate in the marae welcome for overseas delegates to a Commonwealth economic conference.

The comments of a kaiarahi reo at a different school indicated that, as a result of their involvement with the bilingual class whanau, closer ties between the Maori community and the school had been forged and that Maori community members were no longer content to "leave it [educational decision-making] to the schools".
"It's [bilingual whanau class] been set up and we wouldn't let it go now. If there was a hint of a problem, they [the Maori community] would rally."

Indeed, family involvement in the whanau classes has been very high at all sites (see Chapter Eight and this Chapter, below) and this must surely rank among the major positive outcomes of the whanau programmes.

There were also indications, based on interviews with participants, that the whanau classes had had positive impact on the attitudes of some of the majority community members in the districts in which they were located. A resource teacher of Maori stated his feelings that educational initiatives, such as the whanau programmes which authenticated the Maori language and culture, were important means by which New Zealand society at large could be exposed to a more realistic view of New Zealand's social and cultural history:

"It's important that we have a good look at the past 150 years to bring out what's been hidden. We're finally beginning to realise that Maori get the short straw."

**Effects on the Schools**

**Classroom changes:** Over half of the associate teachers surveyed (questionnaire item # l8d) indicated that as a result of their participation in the whanau programmes, they had changed their teaching approaches. Principally, these changes involved teaching methodology, classroom management and family contact. In interview situations, four teachers commented on their attempts to modify assessment procedures, typically relying heavily on descriptive comments, rather than on grades, and concentrating on social development and attitudes as well as academic performance. The standard progress report at one site, for example, had been modified by the associate teacher and kaiarahi reo to accommodate whanau goals, such as "appreciation of cultural difference", "participation
in tikanga Maori" and "te reo". However, in all cases, with one exception, teachers also used standardised tests, such as the Reading Diagnostic Survey, to measure students' abilities and progress.

It must be noted that it was impossible for the researcher to determine to what extent whanau classroom teaching approaches were "different" from those typically employed in primary school classrooms, except for readily observable factors, such as vertical age grouping, as no comparison research on "regular" classes was undertaken at any of the schools.

**School-wide Changes:** - It is impossible to make precise statements regarding the effects of the whanau programmes on the wider schools, as no before-and-after comparisons were undertaken due to the limited time frame of this research project. There were also suggestions, however, based on interview data collected at four of the six schools, that the whanau programme had had positive effects on the attitudes of some school staff, Board of Trustees (BOT) members and non-whanau school parents toward the concept of bilingual, bicultural education. One principal noted that although there had been some "defensiveness" in regard to the establishment of a whanau programme, "the BOT and others are becoming used to the idea of making provision for Maori language and culture within the school."

A Maori representative on one school's Board of Trustees stated that:

"The governance of the school has changed and the people on it [BOT] have changed, too. ... [They've taken] a different stance as individuals to how they feel about things now."

The kaiarahi at this site noted that staff, as well, were "more on board now, they can see our kids are not a problem in the playground [and they are] seen to fit in."
One principal reported that significant positive effects on the perceptions of several school parents, who had been against Maori aspects of the school's curriculum, resulted from a marae visit arranged by the kaiarahi reo. These parents, according to the principal, had been particularly impressed by the warmth and affection shown to all children by the marae whanau.

Interview data revealed that the primary school whanau programmes were beginning to affect the operations of local intermediate schools. At three sites, intermediate schools were beginning to initiate changes in order to accommodate whanau children who were coming on from contributing primary schools.

At the school level, perhaps the most significant positive change which may be attributed to bilingual units is that they have served as a spring board from which kaiarahi reo have entered colleges of education. Despite the lack of Division K courses in the South Island, three of the six kaiarahi who participated in this study entered full-time teacher training during the 18 months period of contact. There were indications that a fourth kaiarahi would have applied for training if Division K had been available in her area.

**Levels of Satisfaction**

With few exceptions, questionnaire data supplied by school staff participants (principals, associate teachers and kaiarahi reo) indicated that they were generally quite satisfied with the bilingual programmes with which they were involved.

All principals contacted in the study reported that they were "somewhat satisfied" (questionnaire item # 6) with the bilingual programmes at their school and, with one exception, also indicated moderate satisfaction with the
whanau children's progress in school. Five out of the six principals, however, reported less satisfaction ("neither satisfied nor dissatisfied") with their school communities' acceptance of the programmes. Several principals' comments clarifying their responses to this questionnaire item suggested that the less than wholehearted community acceptance of the whanau programmes stemmed from: 1) misinformation about the nature and purposes of the bilingual class and 2) the disappointment of some Maori community members with the programmes' operations.

Of the eleven bilingual staff members (four kaiarahi reo and seven associate teachers) surveyed, eight reported (questionnaire items #2) that they were either "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with the attitudes and behaviour of whanau class children; and, somewhat surprisingly, ten out of eleven indicated that they were satisfied with the children's progress in Maori language. Bilingual staff members also tended to express satisfaction with the general progress in school work achieved by whanau children. As indicated above, most bilingual staff felt that children were "better off" in a bilingual unit than they would have been in a "regular" classroom.

As demonstrated in Table 9.3, parents, also, tended to express (questionnaire item # 3) satisfaction with the bilingual programmes in which their children were enrolled and to be moderately pleased (questionnaire item # 4) with their children's progress in the bilingual class.
TABLE 9.3: PARENTAL SATISFACTION WITH BILINGUAL CLASSES
Parents' Questionnaire item #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>All schools*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately satisfied</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* where Parents' Questionnaires were distributed

However, this satisfaction was not uncritical, with Kohanga parents expressing significantly (p<.05) less satisfaction than the non-Kohanga cohort. In fact, one of the major findings of this study was the high number of statistically significant differences between the reported attitudes of these two groups of parents toward many of key operational elements of the bilingual classes. As might be expected, these divergent levels of satisfaction were foreshadowed by the different rationales for bilingual education espoused by these two groups (see Chapter Seven). In addition to the fact that Kohanga parents tended to favour language maintenance and expansion rationales more highly than the social and affective goals most highly favoured by non-Kohanga parents, there were also a number of other areas of significant difference between these two groups demonstrated in Parents' Questionnaire responses:
The Kohanga group felt much more strongly that the whanau classes needed more Maori language books and materials and that more Maori language should be spoken in class and used in class prayers.

Kohanga parents were more likely to express the viewpoint that bilingual classes should have more of a Maori perspective.

More Kohanga parents indicated that they would prefer a separate Maori language school, but opinion was widely dispersed within both groups.

The Kohanga group expressed less satisfaction with the bilingual programmes, specifically identified more concerns in regard to their children's bilingual education and were more likely to want to see significant changes made in the programmes.

It is highly probable that different rationales for bilingual education expressed by the two groups of parents, combined with the differences listed above, contributed to the differing levels of satisfaction demonstrated in Table 9.3. However, there were also a number of parent questionnaire items which elicited no statistically significant differences from Kohanga and non-Kohanga parents and which suggested that both groups of parents tended to be at least somewhat supportive of the bilingual units under study.
Both groups indicated that they were moderately satisfied with their children's progress in class.

Both groups indicated that the teachers expected neither too much, nor too little from the children in the whanau classes under study.

They both tended to agree that there were sufficient English-language books and materials and that children received a reasonable amount of individual attention in class.

About 40-50% of both groups of parents visited the bilingual class at least once a week, and both groups strongly indicated that they
  1) felt welcomed when they did visit the class
  2) were kept informed of class activities
  3) were kept informed of their child's progress.
Parents from both groups gave similar reasons for visiting the class, with the exception of "assisting with a culture group" which was reported by a significantly greater proportion of Kohanga parents.

Both groups of parents expressed support for classroom use of Maori language in the areas of conversation, marae language, action songs, and traditional chants.

Neither group appeared to favour compulsory Maori language teaching for all New Zealanders, nor limitation of bilingual class enrolment to Kohanga Reo children only.

Kohanga and non-Kohanga parents indicated strong support for continuation of bilingual education through the secondary grades.

**Conclusions: Levels of Satisfaction:** - As demonstrated by the tables above, Kohanga parents gave clear indications that they were not fully satisfied with the way the bilingual programmes functioned. In addition, further dissatisfaction with the bilingual units was suggested by parents' responses to questionnaire item # 4, (see Table 9.4) which showed that 25.5% percent of all parents surveyed (47.4% of Kohanga parents and 12.5% of non-Kohanga parents), would have preferred a separate Maori language school rather than a bilingual unit located within a mainstream school.
TABLE 9.4: PARENT PREFERENCE FOR SEPARATE MAORI LANGUAGE SCHOOL. Parents' Questionnaire item #4

"I would prefer a separate Maori language school."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE RESPONDING</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>nor disagree</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kohanga parents</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanga parents</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there were also strong indications, based on questionnaire comments and interview data, that the programmes under study were viewed by both groups as offering benefits to their children. In view of the fact that at time of writing (1991) there were no official bilingual schools or state-supported kaupapa Maori schools operating in the South Island, the bilingual programmes in operation were probably perceived by both groups to represent the best educational option freely available to their children.

While the programmes have been criticized by some participants as "token" efforts, there appeared to be general agreement that they were certainly an improvement over previous primary school programming which had made little or no provision for Maori cultural distinctiveness. No one contacted during this study advocated the abolition of the whanau units. In fact, participants who favoured enrichment or social rationales for the establishment of whanau classes appeared to be highly satisfied with the operations of these programmes.

**Contexts Leading to 'Successful' Outcomes**

It is very difficult to identify, and probably impossible to quantify, the contextual variables which were related to the outcomes in the six programmes under study. However, as the analytical frameworks provided
by Fishman (1976), Spolsky (1978) and Landry (1987) make clear, the outcomes of these programme were undoubtedly influenced, not only by the school contexts within which they were situated, but by the home and community contexts surrounding them as well.

Defining the term "success" is problematic, but for purposes of this discussion, bilingual programmes considered to have the most "successful" outcomes were those which best promoted their stated rationales with optimum results, given the limitations imposed at the situational and operational levels. (Spolsky, 1987; Spolsky, 1978 and Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976. See also Mackey, 1977). As demonstrated in Chapter Seven, the major rationales for bilingual education identified by participants in the programmes under study were promotion of:

- Maori language and culture.
- Enhanced self-concept for Maori pupils.
- Whanau security (warm, family-like atmosphere).
- Appreciation of cultural differences.

To these four criteria for success, the researcher has added a fifth, programme stability, as there was some evidence, based on follow-up interviews conducted in 1991 after the main data collection phase of this project had been completed, that the continuing operation of bilingual units at two schools did not appear to be assured.

In order to facilitate generalization of findings, and thus, to offer some predictions regarding the contextual configurations which may be expected to lead to "successful" outcomes for bilingual programmes, the six cases under study have been grouped, based on the researcher's judgement, into three categories (Table 9.5), according to their apparent level of success in
achieving the objectives stated above. It must be noted that in case study methodology, generalization of findings is a matter of judgement, rather than calculation, and that "the task of case study is to produce ordered reports of experience to which judgement can appeal." (Stenhouse, 1990, p. 644).

The analysis of factors influencing programme outcomes presented in Table 9.5 originated with an identification of the "outlier" or exceptional cases, as suggested by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) that is, by identifying bilingual programmes which appeared to have uniquely successful or unsuccessful outcomes. Analysis proceeded by examining the similarities and differences of key school and community factors within these cases and the remaining, less exceptional cases, to note apparent relationships between situational and operational factors and qualitative differences in programme outcomes.

The programme with the "most successful outcomes" stood alone in its significant promotion of Maori language within a culturally appropriate educational framework. This programme (which was located at one of the original six schools under study) altered its operations, beginning in Term 1, 1991, to include an immersion unit, staffed by a Maori-speaking teacher as well as a kaiaraha reo, which received strong support from a vital Maori community. Although this immersion unit retained strong links with the host school and was managed by the school's Board of Trustees and Principal, in many respects its operations were separate from those of the larger educational setting. For example, the unit did not form part of the junior school syndicate and, therefore, was removed from many of the conflicts which characterised whanau programmes more closely integrated with the total school programme. This unit had a clearly established clientele, i.e., junior class children whose parents favoured a total Maori
language immersion. The programme also benefited from clear educational rationales based on the same kaupapa Maori principles as Kohanga Reo.

In the two "less successful outcomes" cases, the future of the whanau classes appeared to be at risk. This was related to the resignation, at both sites, of the senior teachers who had been instrumental in establishing the programmes and who had served as associate teachers, indicating that the enthusiasm of one or two staff members alone cannot suffice to institute ongoing bilingual change. It must be noted, however, that all programmes, including the programmes in this category, appeared to have been successful in promoting security, self-esteem and appreciation of the bicultural heritage of New Zealand.

During the latter stages of this study, significant changes in the structuring of the "whanau" classes took place at one of the "less successful outcomes" sites mentioned above. Beginning in 1991, the bilingual programme at this school was composed of a group of six to seven ex-Kohanga pupils meeting daily under the supervision of a Kohanga kaiako and another classroom where the whanau children were kept together with the previous associate teacher and where Maori language and culture were supported, but without the services of a full-time kaiarahi reo or other Maori speaker. This unit appeared to receive little support from the Maori community within the school district.

In the second "less successful outcomes" programme, where the recently (temporarily) appointed associate teacher had had no experience or training in bilingual methodology or Maori language, and where the 30 pupils ranged from New Entrant to Standard Four levels, the unit was, according to one participant, "... just holding together." Like the other school included in the "less successful outcomes" category, this unit appeared to have little support from the local Maori community. For example, when the
researcher wrote to the Chairperson of the local Maori Executive requesting an interview, he never responded because, according to the kaiarahi reo, "He'd never heard of the bilingual programme here." Efforts of the whanau parents to add a second class in order to cater to the wide age range of pupils were unsuccessful.

The three cases which formed the median grouping between "most successful outcomes" and "less successful outcomes" shared several characteristics. 1) The future of the bilingual programmes appeared to be secure within each of the schools. 2) All whanau classes had a full complement of students and were staffed by an associate teacher and a kaiarahi reo. 3) Although these units did not appear to promote high degrees of additive bilingualism across a wide range of linguistic functions, and followed Maori kaupapa only to a limited degree, they appeared to satisfy the expectations of most participants.
### TABLE 9.5: FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO VARIATION IN PROGRAMME OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devolution of authority</th>
<th>Maori SES of Vital active to Maori speaking school</th>
<th>Support from RTM/ dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Parent dissat- school enrol. Kohanga principal</th>
<th>Commun. teacher commun. advisors</th>
<th>&gt;25%</th>
<th>&gt;35%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most successful programme outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately successful programme outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less successful programme outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* effectiveness limited as principal was a temporary appointment
** no data available

#### Factors which appeared to influence differences in outcomes:

Analysis of Table 9.5 indicates that three factors\(^1\) appeared to influence the highly "successful" outcomes of the bilingual programme at School 1:

- A pro-active principal.
- A Maori-speaking teacher.
- A Maori community with real decision-making power within the school.

---

\(^1\) In all likelihood these factors are interrelated, but, as pointed out by Spolsky (1978), it is difficult to give an account of how they interact.
To a lesser extent than the three variables listed above, the presence of well-established local Kohanga Reo appeared to promote the success of whanau programmes.

In the "most successful outcomes" school, the principal had initiated action on a number of fronts to ensure that the outcomes of the whanau programme at his school would be successful. Initially, he rearranged all classes at his school into vertical age groups, so that the 'whanau' would not stand out as exceptional, in hopes that this would counter some resistance to the programme. In order to ensure that a suitable kaiarahi reo would be appointed, he actively recruited a young woman from another school. He distributed a survey questionnaire, with specific items aimed at gauging the expectations and opinions of whanau parents. Above all, he joined with Maori in his school and school community to develop a suitable programme to carry on the work begun at Kohanga Reo, this included his learning Maori alongside the bilingual whanau. As the kaiarahi reo at this site put it:

"I don't mind explaining things to ... [principal], because I know he'll listen."

The whanau programme at this site was the only South Island programme to have attracted a Maori-speaking teacher. It may be speculated that this unusual situation occurred because the groundwork had been laid and that, as the school's programme offered promise of promoting Maori values and goals, it appealed to a Maori person more than other South Island sites.

Co-operation between school personnel and community members promoting language and cultural maintenance goals was a unique feature of the operations of this programme. Community members, including some who were expert in te reo and tikanga Maori, appeared to have had a great deal of influence in the planning and management of Maori language
programming and in initiating and supporting the significant changes which occurred at this site. In addition, several well-resourced and active Kohanga Reo served as "feeder" pre-schools for this programme.

**Factors which did not appear to influence differences in outcomes:**
Analysis of Table 9.5 demonstrates that several factors did not appear to be related to differences in programme outcomes.

- The socio-economic status of school district families.
- Levels of parental dissatisfaction with programmes, as evinced by questionnaires distributed during the first phase of the study.
- Percentage of enrolment of Maori pupils.
- Level of available educational support.
Factors which do not appear in Table 9.5, as they appeared to be fairly consistent across all schools, and therefore were considered unlikely to contribute to outcome differentials (although they undoubtedly influenced to programme outcomes) included:

- Dedication of the bilingual staff. (This included both associate teachers and kaiarahi reo, who, in all cases were committed and caring.)
- The rate of turnover of associate teachers.\(^2\) (variable, but generally high at most sites). In fact, the school which eventually developed the "most successful" programme experienced the highest teacher turnover of all cases included in the study.
- Adequacy of Maori language resource material. (Inadequate in all cases.)
- Level of resistance to the programmes from some individuals and factions within schools and school communities. (Reported at all sites.)
- Level of input from a core group of whanau parents. (High in all cases.)

**Conclusions:**

- In general terms, the bilingual units under consideration were far more successful in promoting social (whanau security) and personal (confidence and self-esteem) rationales articulated by the participants in the study than they were in promoting language maintenance and expansion goals, which, in five out of six cases remained elusive.

- In one exceptional case, however, a unique combination of home, school and community factors provided an auspicious context for more "successful" outcomes. A cross-case analysis of school and community variables suggests that these micro-level factors included a pro-active

\(^2\) In the opinion of the researcher, this is not an indication of lack of dedication, but rather an indication of the high stress levels experienced by bilingual personnel.
principal, an associate teacher who spoke Maori, and devolution of planning and management authority to Maori community members who were well-equipped to undertake these responsibilities. To a lesser degree, the location of active Kohanga Reo within school communities appeared to contribute to the likelihood of programs "success". Therefore, the findings of this study support Fishman's contention that bilingual education programs are, "... dependent on forces and factors in the ... communities that surround the school." (1976, p. 124).

However, it must be noted that while the programs under study were influenced by the home and community contexts in which they were situated, the programs, in turn, appeared to have had an impact on families, communities, and school personnel. (Spolsky, 1978). Findings suggest that, in conjunction with the development of bilingual programming, associate teachers had modified their teaching approaches in order to cater to the needs of their whanau classes, parents were more involved in the education of their children, and, in three instances, kaiarahi reo had entered teacher training institutions and two kaiarahi served on school Boards of Trustees. Further, in several cases it was reported that school Trustees and community members had developed more positive attitudes toward Taha Maori as a result of the implementation of whanau units. Apparently, not only are schools affected by social factors, but "... educational activities [also] affect the life and constitution of the community." (Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976, p. 239).
Chapter 10

Future Programming and Policy Implications

Introduction

According to interview, survey and observational data, a number of positive outcomes have been promoted in the six whanau programmes under study. There were indications at these sites that:

- Children's self-esteem and confidence have been fostered within culturally sensitive and secure classroom environments.
- Whanau classes provided the significant educational advantage of some Maori language and cultural enrichment in addition to the standard English language primary school curriculum.
- As measured by Progressive Achievement Test scores, whanau pupils' English language development appeared to have been unimpaired, and may even have been enhanced by exposure to Maori language within the classroom setting.
- Family involvement with the programmes has been high.
- As a result of the whanau programmes, local schools and local school districts appeared to have placed a somewhat higher value on the distinctiveness of Maori language and culture.

What must not be lost sight of, however, is that at the operational level Maori language maintenance and expansion goals have proven to be very difficult to promote within the present contextual limitations. Without doubt, in five of the six programmes under study, English remained the dominant language of instruction. Rather than producing balanced bilingual speakers, these classrooms represented a subtractive situation for those children who entered them with any degree of proficiency in Maori language. This was the result of three major factors. Firstly, associate teachers, despite efforts to improve their functioning in this area, were not
proficient Maori speakers. Secondly, adequate training in bilingual teaching methodology was unavailable to associate teachers and kaiarahi reo. Thirdly, even the most basic material resources, such as graded Maori language readers, were completely inadequate. In short, the functioning of programmes at the micro-level were severely hampered by lack of provision, at the macro-level, of a cohesive, co-ordinated educational plan or the extensive infrastructure necessary to promote learning in and through the Maori language. This is of special concern, as language maintenance and expansion was cited by participants as the most important rationale for bilingual education.

A second limitation of the present programmes must be highlighted as well. Not only in terms of language allocation, but also in terms of cultural framework, whanau classes, in five out of six cases, represented only a minor modification of the dominant, Pakeha-controlled educational system. In terms of key structural elements, such as the background and training of teachers, the core curriculum and classroom assessment procedures, the educational goals and procedures validated by the cultural majority remained intact. As Kathy Irwin (1989) has pointed out, what is actually called for by many Maori is radical transformation, "... not a reworked version of the racist system" which already exists (p. 5). Apart from one exceptional case, the whanau programmes under study were adaptations or "reworkings" of kaupapa Maori practices and beliefs, severely tailored to conform to a non-Maori system of schooling, rather than a radical redefinition of educational priorities and operations. One Kohanga kaiako aptly summarized the relationship between Maori and mainstream education in the following analogy:

"Sexual intercourse of mind, body and spirit has not taken place. Not even heavy petting has begun - maybe we're still in the hand holding process."
Utilizing the analytical framework provided by Spolsky's four-tier model, it appears that this phenomenon may be the result of situational and operational factors at work on both the macro- and micro-levels. More particularly, lack of a cohesive educational infrastructure, including teacher training and resource development, has mitigated against effective classroom promotion of the Maori language. Moreover, the monocultural and monolingual nature of New Zealand society at large, and a history of language and cultural assimilation within the education system, has resulted in resistance to the incorporation of a Maori educational perspective and the failure of the educational system to actively enlist the co-operation of Maori in planning and managing bilingual programmes.

**The Management of Educational Change**

Spolsky's model has proven to be very useful in providing an organizational schema for the present study and in demonstrating the reciprocal inter-relationship among factors at the situations, rationales, operations and outcomes levels. In order to explain how protracted pressure for radical change within the educational system to accommodate tikanga and te reo Maori has been so successfully resisted, however, it may be useful at this point to review the macro- and micro-level findings, organized in the present study according to Spolsky's framework, in light of the explanatory potential offered by organizational management theory. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) point out, analysis from a variety of theoretical perspectives can be used profitably to exhaust the potentialities of data:

... for any initial statement of the field problem a whole series of theories may be successively applied, each yielding different orders of data and each perhaps being limited by the special perspectives and dimensions on which it is predicated. (Bensman and Vidich, in Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p. 18).
Consequently, this chapter will draw on the explanatory elucidation offered by change theory and also develop the arguments of contingency theorists in order to probe more deeply the data collected and organized according to Spolsky's analytical model. The chapter will conclude with a recommendation for the incorporation within the New Zealand educational system of radical change, based on the community-developed models of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori.

**How Change Occurs**

1) According to management theorists (see reference to Lippett, et al. in Levy and Merry, 1986) planned change results from a decision on the part of a system to improve its functioning, often as a result of changes in the external environment. The most significant situational factor leading to the decision on the part of the New Zealand educational establishment to expand bilingual, bicultural schooling was the rapid spread of Kohanga Reo, a Maori community initiative. The proliferation of Kohanga Reo created a nation-wide demand for primary school programmes to provide continuity of educational experience for the thousands of children who receive a pre-school education based on language and cultural maintenance and expansion rationales. It must be noted that pressure for educational reform was primarily initiated from outside the national education system, rather than from within.

2) Huse (in Levy and Merry, 1986) adds to the definition of change the notion of power-sharing, that is, power based on knowledge, skills and competencies, between the host system and the change agent. If Maori communities are seen as the primary change agents in the programmes under consideration, then, according to Huse's definition, bilingual education should involve a change in the power relationships between these communities and the schools hosting bilingual programmes.
What Should Have Taken Place

According to Lewin (in Chung and Megginson, 1981, pp. 487-488; see also Schermerhorn, 1986, pp. 516-517) effective change takes place in three stages:

Stage 1 - Unfreezing - Recognition of the need for change or pressure for change. Once the recognition takes place, the status quo in the organization's behaviour and structures needs to be changed. This can be accomplished by increasing the pressures for change and by reducing any forces resisting change.

Stage 2 - Implementing Change - This stage involves knowing what and how to change. Managers must know what components need to be changed and understand how change will affect other components. According to system theory, a change in one component necessitates change in other components to make them compatible.

Stage 3 - Refreezing - The final stage of effective change involves maintaining the new-found compatibility by correcting any "misfits" among organizational components before they become unmanageable.

What Did Take Place

Stage 1 - "Unfreezing"; - Within five of the six programmes under study, "unfreezing" did not take place as, at macro- and micro-levels, the educational establishments were insufficiently convinced of the need to implement systems-wide change. Although there was considerable external pressure, both at national and community levels, to affect profound changes within schools, this pressure was not strong enough to counter resistance within the system. Undoubtedly, one reason why external pressure was so successfully resisted was the relative political powerlessness of Maori within New Zealand as a whole (see Shafer, 1988), with the accompanying marginalization of Maori within the education system.
We have received information that Te Wahanga Maori Unit in the Ministry of Education is constantly frustrated by being effectively excluded from most of the important decision making in the Ministry of Education, even on issues indisputably relating to education of Maori such as the distribution of Maori Language Factor Funding. (Kā Awatea, p. 48).

Another factor contributing to change resistance at the local levels was the failure to establish the stipulated community/school advisory committees which could have informed communities of the purposes and strategies of bilingual education and provided a forum for open and frank discussion of doubts and fears regarding the introduction of bilingual units. Additionally, counter-pressure, stemming from strong "anti-separatist" or anti-pluralist sentiment, mitigated against change at the local, regional and national levels. Bicultural education programmes were perceived by many to threaten the cohesiveness of New Zealand society or to offer Maori children unfair advantages not enjoyed by other pupils.

**Stage 2 - "Implementing Change":** Even if the schools in question had been convinced of the need to implement far-reaching linguistic and cultural changes in educational curriculum and organizational patterns, there is little to suggest, given the monocultural backgrounds of almost all school personnel contacted, that they would have known what or how to change. During this stage of the change process, Huse's "power sharing" with Maori "agents of change" should have occurred, but, in fact, at only one site did the Maori community become active decision-makers in their children's whanau-based education. At other sites, although whanau and other community members were consulted, the schools failed to acknowledge, in practical terms, that Maori alone possess in-depth knowledge of and competency in their own cultural and linguistic heritage and, therefore, they alone can determine how this heritage must be passed on to future generations.
There were clear indications that in the six schools under study, neither school administrators nor bilingual classroom teachers had been adequately prepared to implement bilingual education programmes and had few specific notions of what form such programmes should take. Moreover, there was also evidence of lack of in-depth understanding regarding biculturalism and teachers' and administrators' awareness of this concept remained, in some cases, at the "basket weaving" level. (See K. Irwin, 1988). Moreover, resources and services which should have been in place to provide support and in-service training for schools and staff embarking on new programmes were often non-existent or completely inadequate.

Implementation of bilingual education in the South Island programmes included in this study was further hampered by regional disparities in the allocation and distribution of the limited resources and services which were available. For example, only two Maori language advisors were appointed for the whole of the South Island.

Low numbers of Maori school children, particularly those with Kohanga experience, created further difficulties for South Island schools implementing bilingual programmes. In all cases but one, there was no clearly-defined pupil clientele and both Kohanga Reo children and those with little or no Maori language background were enrolled in the same classes. Because the children's needs, and their parents' expectations, were so different, it was difficult or impossible for schools to formulate clear rationales or to establish consensus on how the programmes should operate. In all but the one exceptional case, the expectations of the non-Kohanga group of parents appeared to receive higher priority than those of the Kohanga group.

Typically, the bilingual programmes under study suffered from a severe shortage of trained, fluent Maori teachers; a paucity of support personnel; a
lack of clear objectives, goals and strategies; underdeveloped curricula; inadequate supplies of books and other Maori-language learning materials and the lack of appropriate evaluation procedures. At both macro- and micro-levels, as a result of the educational establishment's failure to come to grips with the complexity of either bilingual or bicultural change, what took place was a "hit or miss" modification of existing systems, based on narrow perceptions of what "Maori" education might entail.

Stage 3 - "Refreezing": - As a result of failure to implement Stages 1 and 2 of the change process, apart from the exceptional programme which evolved at one site, any "correcting" that occurred served to "water down" programmes to make them compatible with mainstream educational organization, not the other way around. Elements of kaupapa Maori education which were unfeasible given the limitations of the existing school system, such as continuation of the immersion approach to Maori language acquisition utilized by Kohanga Reo, were eliminated from the programmes.

In order to avoid alarming those opposed to "separatist" education, whanau programmes and whanau pupils were heavily integrated with mainstream classes and children. In fact, a chief concern identified by principals contacted in this study was that the bilingual units not stand apart from other classes. The result of this integration was to lessen even further the impact of the children's minimal amount of school exposure to Maori language and to make it even more difficult for whanau pupils to achieve bilingual fluency.

First- and Second-Order Change

Further insight into the process of introducing Maori language programmes into the school system may be gleaned from an examination of the two qualitatively distinct categories of change posited by Levy and Merry
which they label first- and second-order change. First-order change is defined as that involving minor adjustments and improvements that do not change the system's basic core (p. 5). This type of change maintains "the course of affairs in line with governing relations, norms and standards", while second-order change re-forms "the governing relations which assume, express, and create a whole new system of values." (in Levy and Merry, 1986, p. 6). Levy and Merry encapsulate the radical nature of second-order change by describing it as a "revolutionary jump", which while appearing to those entrenched in established order to be irrational is, in fact, based on a "different logic" resulting in new world views and new paradigms for the organization. (p. 9).

Clearly then, the primary school bilingual units under study, resulting from, but not satisfying, community demands for radical, second-order change, in five cases out of six, remained frozen at the first-order change level as the existing system had not been "thawed". Minor modifications were made in choices of curriculum material, the languages of instruction, and vertical age-grouping of pupils: nevertheless staffing policies, school-community power relations, validated epistemology, pedagogical practices and assessment procedures remained intact. Second-order change, the type of change which would occur if kaupapa Maori provided the educational foundation for bilingual units, would entail significant change in all of these areas (See Table 10.1, below).

Organizational Culture

There exists a considerable body of theoretical support for the notion that transformational, second-order change requires a change in organizational culture. (Huse and Cummings, 1985; French and Bell, 1984; Schein, 1985). In management terms, the culture of any system, be it a nation, a society, an ethnic group, a business organization, or an educational system, is the set of
collective and integrated beliefs and behaviours shared by organizational members. Culture is reflected in and guided by "system-generated images" or "core metaphors" which characterize the organization's view of itself and its relationship with the external environment. (R. Evered, 1980, p. 9).

Culture is the product of an organization's history and environment and is maintained, at an institutional level, by admittance practices (such as hiring policies) and socialization processes undertaken within and across hierarchical groups. It acts as a cohesive force to regulate appropriate standards and offers a conceptual framework by which members can understand which attitudes and behaviours are preferred and exerts a powerful influence on individual and group behaviour. (Robbins, 1983; see also Schermerhorn, 1986; and Schein, 1985). Culture works to maintain the identity and cohesion (status quo) of organizations and protects them from external threat.

Because culture exerts such a profound influence on all the undertakings of an organization, if we wish to understand a system's functioning, we must understand its culture. For present purposes, if we wish to explain the functioning of the bilingual units under study within the host organization of mainstream schools, we must begin with an understanding of the culture of New Zealand education and how this culture is mirrored in the educational system. For purposes of comparison, and to understand why the continuation of the educational experience Maori education offered by Kohanga Reo necessitates a radical transformation of the school system, a theoretical model of the typical (but not universal) cultures of both kaupapa Maori and mainstream New Zealand schools are presented below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic Attributes</th>
<th>Kura Kaupapa Maori</th>
<th>Mainstream Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Philosophy</td>
<td>Cultural autonomy.</td>
<td>Cultural assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Setting</td>
<td>Focus of community action and social cohesion.</td>
<td>School operates as a separate enclave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Political Aims</td>
<td>Maintenance and expansion of Maori language and culture.</td>
<td>Maintenance of majority culture and present social and economic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whanau development and, eventually, full participation by Maori in New Zealand economy and society.</td>
<td>Development of skills and technology for modern world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of skills and technology for modern world.</td>
<td>Development of skills and technology for modern world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Qualifications</td>
<td>Qualifications validated by Maori community while observing national requirements.</td>
<td>Credentials from non-Maori institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional and non-professional participation.</td>
<td>Power concentrated at the pinnacle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
<td>Immersion education in Maori.</td>
<td>English dominates, even in &quot;bilingual&quot; classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children benefit from a single language model.</td>
<td>Frequent code switching, even in &quot;bilingual&quot; classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on the works of D. Grace, especially, "The Structure and Organisation of Schools”. (Unpublished Manuscript. No Date). Also on the works of R. Pere and on the "Report of the Review of Te Kohanga Reo’. (See Literature Review, Section 1, above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic Attributes</th>
<th>Kura Kaupapa Maori</th>
<th>Mainstream Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Holistic learning.</td>
<td>Concern with cognitive functioning predominates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation of both majority and minority knowledge systems.</td>
<td>Validation of majority learning and culture only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus provided by kaupapa Maori.</td>
<td>Token approach to Taha Maori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance of oral and literacy-related skills.</td>
<td>Beyond Junior level, emphasis on literacy-related skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Tuakana/teina relationships fostered through vertical age grouping and peer learning.</td>
<td>Single age grouping, especially after primary grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery learning emphasis.</td>
<td>Time-tabled instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Adults and children assume teaching/learning roles.</td>
<td>Teaching responsibility typically rests with one adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual development emphasized within a context of group responsibility.</td>
<td>Individual child’s development has priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Intrinsic evaluation in conjunction with on-going assessment by teacher.</td>
<td>Typically, learners are excluded from assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Mana Mauri - For all students Wairua</td>
<td>&quot;Bright&quot; children expected to excel; others either keep up or are offered remedial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High expectations for all students.</td>
<td>Low expectations for Maori children, based on under-achievement beginning at junior grade levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the two school systems diagrammed in Table 10.1, shows that in many respects, mainstream and Kura Kaupapa Maori education, although exhibiting some similarities, are, in many respects, poles apart. Essentially, therefore, if schools are to accommodate the changes demanded
by parents and community members who are committed to Kohanga Reo, which operates under kaupapa Maori, a change in the culture of schools as well as in attendant hierarchies, teaching methods, assessment procedures is necessitated. However, management theory makes very explicit the difficulty, if not impossibility, of changing organizational culture, particularly if this change is initiated from outside the organization. Havelock (in Morrish, 1976) has highlighted the crucial importance of resistance to change by postulating a three-variable formula:

"Innovation = Demand minus Resistance". (p. 88).

**Resistance to Change**

As noted in the "unfreezing - change - refreezing" model, one of the key problems with implementing change is reducing resistance to innovation. Resistance must be anticipated and managed during the First Stage or change can be effectively forestalled.

Some organizations, more culturally dynamic and innovatory than others, respond fairly quickly to change demanded or necessitated by internal or external environmental forces. Educational organizations, however, do not fall into this category and tend to be highly resistant to change.

The major portion of available energy [in educational and other 'permanent' systems] goes to carrying out routine operations and maintenance of existing relationships within the system. Thus the fraction of energy left over for matters of diagnosis, planning, innovation and deliberate change or growth is ordinarily very small. (Miles, in Morrish, 1976, p. 55. See also Owens, 1970).

Havelock (cited in Morrish, 1976, Chapter 7) identifies a number of causal factors which contribute to change resistance within school systems:
1. Generally, communities and educators do not promote or expect changes in the school system, unless they perceive a crisis situation. There is a tendency to resist "experimentation" as children may suffer as a result. For example, Dr. Colin Knight, Principal of Christchurch College of Education, commenting on the development of Maori language education, has been quoted as follows:

   It is all very well providing Maori language and culture but the planners have to weigh up whether it is right to imbue children with this, when by doing so it may deprive them of the skills and knowledge to compete in the new technological age that is upon us. (Brown, 1988, p. 2).

   In each of the six cases under consideration, individuals and groups within communities and schools were antagonistic or suspicious of the bilingual education programmes in their midst. These negative reactions stemmed from a number of causes, including antipathy toward social pluralism, resentment of perceived Maori privilege, and the notion that Maori culture is somehow antipathetic to Christian doctrine. Whatever the reasons, however, community resistance to bilingual education tended to neutralize pressure from individuals and groups who were pushing for bilingual, bicultural change.

   Within schools, some mainstream teachers, uninformed about current bilingual education research and holding naive assumptions regarding the linguistic confusion previously thought to result from bilingualism, expected bilingual education only to compound the educational difficulties already experienced by many, many Maori children.

   Ironically, these critics of bilingual education appeared not to have questioned existing monocultural practices which have served to disadvantage Maori children throughout the history of New Zealand public education. Perhaps this was because one of the "core metaphors" which
continues to guide the New Zealand education system in its dealings with Maori children (and families) is that Maori living standards, child rearing practices, attitudes toward education and cultural and linguistic differences ("deficits") have resulted in educational disadvantages so severe that schools cannot reasonably be expected to remediate them. The majority of school principals contacted in this study, for instance, appeared to subscribe to cultural deficit theories as explanations for the academic difficulties experienced by Maori children. However, it has been noted that the notion of cultural deprivation has been, "both an excuse for and a cause of Maori failure." (R. Benton, personal communication, Sept., 1990).

Even in school districts with high Maori populations (See also Ramsay, et al., 1983, for macro-level data), it was typically from outside, rather than from within, the educational system that changes in the cultural practices and language of instruction of primary school classes were called for in order to make use of the cultural capital with which Maori children entered school.

2. Hampton, Summer and Webber, (1982) and Havelock (in Morrish, 1976) point out that change which originates from outside the host organization is frequently resisted, as succumbing to pressure from outside agents amounts to a tacit admission on the organization's part that it was remiss in not recognizing, for itself, that there was a better way of doing things.

Such admission can be extremely trying if it means facing your own guilt in causing harm. (Hampton, et al., p.697).

These authors illustrate this last point by citing a classic example (from Kaufman, 1973) of resistance to change from the history of medical science:

Ignez Semmelweis was a physician in charge of the maternity clinic at Vienna University Hospital in 1847. At the time, the death rate in childbirth was very high - over 12
percent at his hospital. He sharply reduced this rate - to approximately 1 percent by 1848 - by having physicians disinfect their hands in carbolic acid before examining patients. Before this time, attending doctors had just lightly washed or wiped their hands on their aprons and moved directly from pathology examinations (even autopsies) to women in labour.

The physicians didn't like the change because the acid irritated their skin, and Semmelweis was dismissed from his post in 1849. By the following year, however, he had begun to repeat his success at the maternity ward in Budapest, achieving mortality rates under 1 percent. He published his findings in 1861, but once again he was rejected by the leading medical authorities. In 1865 he died in an insane asylum, his discovery mainly forgotten.

Joseph Lister is not forgotten, however. Two years later, in 1867, this English physical published a paper describing how he used carbolic acid to clear the site of compound bone fractures (where the skin had been punctured). His innovation rapidly became widely celebrated in the medical world.

Almost twenty years later, in the 1880's, a Hungarian doctor wrote Lister, telling him how Semmelweis had anticipated the use of a disinfectant. To his credit, Lister acknowledged Semmelweis' prior innovation and used his own great authority to get it accepted as standard procedure in maternity hospitals - fully forty years after the Hungarian had demonstrated that it could reduce maternal mortality by more than 90 percent.

Why was Lister's procedure so easily accepted by physicians while they fought Semmelweis' for so long? Perhaps it was because the former's was consistent with the doctors' own self-image: that is, they treated the wound to heal the patient. They were agents of healing. In Semmelweis' case, however, adopting his procedure would have required tacit admission that they themselves had been the agents of infection and death. This required a change in self-image that was inadmissible. (Hampton, et al., 1982, p.697).

There is a clear parallel between this example of change resistance and the widespread failure of the New Zealand educational system to acknowledge its own culpability in closing the achievement gap between Maori and non-Maori students. Despite the fact that nearly a quarter of a century has elapsed since Watson's visionary publication, *Horizons of Unknown Power* (1967), pointed out the need for substantial change in the education system vis a vis Maori children (see Chapter Two, above) and despite the protracted
criticism from Maoridom specifically detailing areas where the system is falling down (see Chapters Two and Four, above) flat earth notions drawing from outmoded cultural deficit theories are still considered by many, many influential educators to be full and sufficient explanation for the underachievement of Māori children in Pakeha schools. These theories fit in very tidily with wider notions that although Māori are offered the same opportunities as other New Zealanders, they remain at the bottom of the social and economic, as well as educational, hierarchies because of their own unwillingness to better themselves. (National Research Bureau Survey reviewed in Chapter Four, above). Cultural deficit ideology enables schools to justify their existence as highly efficient "gate-keeping" institutions, whose job is not to provide educational success for all children, but rather, under the guise of a spurious meritocracy, to maintain the privilege of those who already hold it by controlling access to future educational and vocational opportunities. As Havelock notes, historically, education is a conservative enterprise, which concerns itself primarily with assuring cultural and social continuity, rather than with provoking cultural revolution or change. (in Moorish, 1976).

3. This last point leads us to another causal explanation for resistance to change in education, that is, that there are so few individuals within the education system willing to promote controversial new ideas. The role of school administrators, including school principals, is a type of balancing act, in that they must please or placate external change agents, if they become powerful enough and vocal enough, while at the same time, maintaining the cultural integrity of the school. There were many indications in the present study that school principals were very concerned that the bilingual programmes located in their schools not become foci for community divisiveness and contention and, typically, principals approached the implementation and organization of programmes from a conservative, rather than an innovative, point of view. Findings of the
present study offer clear indications that at only one site, where the principal adopted an innovative stance toward the whanau programme at his school, did radical change take place.

In other words, to come back to Havelock's categories, a key feature in resistance to change in education and a reason why schools change so slowly is lack of "entrepreneurial new models" (Moorish, p. 67). There are many pitfalls, and few rewards, for those within the school system who initiate innovatory (second-order) change. Although dedicated and hard-working associate teachers and kaiarahi reo were seen to be very important contributors to the positive outcomes of the bilingual programmes under study, almost without exception they did not receive the pay increments to which they were entitled and, in some instances, associate teachers actually appeared to be discouraged by the educational system from developing proficiency in Maori language.

According to Havelock, educators who tend to be rewarded are the those who demonstrate stable and dependable, if uninspired, performance.

Generally speaking, the school system is not usually the milieu in which individuals are found who sense needs, develop a series of practices suited to meet those needs, and push them through the organisation. It is a fact that most school administrators are themselves former teachers ... and they have evolved too many personal allegiances within the system to disturb the individuals or groups who serve under them. (Havelock, quoted in Moorish, p. 67).

Within the New Zealand context, this means that school administrators have formed familiar and comfortable networks with others, like themselves, who are overwhelmingly Anglo-Celtic and middle class and who would tend to benefit from retaining the status quo. This does not augur well for the future of kaupapa Maori education within the state school system. In fact, the findings of the present study showed school principals to
be the least receptive of any participant group to this type of educational alternative.

4. The final causal variable leading to the characteristically slow pace of change in education, and one which reinforces both of the above-mentioned variables, is that educational institutions, in common with other tax-funded organizations, resist change because they can. With an impunity denied other organizations whose survival depends largely on demonstrated performance, schools and school systems, untouched by profit struggles, are virtually guaranteed perpetuation almost irrespective of performance and can hold themselves unaccountable and unresponsive to large numbers of their constituents. (Havelock, in Morrish, 1976). This is especially the case for Maori constituents, who wield less political power than their numbers indicate.

Maori children, whether they or their parents will it or not, must attend school between the ages of six and fifteen, unless other "acceptable" (that is acceptable to the Pakeha controllers of education) arrangements are made. Given that Maori people as a group (see Chapter Four, above) are struggling to provide their children with the basic necessities of food, clothing, shelter and medical care, it is highly unlikely that there will be sufficient surplus to pay for private education which might be more responsive to their needs, however much they might desire this option. Therefore, Maori parents, denied meaningful choice, almost always send their children along to neighbourhood schools and hope for the best.2

Therefore Maori children, who make up approximately 20% of the total enrolment for New Zealand primary schools, provide a compulsory client

---

2 Increasing numbers of these parents, reading the writing on the wall (i.e. Maori underachievement in the mainstream education system, including the primary school system), however, are choosing kaupapa Maori education for their children if given the opportunity (Ka Awatea, p. 16).
group, even though data compiled over the last 30 years shows that mainstream schools are patently unable to bring Maori pupils' achievement up to the same average levels attained by non-Maori. In short, regardless of shortcomings in delivery of services to Maori children, there is little incentive for schools to challenge the basic tenets of their organizational culture in order to meet the needs of these pupils. Schools continue to receive public support despite the characteristic "problems" of Maori pupils. In fact, schools have been capitalizing on these "problems", as extra funding is allocated to schools with high Maori enrollments in an effort to improve Maori children's academic performance.

Where We Are Now

It is no wonder that the outcomes of five of the six bilingual programmes under study proved so disappointing to those who had anticipated, or at least hoped for, a genuine alternative to monolingual, monocultural state school education, as their implementation and operations have been very poorly managed. In fact, based on the macro-and micro-level data collected, it may be said that these initiatives have not been managed at all. Typically, programmes were ill-planned and severely under-resourced. Further, they were constrained by 1) unresolved cultural conflict and 2) resistance to innovation based on the persistent power of core mythologies, both of which combined to force programmes to dilute their innovative characteristics in order to appeal to the majority palate. The result is that the bilingual programmes under study, with one exception, were so well integrated, or assimilated, into the regular state school programmes, that in many key aspects of classroom functioning, they were scarcely different at all.

There was little evidence to show that either the New Zealand educational system or typical local schools were prepared to change their culturally-determined conceptual frameworks or to commit adequate resources in order to effect the second-order changes seen by many Maori as the only
solution to the crisis in Maori education. As Fishman, 1985; (also Holm, 1982), has noted, it is only when minority communities possess a certain measure of autonomy and decision-making power that bilingual programmes can be expected to succeed, either in promoting language and cultural maintenance rationales or in enhancing the academic performance of minority pupils. In other cases, as has been seen from the present study, resistance to change overwhelms minority initiatives and new and different programmes become engulfed by the already existing educational structures.

Where Can We Go From Here?

At this point it may be useful to take a look at the management concept of organizational "fit", as it appears not only to hold explanatory potential for the dysfunction of bilingual education programmes, but also, combined with contingency theory, to suggest a means by which performance may be significantly enhanced.

Briefly, organizational fit is the way in which the key elements of the organization are co-ordinated in order to achieve desired ends and reflects, in many respects, the organization's view of itself, in other words, its culture. (Van De Ven & Joyce, 1981, p. 3).

As demonstrated above, the cultures and other organizational components of mainstream New Zealand education and Kura Kaupapa Maori are radically different and, in the majority of programmes under study, a great deal of conflict and heartbreak resulted from unsuccessful attempts to promote Kura Kaupapa Maori practices and goals under the umbrella of mainstream organizational design. The gears did not mesh and the programmes did not accomplish one of their main purposes, that is, to expand upon the linguistic and cultural competencies of children who entered primary school with a firm grounding in tikanga and te reo Maori.
In most cases, there was evidence to suggest that, for Kohanga children, competency in these areas actually diminished upon entry into bilingual units.

Were the education system to adopt a "contingency theory" approach to the schooling of Maori children, however, then there would be a way out of this conflict situation. Briefly, contingency theory management involves a process of finding and maintaining organizational fit among the culture, environment, purposes, tasks, structures, strategies, and resources (including people) of the organization. (Chung and Megginson, 1981). According to contingency theory, there is no "one best way" of achieving a stated end, but, rather, the most appropriate design pattern is contingent on the objectives and particular needs and preferences of the people involved. (Morse and Lorsch, 1970, pp. 105-117).

Applied to bilingual, bicultural education, contingency theory would suggest that, as the educational objectives, needs and preferences of Kohanga Reo children (or other children with similar pre-school experiences) and their families are demonstrably different from those of children and families who form the cultural and linguistic majority of New Zealanders (even those who chose to enrol their children in whanau classes), then their schooling should be different as well. As the culture and resulting policies and practices of mainstream schools have proved to be predictably resistant to bilingual/bicultural transformation, then this transformation must take place outside of the mainstream schools.

There are ... strict limits to the nature and extent of change which can be sustained by the host system. (reference to Clay, in Robinson, 1989, p. 36).

As Ranginui Walker, (1991) has suggested, Maori must take control over their own education, and he recommends the establishment of an autonomous, parallel system which could cater to the requirements of those
who prefer kaupapa Maori education. Such a system, freed from the necessity of mounting (futile) attempts to achieve congruence with a change-resistant host system, could establish a new and harmonious organization, composed of congruent sub-parts (See Table 10.1, above). If contingency theorists are correct in their assumptions, then such a parallel educational system stands a much better chance of achieving its stated objectives. Specifically, an alternative kaupapa Maori system would have the potential to address several of the major concerns articulated by participants in the bilingual programmes under study by offering the following advantages:

• An alternative kaupapa Maori system could capitalize on the pre-school experiences of Kohanga Reo pupils.

• It could provide for continuation of educational experience through primary, grades and beyond.

• It could increase opportunities to use Maori language in the classroom and play areas and decrease pressure to use English.

• It could promote full whanau involvement in and responsibility for learning, teaching and management of programmes.

• It would permit the full exercise of Maori educational preferences.

• It would free Maori participants from the necessity of justifying their positions to (frequently change-reisitant) educational officials, school personnel and school communities and allow participants to concentrate on the achievement of their objectives.
Summary

Attempts to reform the New Zealand school system in order to make it more compatible with kaupapa Maori education, have, in large measure, proven to be ineffectual. At least in part, this is the result of cultural conflict between the two systems and an inability on the part of the host system to acknowledge the necessity for or desirability of radical change. As the present situation, whereby bilingual classes offer only minimal alternative to mainstream education, is unacceptable to large numbers of Maori, clearly a "better way" is called for. The establishment of an autonomous, parallel education system, based on the principles and practices of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori, appears to offer a viable alternative.
Chapter 11

Conclusions and Research Implications

Major Findings

A number of positive outcomes for some or all of the six bilingual programmes under study have been identified:

- Children's self-esteem and confidence have been fostered within culturally sensitive and secure classroom environments.

- Whanau classes provided the educational advantage of some Maori language and cultural enrichment in addition to the standard English language primary school curriculum.

- As measured by Progressive Achievement Test scores, whanau pupils' English language development appeared to have been unimpaired, and may even have been enhanced by exposure to Maori language within the classroom setting.

- There was a high level of family involvement with the bilingual units under study. Questionnaire responses indicated that 46% of parents visited the bilingual unit at least once a week and that 84% visited at least once a term. Close to 100% of parents at all sites reported that they felt welcomed when they did visit.

- According to local participants' reports, following the introduction of bilingual classes, school staff, Board of Trustees (BOT) members and non-whanau school parents have displayed somewhat more tolerant attitudes toward bilingual and bicultural curriculum initiatives than they had previously displayed.
• The programmes have served as a spring board from which kaiarahi reo have entered colleges of education. Despite the lack of Division K courses in the South Island, three of the six kaiarahi who participated in this study entered full-time teacher training during the 18-month period of contact.

What must not be lost sight of, however, is that at the operational level Maori language and cultural maintenance and expansion goals have proven to be unfeasible within the present situational and operational limitations:

• Without a doubt, in five of the six programmes, English remained the dominant language of instruction. Two thirds of the associate teachers surveyed reported using 10% or less Maori language during an average school day.

• Eighty-six percent of associate teachers and half of the kaiarahi reo described their training for bilingual classrooms as inadequate.

• Even the most basic material resources to support a Maori language curriculum, such as graded Maori language readers, were totally inadequate or non-existent. In addition, the distribution of available materials was reported to be inequitable, with schools outside major urban centres tending to be overlooked.

• Neither curriculum guides nor developed strategies for implementing a bilingual programme were available to associate teachers and kaiarahi reo. Interview data revealed that the lack of these types of resources created considerable stress for bilingual staff.
• In the absence of planning/advisory committees, bilingual programmes were left largely rudderless and leaderless, with no one person or body responsible for co-ordinating and managing the planning or operational stages of development, or for providing follow up evaluation in order to make necessary adaptations and changes.

• Key educational support personnel and support services, including resource teachers of Maori and relieving teachers; advisory services in Maori language and other curriculum areas; and special education services, such as Reading Recovery, were either inadequate or totally unavailable to support Maori language in the bilingual programmes under study.

• In all cases but one, programme rationales had not been clearly articulated and, without exception, there had been no assessment of goal feasibility. In all cases, the bilingual units under study lacked specific and detailed strategies to implement their goals. Moreover, since clear understanding of basic aims and their relative importance had not been determined, effective evaluation, which could have provided much-needed feedback to guide further planning, could not and had not taken place.

• At none of the schools under study was there a clearly defined client group for the bilingual programmes; both children with considerable pre-school experience in a Maori language and culture, as well as children who had not received this exposure, were enrolled in the same whanau classes. As a result, children who entered school bilingual programmes with well-developed Maori language skills either "marked time" or went backwards while others caught up with them.
A second difficulty arising from the grouping of both Kohanga and non-Kohanga children in the same classroom was that the parents of these two groups of pupils held very different expectations for the operations of the units. In all but the one exceptional case, the expectations of the non-Kohanga group of parents appeared to receive higher priority than those of the Kohanga group. Forty-seven percent of Kohanga parents who were surveyed indicated that they would have preferred a separate Maori language school rather than a bilingual unit located within a mainstream school.

As a group, Kohanga parents were significantly less satisfied than non-Kohanga parents with the whanau classes, chiefly in the areas of distribution of language functions and the lack of Maori language resources. Kohanga parents were also concerned with the monocultural perspective which they perceived to characterize their children's school experiences, as these experiences did not promote continuation of the linguistic and cultural gains which children had made in Kohanga Reo pre school immersion programmes.

The school whanau programmes also failed to provide continuation of two other key features of Kohanga Reo:

1) Maori control of Maori education and
2) whanau development.

In all but one of the bilingual programmes under study, authority for the education of Maori children remained firmly in the hands of the "professionals" and parents and community members were involved as helpers, consultants or teaching assistants, but not as managers or learners. At one site, however, a separate immersion unit was set up which involved the community in programme management and
included a Maori language tutorial group for families and school staff. In all other cases, there appeared to be little likelihood of promoting kaupapa Maori (the educational principles underlying Kohanga Reo), as far-reaching change tended to be engulfed by existing systems and structures.

• In each of the six schools there were strong indications that some community and school staff members were actively hostile toward the schools' bilingual units. Furthermore, there were indications that this hostility had imposed significant constraints on the operations of whanau programmes. In all but one case (where there was no separate whanau unit) associate teachers and/or kaiarahi reo reported that at least some other teachers were "envious and watchful" about the "extras" given to whanau classes.

• In each of the whanau units under study significant aspects of Head Office policy for kaiarahi reo were either ignored or inadequately implemented. Although according to Ministerial policy, the major role of kaiarahi reo was to support Kohanga children, within the contexts of the classrooms under study, where there were significant numbers of non-Kohanga children (ranging from 76 % - 31%) this proved to be unfeasible.

• Participants articulated major concerns about the lack of provision for continuity of bilingual programming throughout primary school and at higher grade levels.

• Rather than producing balanced bilingual speakers, the classrooms under study represented a subtractive situation for those children who entered them with any degree of proficiency in Maori language. While whanau class children appeared to hold very favourable attitudes
toward the Maori language, apart from a narrow range of cultural and social functions, they actually used very little Maori language in class. Although most children seemed to comprehend the Maori language speech of teachers and kaiarahi reo, they showed little age-appropriate proficiency in either oral or literacy-related tasks. In written tasks, particularly, children tended to switch between English and Maori language codes. Children most proficient in Maori language appeared to be "marking time" while others "caught up" with them.

- The low levels of Maori language used by children and adults in whanau classes was a cause for widespread concern among Kohanga parents and concern was also suggested by staff survey questionnaire responses. With one exception, all teachers and kaiarahi indicated that at least 50% of the language used in a bilingual classroom should be Maori. Moreover, all associate teachers and kaiarahi reo reported favourable attitudes toward immersion education in Maori.

**Generalization of Findings**

It is impossible to state with any certainty whether the findings of this study, based almost exclusively on South Island data, hold true for North Island bilingual programmes as well. However, limited amounts of data collected from two bilingual units and one bilingual school located in the North Island suggest that these three programmes held several key characteristics in common with the South Island programmes under consideration.

- Associate teachers and kaiarahi reo had not received adequate pre-service training for their roles in bilingual classrooms. There were also insufficient numbers of Maori speaking teachers to fully staff the programmes.
• Material resources and ancillary services to support a bilingual curriculum were completely inadequate.

• Children entering bilingual classes had experienced variable levels of pre-school exposure to Maori language, with very few children speaking Maori as a home language.

• Within mainstream schools, there were suggestions of some staff resistance to the bilingual units.

However, there were also several readily-apparent differences between the North and South Island programmes under investigation:

• In four out of five North Island classrooms, both adults and children were observed to speak only Maori for all classroom functions.

• Interview and questionnaire data suggested that the North Island principals of mainstream schools which housed the units under consideration were more actively supportive of the bilingual programmes than was typical in the South Island.

• Kaiarahi reo, kaiawhina and associate teachers in the North Island programmes had organized a support network which offered training in bilingual education methods and methodology.

It is almost certain, as Spolsky's model suggests, that these differences were interrelated and also that they were, at least in part, related to situational differences, particularly demographic differences, between the North and South Islands.
Recommendations

1. Establish a parallel system of state-supported kaupapa Maori schooling for families who prefer this option.

Nearly half of the families surveyed in the present study whose children had attended Kohanga Reo favoured a separate Maori language school over a bilingual unit established within a mainstream school. This suggests that these families remain unconvinced that mainstream schools can deliver alternative programming which provides an adequate continuation of their children's pre-school experiences. Further, there were many indications from the findings of the present study that due to fundamental differences between the beliefs, purposes and operational strategies of mainstream schooling and Kura Kaupapa Maori, kaupapa Maori schooling is unlikely to be promoted within existing mainstream educational structures.

2. Maintain the bilingual units.

A number of positive outcomes have been identified as resulting from the six programmes under study. As participants have indicated a number of serious concerns, however, the following changes are urgently recommended in order to improve the operations of these programmes.

3. Devolve decision-making authority for Maori language education to the Maori community on a national, regional and local basis.

Community consultation is a necessary, but not sufficient requirement for the successful operations of bilingual programmes. There is also an urgent need for increased scope in community responsibility for and management of the bilingual programmes under study if they are to:

1) receive wide-spread community support and
2) offer a real alternative to mainstream programming.

4. **Establish Planning/Advisory Groups in all schools where bilingual programmes are in operation.**

These bodies would assume responsibility for policy development and oversight of the operations of the bilingual units. Further, they would coordinate the efforts of community support groups and professional support personnel and provide liaison contact with the Ministry of Education. At present, too much distance exists between policy makers in the Head Office of the Ministry and local bilingual programmes. This gap must be closed, as significant aspects of nationally-established bilingual education policy, such as policy relating to the role of kaiarahi reo, are unworkable or unfeasible at the local level.

5. **Develop a clear statement of programme policy at each site.**

As participants at all schools experienced difficulty in indentifying and prioritizing the aims of their bilingual programmes, and also considering that two groups of parents appear to favour somewhat different rationales for the bilingual education of their children, the development of comprehensive policies for the bilingual units, beginning with a clear declaration of rationales, is required to provide much-needed focus for the operations of the programmes. Further, a clear statement of policy would facilitate programme evaluation and allow parents to make informed choices about enrolling their children in the bilingual units.

6. **Accord top priority to training programmes to provide sufficient numbers of teachers who are fluent in Maori to ensure full staffing of bilingual classes.**
There is an urgent need for pre- and in-service training and development for associate teachers and kaiarahi reo - and an equally urgent need for Maori teachers, as opposed to teachers of Maori, to staff bilingual units.

It must be kept in mind that recruitment policies aimed at Maori applicants do not mark the beginnings of a racially discriminatory teaching service. Rather, they begin to redress the current proportional imbalance between Maori and non-Maori teaching staff and, therefore, signal an end to the present de facto discrimination.

If colleges of education are unable, or unwilling, to provide fluent Maori teachers thoroughly trained in bilingual methodology or to offer programmes appropriate to the values and aspirations of Maori, then funding should be diverted to other institutions, such as tribal runanga or polytechnics, which may be more capable of accomplishing these long-deferred tasks.

There is an urgent need for a South Island "Division K" programme, as Kaiarahi reo, in particular, should be offered the opportunity to attain teaching qualifications while maintaining their current employment.

7. **Significantly increase the production and ensure equitable distribution of Maori language educational resources.**

Survey and observation data indicated that kaiarahi reo, associate teachers and resource teachers of Maori spent a great deal of time and energy creating their own resources, such as translations of already existing materials, and that these locally-produced resources were frequently of very high quality and very appealing to children. In addition, a large number of resources were collected in conjunction with the creation of the Maori language syllabus which have never been produced or distributed.
One potential way to alleviate the shortage of Maori language materials would be to collect (with proper remuneration) locally-created materials, to produce them professionally, and to distribute them among bilingual units.

It may well be the case that more efficient production of books and other materials appropriate to local needs and conditions could be met by devolving funds for Maori language resource development to local runanga.

8. **Provide for continuation of bilingual programming, at least through the intermediate grades and, preferably, through high school.**

Positive linguistic and cognitive outcomes can be expected to result from bilingual education only when both languages are developed to a high level of age-appropriate proficiency. This may require up to six years of schooling.

9. **Provide release time for kaiarahi reo and associate teachers.**

By default, in the absence of adequate support services and training, kaiarahi reo and associate teachers are responsible for formulating curriculum, devising strategies, and creating materials for their bilingual classes to a far greater extent than is usual in monolingual classrooms. They need release time on a regular basis in order to accomplish these tasks. It may be that resource teachers of Maori can assist in this process by serving as relieving teachers in bilingual classrooms.

10. **Establish information programmes to enhance awareness of issues pertinent to bilingual education.**

There is an urgent need to implement programmes to familiarize school staff and community members with the goals and operations of bilingual
programmes in their midst. In this way fears or concerns, which have the potential to undermine the operations of the programmes, can be discussed and neutralized before they become unmanageable.

11. **Establish national and regional professional associations for both kaiarahi reo and associate teachers.**

It is recommended that the Ministry of Education, in conjunction with local participants, establish professional networks for staff working in bilingual units. The purpose of such networks would be to assist in development of skills and facilitate sharing of information and resources. An additional function of these networks would be to target research priorities and formulate policy recommendations for bilingual units, including policy for credentialing of kaiarahi reo.

12. **Provide appropriate support services for bilingual programmes, on a par with services which support the English-language portions of the primary school curriculum.**

Within the programmes under study, associate teachers and kaiarahi reo frequently expressed concerns about the paucity of effective support services for bilingual classes.

13. **Facilitate Maori language acquisition in the community and home milieux.**

Functional power for Maori language must come from homes and communities as well as from schools. Television appears to be an important source of extracurricular Maori language input for children enrolled in the programmes under study and is the one source of Maori language available to almost all children. Therefore, increased Maori language television
broadcasting, targeted toward the interests and language abilities of school age children, is recommended as an adjunct to bilingual schooling. Radio broadcasting, appropriate to this age group, is also recommended.

**Directions for Future Research**

- As demonstrated by the limitations of the research methodology employed in the present study (see Chapter Three, above), there is a clear need for a "paradigm" (comprehensively-developed and validated model) of educational research in line with Maori values and concepts, with which to examine Maori language and cultural programmes. Research techniques and instruments well established within the context of mainstream educational research need re-examination in light of the demonstrably different goals and strategies of linguistically and culturally distinct programmes. In particular, this new paradigm may involve changes in the locations, purposes and procedures of research and also changes in identification of research problems and perceptions of "qualifications" which are desirable in those who undertake the role of researcher. It may also necessitate change in the "... ethical framework governing the collection, use, and release of data." (Peters and Robinson, 1984, p. 118).

- Results of the present study indicate that there are a variety of nationally and locally-determined rationales for bilingual education in New Zealand, many of which have clear referents in this nation's social and cultural history. Therefore, we need to avoid too "global" an approach to research. Rather, there is an urgent need to determine, based on our own rationales, what types of bilingual programmes work best for which children within uniquely New Zealand contexts for bilingual education.
In particular, as cultural and social, as well as linguistic and educational goals have been articulated for programmes here, future researchers in the area of bilingual schooling would do well to avoid North American researchers' "obsession" (see Wong Fillmore and Valadez, 1986) with normative tests of the language abilities and other academic skills of bilingually educated children as the sole indicators of programme "success". These tests do not adequately measure the full range of potential programme outcomes (see Chapter Nine, above) and a research perspective informed by test results alone may deflect attention away from other important, but less precisely quantifiable goals which New Zealanders hold for bilingual education. Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) advocates a very broad focus for evaluation of programme outcomes, involving longitudinal measurement of the effects of schooling on indices of social justice, such as rates of unemployment, which, she feels, may ultimately give a much better indication of programme "success". Such an approach may prove useful as a way of evaluating the long-term outcomes of New Zealand programmes, but would require a research design spanning decades, rather than years.

- For the present, the most productive aim for future research may be to look for positive directions for change. This process could begin by locating "successful" programme models (that is programmes which meet the criteria for success determined by participants) and by identifying, within these programmes:

  - interaction patterns between adults and children and between schools and communities
  - organization of managerial functions
  - staffing procedures
  - programme philosophy
  - curriculum
assessment procedures and pedagogical strategies, particularly strategies for the provision of comprehensible input in the Maori language.

- Finally, it should be noted that the recurrent problem of relating educational theory to educational practice may be alleviated if research is conducted by those who have an intimate familiarity with and a demonstrated commitment to Maori language education, rather than by dispassionately "objective" on-lookers. For this reason, local schools and school communities should be empowered to undertake their own research. Although experienced researchers may offer valuable skills and assistance, the identification of research problems, selection of research instruments and administration of research procedures should largely be carried out by participants themselves. In this way, research would be more likely to fulfil real needs and receive fuller cooperation than projects initiated and controlled by "outsiders". Further, it is more likely that recommendations emanating from research conducted by participant groups would not only be feasible within local educational and social contexts, but also, because researchers would have long term involvement with the programmes, stand a better chance of being translated into action.
(te) ao Maori - the world of the Maori.

(te) ao pakeha - the world of the pakeha.

aroha - love, pity, compassion.

haka - fierce dance with accompanying chant.

hangi - feast serving food cooked in an earth oven.

himene - hymn.

hui - a gathering, a meeting.

iwi - tribe.

kaiako - teacher.

kaiarahi reo - language expert.

kaiawhina - helper.

(te) kanohi kitea - face-to-face contact. Literally, "the face seen".

karakia - prayer-chant.

kaumatua - respected elder (male).

kaupapa - basic principle.

Kohanga Reo - a national pre-school movement to promote Maori language.

(Te) Komiti - the Committee.

koroua - respected elder (male).

kuia - respected elder (female).

(Nga) Kura Kaupapa Maori - a national movement of primary school education utilizing Maori as the sole language of instruction and based on Maori cultural practices.

mana - influence, power, prestige.

Maori - indigenous people of New Zealand.

Maoritanga - Maori culture.

marae - total village complex.

mauri - life principle.

(nga) mihi - ceremonial greetings.
pakeha/Pakeha - not Maori; European.

poi - a light ball with a long or short string attached, swung and twirled rhythmically in the poi dance.

powhiri - ceremony of welcome.

rakau - stick.

rangatiratanga - sovereignty.

(te) reo - the (Maori) language.

runanga - assembly, council.

taha - side, dimension.

Taha Maori - school programmes providing exposure to Maori language and culture.

Tamaki Makaurau - Auckland.

tangata whenua - local tribal groups.

tangi - ceremony of mourning.

taonga - irreplaceable treasure(s).

teina - younger children in a whanau grouping.

(nga) tikanga - customs.

(Te) Tino Rangatiratanga - the sovereign power and authority of Maori.

tuakana - elder children in a whanau grouping.

tuturu - authentic.

(te) wahanga - section.

whanau - traditionally, an extended family group. By extention, any group banded together for an on-going common purpose, such as a school "whanau".

(nga) wahine toa - formidable women.

waiata - song.

(te) wairua - spirit.

(te) wairua Maori - Maori spirituality.
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Appendix

Parents' Questionnaire


I am preparing a report on seven bilingual units located throughout the South Island in order to complete my Ph.D. requirement at the University of Canterbury. The report will also go to the Department of Education in Wellington in order to inform them of the experiences and attitudes of parents, teachers, administrators and others involved in bilingual education units. A copy of the completed report will be sent to your school as well.

Each response will be treated as confidential. The processing of the data will be carried out by me alone; you are not asked to identify yourselves or your children.

Some people may be sensitive to one or more of the questions, for example, those relating to family background. If so, please feel free to leave them blank. The reason I have asked such questions is because researchers have identified them as being important in getting a clear picture of bilingual programmes.

If you can help me to gather information for this report by filling out the Parent Questionnaire, I would be very grateful.

Thank you for considering my request.

Very sincerely

(Mrs) Kathleen Jacques
PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Please tick the appropriate boxes or follow particular instructions. Feel free to show more than one answer for each question and to add any suggestions, comments, or criticism of the questionnaire you might have.

1. Why did you enrol your child (or children) in the bilingual class? For example:

   ( ) Child’s choice
   ( ) To carry on from Kohanga Reo
   ( ) Family-like atmosphere
   ( ) Enrich child's language and culture
   ( ) Give child a good education
   ( ) Any other reasons?

(For coding use ONLY)

1 (a) What do you feel are the biggest advantages and disadvantages of educating your child (or children) in a bilingual class?

(For coding data ONLY)

1 (b) Do you have any concerns either at present or for the future about your child's schooling?

(For coding data ONLY)
2. Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes, which of the following aims you consider most important for a bilingual class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not important</td>
<td>somewhat important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>very important</td>
<td>extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Keeping the Maori language alive
- Providing a Maori cultural dimension
- Helping children succeed in school work
- Providing children with fluency in spoken Maori
- Providing children with literacy skills (reading and writing) in Maori
- Helping children to like school
- Giving children confidence
- Providing a warm, family-like atmosphere
- Giving the children a chance to participate in both Maori and Pakeha activities
- Teaching children to work and play co-operatively
Please write in your own answers

What is the most important aim for a bilingual class?

The second most important aim?

The third most important aim?

Any other comments?

3. Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the box how satisfied you are with the bilingual class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>moderately satisfied</td>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>extremely satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments?
4 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes what changes, if any, you would like to see in the way the bilingual class operates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I disagree strongly</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I agree somewhat</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I don't want to see any big changes. 

The class needs more Maori language books and materials.

The class needs more English language books and materials.

There are too many children in the class for the teacher to handle.

The teacher-pupil ratio is satisfactory.

More English language should be spoken in class.

Less English language should be spoken in class.

There should be more of a European or Pakeha perspective in class.

There should be more of a Maori perspective in class.

More Maori language should be spoken in class.

Less Maori language should be spoken in class.

There ought to be more contact between the bilingual class and the rest of the school.

There ought to be less contact between the bilingual class and the rest of the school.
I would prefer a separate Maori language school.

I am pleased with my child's progress in this class.

The teacher expects too much from the children in terms of school work.

The teacher expects too little of the children in terms of school work.

There should be more individual attention for children.

The children are usually attentive and well-behaved in class.

The children are usually inattentive and poorly-behaved in class.

Comments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>How often do you visit the bilingual class?</th>
<th>(For coding use ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often do you visit the bilingual class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(  ) almost every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(  ) about once a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(  ) about once a fortnight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(  ) about once a term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(  ) less than once a term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When you do visit the class, do you feel

- Welcomed ( )
- Unwelcome ( )

Do you get regular information on the activities of the class?

- Yes ( )
- No ( )

Do you get regular information on your child's progress in the class?

- Yes ( )
- No ( )
When you do visit the class, what's the reason for your visit? For example:

- [ ] To pick up or drop off children
- [ ] To help the children with lessons
- [ ] To chat (for example, after school)
- [ ] To watch the class in action
- [ ] To help make materials
- [ ] To direct or assist with a culture group
- [ ] To go on a class trip
- [ ] To discuss child's progress
- [ ] To assist in planning activities

Anything else?
6  How important a part do you feel the Kaiarahi reo (language assistant) plays in the bilingual class?

(  ) unimportant
(  ) not very important
(  ) somewhat important
(  ) very important
(  ) extremely important

Why do you feel this way?

(For Coding use ONLY)  

7  (a) How much Maori language do you think ought to be used during a school day in a bilingual classroom? For example:

(  ) 100%
(  ) 75%
(  ) 50%
(  ) 25%
(  ) 10%
(  ) less than 10%

Comments?
7  (b) How do you feel Maori should be used in a bilingual classroom? For example:

( ) conversational language

( ) reading

( ) writing

( ) prayers

( ) marae language

( ) action songs

( ) traditional chants

Any comments?

7  (c) Which children should attend Maori/English bilingual classes?

( ) all New Zealand school children

( ) all those who want to

( ) only Maori children

( ) only children who've gone to Kohanga reo.

Comments?
7. (d) How important do you think the Maori language is for people in this school district? (For coding use ONLY)

( ) unimportant  
( ) not very important  
( ) somewhat important  
( ) very important  
( ) extremely important

Comments?

8. Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes how often your child or children enrolled in the bilingual class have contact with the Maori language outside of class? For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>almost never</td>
<td>less than once a month</td>
<td>at least once a month</td>
<td>at least once a fortnight</td>
<td>at least once a week</td>
<td>almost every day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hears Maori spoken at home by parents  
Hears other Maori-speaking relatives or friends  
Watches Maori language TV  
Attends culture club  
Reads Maori books  
Attends Marae functions  
Any other contacts?  
Comments?
9 Did your child or children who now attend the bilingual class also attend Kohanga reo? For example:
For how many days a week on average?

( ) three to five days a week
( ) one to three days a week
( ) less than once a week
( ) not at all

For how many months or years?

( ) more than 3 years
( ) more than 2 years
( ) more than 1 year
( ) more than 6 months
( ) less than 6 months
( ) other

Any comments?

10 Do you wish to see the bilingual programme continued at higher grade levels? For example:

( ) through junior school
( ) through intermediate school
( ) through high school
( ) other (please specify)

Any comments?
11 How many children do you have in this bilingual class? (For coding use ONLY)

( ) one
( ) two
( ) three
( ) four
( ) other

12 Do you speak any language at home other than Maori or English? (For coding use ONLY)

( ) no
( ) yes (please specify)

Comments?

13 By placing the appropriate number in the boxes, could you please indicate the ethnic origin of your child (or children) in the bilingual class? For example:

1 Maori
2 European/Pakeha
3 Part Maori and Pakeha
4 Pacific Islander
5 Other (please specify)

Comments?
14 Does a father or other male guardian live with the child (or children) who attend the bilingual class? (For coding use ONLY) 

( ) no 

( ) yes 

Comments?

If "yes" please go on to questions 15, 16 and 17.

If "no" please go on to question 18.

15 What does the father or guardian usually do at work? (For example, "Drive a truck" or "Teach at a high school") (For coding use ONLY) 

Any comments?

16 Which of the following groups does the father or guardian belong to? (For coding use ONLY) 

( ) He is not working at the moment 

( ) He works for someone else 

( ) He works for himself on his own 

( ) He is a foreman or manager (people work for him, but he does not own the business) 

( ) He is a boss (people work for him and he owns the business as well) 

( ) Other (please specify)
17 What is the highest level of education for the father or guardian?

( ) University degree
( ) Passed some university papers
( ) Teachers certificate
( ) Other tertiary qualifications
( ) Trade certificate
( ) Bursary exams
( ) U.E./6th Form Certificate
( ) School Certificate
( ) None of the above
( ) Other (please specify)

18 Does a mother or other female guardian live with the child (or children) who attend the bilingual class?

( ) no
( ) yes

Comments?

If "yes", please go on to questions 19, 20 and 21.

If "no", please go on to the last page.
19 What does the mother or guardian usually do at work? (For example, "Teach in a high school" or "Drive a bus").

Comments?

20 Which of the following groups does the mother or guardian belong to?

( ) She is not working at the moment

( ) She works for someone else

( ) She works for herself on her own

( ) She is a forewoman or manager (people work for her, but she doesn’t own the business)

( ) She is a boss (people work for her and she owns the business as well)

( ) Other (please specify)

21 What is the highest level of education for the mother or guardian?

( ) University degree

( ) Passed some university papers

( ) Teachers certificate

( ) Other tertiary qualifications

( ) Trade certificate

( ) Bursary exams

( ) U.E./6th Form Certificate

( ) School Certificate

( ) None of the above

( ) Other (please specify)
Kua mutu. Kia ora mo tou awhina.

Thank you for sharing your ideas with me. I hope that that information you've provided will be taken into account in the planning of future bilingual programmes.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any comments or suggestions.

Kathleen Jacques, Ph.D.candidate
Education Department
University of Canterbury
Christchurch.
Kaiarahi Reo Questionnaire

Please tick the appropriate boxes or follow particular instructions. Feel free to show more than one answer for each question and to add any suggestions, comments, or criticism of the questionnaire you might have.

1 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the box to the right of the question, which of the following aims you consider to be most important for a bilingual class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Not important at all</th>
<th>2 Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the Maori language alive</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Maori cultural dimension</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting competence at age-appropriate levels in all school subjects</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing fluency in spoken Maori</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing literacy skills (reading and writing) in Maori</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting childrens' enjoyment of school</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing childrens' confidence and self-esteem</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a warm, family-like atmosphere</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving children a chance to participate in both Maori and Pakeha activities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching children to work and play co-operatively</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting co-operation between home and school</td>
<td>□ 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please write in your own answers to the following questions

1a What do you feel is the most important aim for a bilingual class?

1b What is the second most important aim?

1c What is the third most important aim?

Any other comments?

2 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes how satisfied you are with the bilingual class (or classes) in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you feel about the childrens' attitudes and behaviour?
How do you feel about the childrens' progress in using the Maori language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>Moderately satisfied</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you feel about the childrens' general progress in school work?

2a Do you think the children you work with are better off in a bilingual class than they would be in a 'regular' class?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Unsure

Please explain your last response.

Any other comments?

3 What do you see as the main advantage of bilingual education at your school?

Could you please list any disadvantages?
4 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes what changes, if any, you would like to see in the way the bilingual class, or classes, operate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I don't want to see any big changes.  

The class needs more Maori language books and materials.  

The class needs more English language books and materials.  

There are too many children in the class.  

The pupil-adult ratio is satisfactory.  

More Maori language should be spoken in class.  

A Maori language school would work better than a bilingual class in an English language school.  

An immersion class (100% Maori language) would work better than a bilingual class.  

Any other change you would like to see?
5. How would you rate the support your bilingual class or classes receive from the following?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no support</td>
<td>A moderate amount of support</td>
<td>A great deal of support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal of your school. □ 33
Resource teacher of Maori. □
Maori advisors. □
Community elders / Marae committee. □
Parents. □
College or University students. □
Kohanga Reo staff. □
Local churches. □
Sports clubs. □
Culture clubs. □ 42
Comments?
6 What is the spread of Maori language fluency among the children in your class (or classes)? For example:

( ) All children are on about the same level.
( ) There are some differences in fluency.
( ) There is a great deal of difference in fluency.

If there are differences in childrens' Maori language fluency; is this a problem for you?

( ) Not really.
( ) Something of a problem.
( ) A big problem.

Any comments?

7 Which children do you think should attend Maori / English bilingual classes? For example:

( ) All New Zealand children.
( ) All those who want to.
( ) Only Maori children.
( ) Only children who have attended Kohanga reo.

Any other choices?

[For Coding data ONLY]
8 How would you describe the children in the bilingual class, or classes, at your school? For example:

( ) Fairly typical of most students at our school.
( ) Somewhat different.
( ) Quite different.

( ) They have good attendance records.
( ) They have average attendance records.
( ) They have below average attendance records.

( ) They are good students.
( ) They are average students.
( ) They are below average students.

( ) They are quite confident.
( ) They have an average confidence level.
( ) They are somewhat unconfident.

( ) They are well behaved.
( ) Their behaviour is average.
( ) Their behaviour is below average.
8. How would you describe the children in the bilingual class, or classes, at your school? For example:

   ( ) Their families are quite well off and well educated for this area.

   ( ) Their families have average income and education levels for this area.

   ( ) Their families have below average income and education levels for this area.

   ( ) Their families are quite concerned with the children's education.

   ( ) Their families are somewhat concerned with the children's education.

   ( ) Their families are not very concerned with the children's education.

   ( ) The ethnic mix of the bilingual class (or classes) is about average for this school.

   ( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of Maori students for this school.

   ( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of another ethnic group (or groups). Please specify.

9. How were you selected for your job in the bilingual class?
9a Please describe briefly your educational and employment background.

9b Please describe any pre-service or in-service training you have had relating to bilingual education.

9c Do you feel that this training has been adequate?

( ) Yes.
( ) No.
( ) Not sure.

Any comments?

10 Do you feel you have had a clear picture of what your job would involve before you began working in the bilingual programme?
10a How would you describe your job? For example do you

( ) support the Maori language and culture of children who have previously attended kohanga reo?

( ) provide Maori language and cultural input for the whole class?

( ) provide support for the associate teacher (or teachers) in te reo and taha Maori?

( ) educate other staff members in te reo and taha Maori?

( ) act as liaison between the school and parents and other community members?

( ) create classroom materials?

( ) perform playground duty or other similar duties?

( ) support Maori pupils who are in the bilingual programme?

( ) attend staff meetings?

Any additional duties?

10b What do you consider to be your most important duty in the bilingual class?
(continued)
10b  Second most important duty?

Third most important duty?

11  How do you use the Maori language in the classroom?
For example:

(  )  Conversational language.

(  )  Classroom management ("haere ra").

(  )  Explaining lessons or teaching lessons.

(  )  Reading Maori.

(  )  Writing Maori.

(  )  Prayers.

(  )  Marae language.

(  )  Action songs.

(  )  Traditional chants.

Any other ways?
12 How much Maori language do you feel should be used during the school day in a bilingual classroom? (For Coding data ONLY)

( ) 100%
( ) 75%
( ) 50%
( ) 25%
( ) 10%
( ) Less than 10%

Comments?

13 How much Maori language do you use during an average school day? For example:

( ) 100%
( ) 75%
( ) 50%
( ) 25%
( ) 10%
( ) Less than 10%
13a Do you use any language other than Maori or English?

Comments?

14 Is there a pool of Maori-speaking parents or community members who are available to talk with the children in your bilingual programme?

14a If these Maori speakers are available, how often do they have contact with the bilingual class?

( ) Almost everyday.  
( ) More than once a week.  
( ) About once a week.  
( ) About once a fortnight.  
( ) About once a month.  
( ) About once a term.  
( ) Less than once a term.  

Comments?
How would you describe the Maori language materials (books, reference works, posters, tapes) available for your programmes? For example:

Do you feel you have enough information about available materials?

Do you feel the materials are of good quality?

Do you feel the materials are easy to obtain?

Do you feel they are geared to the levels of the children with whom you work?

Do you feel the materials are available in sufficient quantities?

Is there a good variety of materials?
15 How would you describe the Maori language materials (books, reference works, posters, tapes) available for your programmes? For example:

Are the materials interesting to children?

□ 112

Please list any favourites.

Are there any types of Maori-language materials you need, but which are not available?

□

Any other comments?

□

16 On average, how many hours do you spend each week making Maori language materials?

□

Planning lessons or other activities?

□ 116
17 In general, how comfortable do you feel working with the associate teacher or teachers?

( ) Very comfortable.
( ) Somewhat comfortable.
( ) Somewhat uncomfortable.
( ) Very uncomfortable.

Please describe any particularly rewarding or problematical aspects of this working relationship.

17a In general, how comfortable do you feel with the rest of the staff?

( ) Very comfortable.
( ) Somewhat comfortable.
( ) Somewhat uncomfortable.
( ) Very uncomfortable.

What types of contact do you have with staff members other than the associate teacher or teachers? For example, do you

( ) Chat with them in the staff room?
( ) Work with their classes?
( ) Contact Maori parents or community members on their behalf?
( ) Advise them on how to handle Maori pupils?
(continued)

17a In general, how comfortable do you feel with the rest of the staff?

(  ) Help them prepare for school assemblies or other special activities?

(  ) Teach after-school classes in Maori language?

(  ) Offer advice on the implementation of Maori programmes in the school?

Any other comments?

18 In general, how would you describe the reaction of the school staff to the bilingual class or classes?

(  ) Very favourable.

(  ) Somewhat favourable.

(  ) Neither favourable nor unfavourable.

(  ) Somewhat unfavourable.

(  ) Very unfavourable or indifferent.

Any other reactions?

Comments?
19 Do you wish to see the bilingual programme continue at higher grade levels? For example,

( ) Through the junior grades.
( ) Through the intermediate grades.
( ) Through high school.

Comments?

20 What aspects of your job give you particular satisfaction?

Please describe any particular problems you face in your job.

21 Based on your experience, how do you explain the high failure rate of Maori students in New Zealand schools?
22 What is your reaction to total immersion programmes in the Maori language?

( ) Favourable.
( ) Unfavourable.
( ) Can't say.

Please explain your reaction.

What is your reaction to nga kura kaupapa maori?

( ) Favourable.
( ) Unfavourable.
( ) Can't say.

Please explain your reaction.

23 Please list any major concerns you may have, either at present or for the future, regarding your school's bilingual programme.
Kua mutu. Kia ora mo tou awhina.

Thank you for sharing your ideas with me. I hope that the information you've provided will be taken into account in the planning of future bilingual programmes.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or suggestions.

Kathleen Jacques, Ph.D. candidate
Education Department
University of Canterbury
Christchurch.
**Teachers' Questionnaire**

Please tick the appropriate boxes or follow particular instructions. Feel free to show more than one answer for each question and to add any suggestions, comments, or criticism of the questionnaire you might have.

1. Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the box to the right of the question, which of the following aims you consider to be most important for a bilingual class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Keeping the Maori language alive. 
- Providing a Maori cultural dimension.
- Promoting competence at age-appropriate levels in all school subjects.
- Providing fluency in spoken Maori.
- Providing literacy skills (reading and writing) in Maori.
- Promoting children's enjoyment of school.
- Enhancing children's confidence and self-esteem.
- Providing a warm, family-like atmosphere.
- Giving children a chance to participate in both Maori and Pakeha activities.
- Teaching children to work and play co-operatively.
- Promoting co-operation between home and school.
Please write in your own answers to the following questions

1a What do you feel is the most important aim for a bilingual class?

1b What is the second most important aim?

1c What is the third most important aim?

Any other comments?

2 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes how satisfied you are with the bilingual class (or classes) in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither satisfied</th>
<th>4 Moderately satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>5 Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you feel about the children's attitudes and behaviour?

[ ] 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you feel about the children's progress in using the Maori language? □ 17

How do you feel about the children's general progress in school work?

2a Do you think the children you work with are better off in a bilingual class than they would be in a 'regular' class?

( ) Yes.

( ) No.

( ) Unsure.

Please explain your last response.

Any other comments? □ 21
3 What do you see as the main advantage of bilingual education at your school?

Could you please list any disadvantages?

4 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the boxes what changes, if any, you would like to see in the way the bilingual class, or classes, operate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I don't want to see any big changes.
The class needs more Maori language books and materials.
The class needs more English language books and materials.
There are too many children in the class.
The pupil-adult ratio is satisfactory.
More Maori language should be spoken in class.
A Maori language school would work better than a bilingual class in an English language school.
An immersion class (100% Maori language) would work better than a bilingual class.
5. How would you rate the support your bilingual class or classes receive from the following?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no support</td>
<td>A moderate amount of support</td>
<td>A great deal of support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal of your school.  
Resource teacher of Maori.  
Maori advisors.  
Community elders / Marae committee.  
Parents.  
College or University students.  
Kohanga Reo staff.  
Local churches.  
Sports clubs.  
Culture clubs.  
Comments?

33  
42
6 What is the spread of Maori language fluency among the children in your class (or classes)? For example:

( ) All children are on about the same level.
( ) There are some differences in fluency.
( ) There is a great deal of difference in fluency.

If there are differences in childrens' Maori language fluency, is this a problem for you?

( ) Not really.
( ) Something of a problem.
( ) A big problem.

Any comments?

7 Which children do you think should attend Maori / English bilingual classes? For example:

( ) All New Zealand children.
( ) All those who want to.
( ) Only Maori children.
( ) Only children who have attended Kohanga reo.

Any other choices?
How would you describe the children in the bilingual class, or classes, at your school? For example:

( ) Fairly typical of most students at our school.
( ) Somewhat different.
( ) Quite different.

( ) They have good attendance records.
( ) They have average attendance records.
( ) They have below average attendance records.

( ) They are good students.
( ) They are average students.
( ) They are below average students.

( ) They are quite confident.
( ) They have an average confidence level.
( ) They are somewhat unconfident.

( ) They are well behaved.
( ) Their behaviour is average.
( ) Their behaviour is below average.
8  How would you describe the children in the bilingual class, or classes, at your school? For example:

( ) Their families are quite well off and well educated for this area.

( ) Their families have average income and education levels for this area.

( ) Their families have below average income and education levels for this area.

( ) Their families are quite concerned with the children's education.

( ) Their families are somewhat concerned with the children's education.

( ) Their families are not very concerned with the children's education.

( ) The ethnic mix for the bilingual class (or classes) is about average for this school.

( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of Maori students for this school.

( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of another ethnic group (or groups). Please specify.
9 How were you selected for your job in the bilingual class?

9a Please describe briefly your educational and employment background.

9b Please describe any pre-service or in-service training you have had relating to bilingual education.

9c Do you feel that this training has been adequate?

( ) Yes.
( ) No.
( ) Not sure.

Any comments?

10 Do you feel you have had a clear picture of what your job would involve before you began working in the bilingual programme?
11 How do you use the Maori language in the classroom? For example:

- ( ) Conversational language.
- ( ) Classroom management ("haere ra").
- ( ) Explaining lessons or teaching lessons.
- ( ) Reading Maori.
- ( ) Writing Maori.
- ( ) Prayers.
- ( ) Marae language.
- ( ) Action songs.
- ( ) Traditional chants.

Any other ways?

12 How much Maori language do you feel should be used during the school day in a bilingual classroom?

- ( ) 100%
- ( ) 75%
- ( ) 50%
- ( ) 25%
- ( ) 10%
- ( ) Less than 10%
12. How much Maori language do you feel should be used during the school day in a bilingual classroom?

Comments?

13. How much Maori language do you use during an average school day?

( ) 100%
( ) 75%
( ) 50%
( ) 25%
( ) 10%
( ) Less than 10%

13a. Do you use any language other than Maori or English?

Comments?
14. How would you describe the Maori language materials (books, reference works, posters, tapes) available for your programme? For example:

Do you feel you have enough information about available materials?

☐ 76

Do you feel the materials are of good quality?

☐

Do you feel the materials are easy to obtain?

☐

Do you feel they are geared to the levels of the children with whom you work?

☐

Do you feel the materials are available in sufficient quantities?

☐

Is there a good variety of materials?

☐

Are the materials interesting to children?

☐ 82
14 How would you describe the Maori language materials (books, reference works, posters, tapes) available for your programme? For example:

Please list any favourites.

Are there any types of Maori language materials you need, but which are not available?

Any other comments?

15 On average, how many hours do you spend each week making Maori language materials?

Planning lessons or other activities?
15a How would you describe your present teaching role compared to teaching in a "regular" classroom? For example:

( ) More work.  □ 87
( ) Less work.
( ) About the same.

( ) Do you make up more of your own materials?
( ) Fewer of your own materials.
( ) About the same?

( ) Do you spend more time on classroom preparation?
( ) Less time?
( ) About the same?

( ) Do you have more classroom discipline problems?
( ) Fewer problems?
( ) About the same?

( ) Do you feel your present role offers more job satisfaction?  □ 92
( ) Less satisfaction?
( ) About the same?
(continued)
15a How would you describe your present teaching role compared to teaching in a "regular" classroom? For example:

( ) Do you feel children are generally better off in a bilingual classroom?

( ) Less well off?

( ) About the same?

Any comments?

16 In general, how comfortable do you feel working with the kaiarahi reo?

( ) Very comfortable.

( ) Somewhat comfortable.

( ) Somewhat uncomfortable.

( ) Very uncomfortable.

Please describe any particularly rewarding or problematical aspects of this working relationship.
17 In general, how would you describe the reaction of the school staff to the bilingual class or classes?

(  ) Very favourable.
(  ) Somewhat favourable.
(  ) Neither favourable nor unfavourable.
(  ) Somewhat unfavourable.
(  ) Very unfavourable or indifferent.

Any other reactions?

Comments?

18 Do you wish to see the bilingual programme continue at higher grade levels? For example:

(  ) Through the junior grades.
(  ) Through the intermediate grades.
(  ) Through high school.

Comments?
18b Do you have a long term curriculum plan (for example a one-year plan) detailing the Maori language portion of your programme?

( ) Yes.
( ) No.
( ) In part.

Comments?

18c In your class is children's general academic progress assessed through

( ) observation.
( ) teacher-made tests.
( ) standardized tests.
( ) running records of reading performance
( ) other means of assessment (please specify).

Please describe ways of assisting children who are not meeting expectations of progress.
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18d In order to carry out your role as associate teacher in a bilingual classroom, have you changed your approach from "regular" classroom teaching? For example in

( ) teaching methods.

( ) teaching style.

( ) classroom management
  (seating, grouping etc).

( ) classroom discipline.

( ) parent contact.

( ) evaluation of childrens' progress.

Any other changes?

Comments?

18e How do you encourage parents and other members of the community to become involved with the bilingual programme? Do you, for example

( ) Have informal chats?

( ) Offer general or specific invitations to visit the class?

( ) Report on class events (by newsletter for example)?
(continued)

18e How do you encourage parents and other members of the community to become involved with the activities of the class. For example

( ) Bring the class on visits to the local marae or Kohanga reo? How often?

( ) Hold meetings? How often?

Any other methods?

18f Do you feel parental or community involvement is different for your bilingual class than it was for "regular" classes you've taught? For example?

( ) There's more involvement in the bilingual class.

( ) There's less involvement in the bilingual class.

( ) About the same level of involvement.

19 What aspects of your job give you particular satisfaction?

Please describe any particular problem you face in your job.
20 Based on your experience, how do you explain the high failure rate of Maori students in New Zealand schools?

21 What is your reaction to total immersion programmes in the Maori language?

( ) Favourable.
( ) Unfavourable.
( ) Can't say.
Please explain your reaction.

What is your reaction to nga kura kaupapa maori?

( ) Favourable.
( ) Unfavourable.
( ) Can't say.
Please explain your reaction.
22 Please list any major concerns you may have, either at present or for the future, regarding your school’s bilingual programme.

Kua mutu. Kia ora mo tou awhina.

Thank you for sharing your ideas with me. I hope that the information you’ve provided will be taken into account in the planning of future bilingual programmes.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or suggestions.

Kathleen Jacques, Ph.D. candidate
Education Department
University of Canterbury
Christchurch.
Principals' Questionnaire

Please tick the appropriate boxes or follow particular instructions. Feel free to show more than one answer for each question and to add any suggestions, comments, or criticism of the questionnaire you might have.

1  Briefly, how did a bilingual programme come to be established at your school?

2  Was any advisory committee established to help implement the programme?

If so, who were the members of the committee? For example:

(  ) Parents.

(  ) Other community members.

(  ) School staff.

(  ) Board or Department of Education personnel.

(  ) Others? Please specify.

Comments?
3 How does the school inform the community about the bilingual programme? For example:

( ) Parent nights.
( ) PTA meetings.
( ) Board of Trustee meetings.
( ) Advice to parents of new students.
( ) School assemblies.
( ) Contact with the Maori community.
( ) Media contact.
( ) Contact with preschool programmes.
( ) General or specific invitations to visit the bilingual classes.

Any other ways?

Comments?
Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the box to the right of the question, which of the following aims you consider most important for a bilingual class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Not important at all</th>
<th>2 Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Keeping the Maori language alive. 19

Providing a Maori cultural dimension.

Promoting competence at age-appropriate levels in all school subjects.

Providing fluency in spoken Maori.

Providing literacy skills (reading and writing) in Maori.

Promoting children's enjoyment of school.

Enhancing children's confidence and self-esteem.

Providing a warm, family-like atmosphere.

Giving children a chance to participate in both Maori and Pakeha activities.

Teaching children to work and play co-operatively.

Promoting co-operation between home and school. 29
Please write in your own answers to the next three questions.

4a What is the most important aim for a bilingual class?

4b The second most important aim?

4c The third most important aim?

Comments?

5 What do you see as the main advantages of a bilingual programme at your school?

Please list any disadvantages.
6 Please indicate by placing the appropriate number in the box, how satisfied you are with the bilingual programme at your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you feel about the programme generally? □ 38

How do you feel about the childrens' attitudes and behaviour? □

How do you feel about the childrens' progress in school? □

How do you feel about the community's acceptance of the programme? □

How do you feel about your school staff's acceptance of the programme? □

Comments?

7 Briefly, how do you select teaching staff for your school's bilingual class or classes?

(For Coding use ONLY) □

□ 44
8. What do you consider to be the most important quality for a bilingual teacher?

The second most important quality?

Any other important quality?

8a. Do you have trouble finding suitable teaching staff for your bilingual programme? Please explain briefly.

9. How do you select Kaipara reo for your bilingual programme?
9a What do you consider to be the most important quality for a Kaiarahi reo?

The second most important quality?

Any other important qualities?

9b Do you have trouble finding suitable Kaiarahi reo for your bilingual programme? Please explain briefly.

10 Have there been recent changes in your bilingual staff? For example, has there been a different Kaiarahi reo

( ) from last year to this year.

( ) during this year.

( ) expected next year.

Please explain any change.
Has there been a different associate teacher?

( ) from last year to this year.

( ) during this year.

( ) expected next year.

Please explain any change.

11 How are children selected for the bilingual programme? For example do you select

( ) Only those who have attended Kohanga reo?

( ) Only those with some knowledge of the Maori language?

( ) All children whose families show an interest?

Any other method of selection?

Do you need to restrict entry because too many children apply?
Do you have difficulty finding enough children to fill a class (or classes)?

12 How would you describe the children in your school's bilingual programme?

( ) Fairly typical of most students in your school.
( ) Somewhat different.
( ) Quite different.

( ) Good attendance records.
( ) Average attendance.
( ) Below average attendance.

( ) Good students.
( ) Average students.
( ) Below average students.

( ) Quite confident.
( ) Average confidence level.
( ) Somewhat unconfident.
12. How would you describe the children in your school’s bilingual programme?

( ) Well behaved.
( ) Average behaviour.
( ) Below average behaviour.

( ) Their families are quite well off and well educated for this area.
( ) Their families have average incomes and education levels for this area.
( ) Their families have below average incomes and education levels for this area.

( ) Their families are quite concerned with the childrens' education.
( ) Their families are somewhat concerned.
( ) Their families are not very concerned.

( ) The ethnic mix of the bilingual class (or classes) is about average for this school.
( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of Maori students for this school.
( ) The class (or classes) have a high proportion of another ethnic group (or groups). Please specify.

Any comments?
13 Is parent or community involvement different for your bilingual programme than it is for "regular" classes? For example:

( ) There is more involvement in the bilingual programme.

( ) There is less involvement in the bilingual programme.

( ) About the same.

( ) There's a different type of involvement in the bilingual programme.

( ) There's about the same type of involvement.

If there are significant differences please explain them briefly.

14 What consideration is given to regular evaluation of the bilingual programme? Do you, for example:

( ) monitor pupil's progress?

( ) evaluate teaching methods?

( ) provide for a parent's evaluation of the programme?

( ) other methods of evaluation. (Please specify).

Comments?
15 Do you wish to see the bilingual programme continue at higher grade levels? For example:

(  ) Through junior grades.
(  ) Through intermediate grades.
(  ) Through high school.
Comments?

16 How would you describe the general reaction of your school staff to the bilingual programme?

(  ) Very unfavourable.
(  ) Somewhat unfavourable.
(  ) Neither favourable nor unfavourable.
(  ) Somewhat favourable.
(  ) Very favourable.

Any other reactions?

Comments?
17 How would you describe the general reaction of your community to the bilingual programme?

( ) Very unfavourable.
( ) Somewhat unfavourable.
( ) Neither favourable nor unfavourable.
( ) Somewhat favourable.
( ) Very favourable.

Comments?

18 Based on your experience, how do you explain the high failure rate of Maori pupils in New Zealand schools?

19 What is your reaction to nga kura kaupapa Maori? Please explain your reaction briefly.

What is your reaction to immersion programmes in the Maori language? Please explain your reaction.
20 Please list any major concerns you may have, either at present or for the future, regarding your school's bilingual programme.

Thank you for sharing your ideas with me. I hope that the information you've provided will be taken into account in the planning of future bilingual programmes.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or suggestions.

Kathleen Jacques, Ph.D. candidate
Education Department
University of Canterbury
Christchurch.